Oxford Policy Management

Dalberg

Effective and Efficient Partnership:

Examination of key actors' roles in GPE's country-level operational model towards GPE2020 delivery.

Inception Report

Volume II – Annexes

Nicola Ruddle, Georgina Rawle, Andrew Wyatt, Veronica Chau, Ying Yeung

March 2018

Table of contents

Annex A Terms of reference for Workstream A 3

Annex B Consultation on scope and methodology 10

B.1 Consultation and iteration in inception phase 10

B.2 Options for further work in a Phase 2 11

Annex C MAPPING of key players' roles and responsibilities 13

Annex D Participants for interviews and online consultations, selected by GPE Secretariat 33

Annex A Terms of reference for Workstream A

16 November 2017
Updated as a result of the inception period:
29 March 2018

Background

Established in 2002, the Global Partnership for Education ("the Partnership" or GPE), formerly the Education for All Fast-Track Initiative, is a multi-stakeholder partnership focused on supporting and financing education in low and lower middle income countries, contributing to the achievement of Sustainable Development Goal on Education (SDG 4). GPE's strategic goals and objectives are to achieve improvements in learning outcomes, equity and efficiency across the 89 developing countries eligible to join the partnership (65 are currently developing country partners, or DCPs). The Partnership's strategic plan, GPE 2020, outlines its approach to achieving both global and country level impacts; the latter through its support for strengthened educational systems, including support to education sector planning, inclusive policy dialogue and mutual accountability, and financing for the implementation of sector plans.

GPE financing for education is primarily disbursed through country-level grants that are underpinned by the importance of developing stronger education systems. Currently, GPE provides three types of country level grants to support the development and implementation of sound education sector plans: 1) the Education Sector Plan Development grant (ESPDG), which supports sector analysis and the design of education sector plans or transitional education plans in conflict-affected contexts; 2) the Program Development Grant (PDG), which supports the design of the GPE implementation grants; and 3) the Education Sector Program Implementation Grant (ESPIG), which is the largest country level grant and which supports the implementation of an endorsed education sector plan. This grant requires countries to adopt credible education sector plans, improve domestic financing and data strategies and provides financing for the implementation of the national plan. Thirty percent of ESPIGs are disbursed as payment for results in three areas: equity, learning and efficiency. GPE is also in the process of operationalizing investments by the GPE Multiplier, a new innovative finance facility to mobilize new and additional external funding for education.

In March 2017, the GPE Board approved a new Financing and Funding Framework (FFF), which aims to create an expanded platform for resource mobilization and deployment across DCPs.

The FFF calls for enhancement of GPE's core funding mechanisms, through a focus on both improved operational efficiency, and innovative approaches to mobilizing greater levels of resources from DCPs and development partners. These terms of reference cover key deliverables for two core FFF work streams:

a. Reinforcement of GPE support for country-level capacity building through better capitalizing on the strengths of key country level actors (specifically coordinating agencies, grant agents, and local education groups). Delivering on this objective of a more effective Partnership requires a thorough stock take of how well these actors approach and, are currently equipped to perform, the roles envisaged for them under GPE's operational model.

b. Development of an Education Sector Investment Case (ESIC). Building upon GPE's existing support to education sector planning and for the alignment and harmonization of funding around this plan, the ESIC approach will enhance the Partnership's efforts to bring new and in some cases non-traditional funders to the table to support the achievement of priorities established in quality, evidence-based sector plans.

GPE is seeking the services of an external contractor to undertake core work within these two areas of the FFF. Further details of these two work streams, including expectations for the firm contracted to complete this work, are outlined in Sections A and B below; wherever possible, synergies across the work streams should be exploited. The work described in these ToRs is not exhaustive, and the external contractor may be

requested to undertake other or modified tasks that arise from GPE's efforts to effectively operatizing the two work streams, described below.

A. Building a more effective Partnership: capacity review of key actors in the operational model

[Work stream A to be conducted from December 2017 to June 2018]

I. Background

The GPE offers an operational framework that focuses on supporting developing country partners' efforts in building effective education systems to improve equity and learning. At the country level, the model is made up of a number of core actors.

At the centre of the model is the **Developing Country Partner (DCP)** itself, where the focal point for the GPE is usually the ministry of education.

GPE supports stronger approaches to sector dialogue and accountability with the DCP at the centre by supporting engagement of all education partners in a collaborative forum called the **Local Education Group (LEG)**, typically led by the ministry of education, and including a range of stakeholders from government, technical agencies and civil society. The LEG participates in the development, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of education sector plans and programs, including through Joint Sector Review processes.

While the LEG is a summative multi-stakeholder body, a **Coordinating Agency (CA)** is selected from among its members to facilitate the work undertaken by the LEG. In particular, the CA coordinates across in-country development partners to collectively support the government in joint monitoring of education plans and policies, enabling the government to lead and interact with partners in a way that minimizes transaction costs.[1]

Additionally, a **Grant Agent (GA)** is chosen by the government and approved by the LEG to oversee the implementation of GPE grants. The operational role of the GA is to disburse GPE transferred funds to implementing partners, generally the government, and provide fiduciary oversight and technical support as appropriate to the context and in line with the specific purpose of the grant. The GA also plays a key role in ensuring that grants are fully aligned with broader education sector developments.[2]

These actors are core to GPE's operational model, with the GA reinforcing Secretariat functions in grant monitoring, and the CA serving a critical function in facilitating LEG engagement in policy processes. These actors also serve as important entry points for capacity development. The technical annex to the FFF (Annex 1 of BOD/2017/03 Doc 03), highlights the centrality of capacity development to the GPE country-level operational model; in particular, through its grant processes:

> *'GPE invests in capacity development through its ESPDG, PDG, and significantly through investments in training, management and research components at central and district levels in its ESPIGs. Grant Agents and LEG partners play key roles in building capacity through these grants. However, delivery modalities vary, sometimes with technical assistance performing tasks for rather than sufficiently engaging national partners in activities.'*[3]

The document implicitly makes an important distinction between technical assistance and capacity building; with the latter understood as the process of strengthening capabilities of actors to carry out their tasks independently, through acquisition of knowledge and know-how. While technical assistance can encompass a

[1] ToR for Coordinating Agencies, August 2016
[2] ToR for Grant Agents, August 2016.
[3] Annex 1 of BOD/2017/03 Doc 03, p. 13.

capacity building component, this is not guaranteed and depends on the approach and the way it is undertaken. As such, delivery of outcomes associated with operational roles through technical assistance alone runs the risk of inadvertently circumventing a central GPE objectives: that of strengthening country systems.

Against this backdrop, the Board requested that the Secretariat and the Grants and Performance Committee (GPC) undertake the following activities:

'*a) Commission an examination of the efficiency and effectiveness of Grant Agents, Coordinating Agencies, and Local Education Groups to deliver on GPE 2020. This study should include an examination of their respective roles in providing capacity building and technical advice, and identify options to clarify or adjust these roles including provision of additional support as needed; and*

b) Make improvements to the provision of capacity building and technical assistance throughout the model'[4]

After consultation with their respective Board constituencies during the inception period, the GPC further requested to expand the Partnership review beyond the initial Board request, cited above. The GPC, considering the Secretariat as a key actor in the Partnership architecture, requested to:

> *Include the Secretariat within the scope of analysis to ensure that the review of the country operational model would be sufficiently holistic and yield the information needed to identify inefficiencies and capacity gaps, and develop appropriate remedial actions (Minutes, GPC, 21 February 2018).*

The **Secretariat** has a supporting role throughout the national education sector policy cycle in promoting inclusive and robust policy dialogue, providing guidance and reviewing processes for the GPE grants, providing sector planning guidelines and tools, leading GPE's quality assurance review (QAR) procedures and processing documents for GPE Board review.

The Secretariat will approach these requests in two stages:

- **Stage I: Mapping** of expected roles and responsibilities of country level actors (GA, CA, LEG; hereafter "key actors"), based on GPE's operational guidance documents for application and implementation across each of GPE's three core grants (ESPDG, PDG, and ESPIG) and guidance for country level actors (ToR for GAs, ToR for CAs, GPE Charter…). The focus will be on their respective roles in ensuring and supporting capacity development processes, including the provision of technical assistance.

  The mapping will be complemented with feedback elicited from DCPs on the effectiveness of the roles performed by key actors in capacity building during GPE grant processes and on their expectations on core actors' roles and responsibilities. This feedback will be collected through a session with DCPs convened at the Secretariat offices in Washington DC, late September.

- **Stage II: Exploratory review** of key actors to assess their capacity to efficiently and effectively support the GPE country level operating model against their expected roles, and identify any discrepancies with actual country practices. This review should articulate strengths, areas of untapped potential, and capacity gaps, as well as proposing recommendations to improve the effectiveness of the key actors in GPE grant processes.

  The exploratory review will benefit from a consultation process with partners through the Grants and Performance Committee (GPC), appointed as oversight committee of the study in December 2017. The consultation process will be part of the inception phase and use the draft inception report as a

[4] BOD/2017/03 DOC 03 - Annex 1, p.14.

basis for consultation to ensure broader ownership and awareness of the study undertakings and that the study design meet partners' expectations[5].

A.II. Project purpose and specific objectives

The GPE Secretariat is currently finalizing Stage I of the review. The external contractor will play a central role carrying out the work envisaged under Stage II of the review, with the ultimate objective of developing options to inform decision-making on how to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the GPE country level operating model and grant processes. Specifically, the recommendations and options formulated should focus on the role of in-country actors in driving capacity development processes and providing meaningful capacity building support. The results of this review will be presented to the Board in June 2018.

The review will engage with the key actors and country development partners, and work closely with the Secretariat to meet the following specific objectives in reviewing the capacity of key actors across GPE grant processes:

- Identify enabling and impeding factors for key actors at country level to effectively and efficiently carry out their expected roles and responsibilities, as outlined in GPE's operational guidance. Gaps between anticipated roles and actual practices should also be articulated as well as the different perspectives of key actors and country development partners. This will include consideration of what the Secretariat's roles are, what it should do more of, what is should do less of, and where its most added value is as perceived by actors in the Partnership.
- Undertake a more detailed diagnosis of common challenges and good practices of key actors (including the Secretariat) for effectively engaging in and performing their respective roles and providing capacity building support and technical assistance under the GPE operational model. This will include identification of ambiguities and duplications – GA, CA and LEG as a body - their cooperation system including views on the role of the Secretariat.
- Identify response mechanisms to address identified bottlenecks and capacity gaps, that could assist in strengthening the intended roles of key actors and mechanisms of the GPE operational model. Recommendations could include provision of additional support to leverage stakeholders within the Partnership, proposals for adjustments to GPE operational mechanisms, and an assessment of alternative modes of capacity strengthening and support, such as cross-country knowledge exchange.
- Formulate recommendations and options to the Board for implementation of remedial measures to ensure that the Partnership delivers efficient and effective support to developing country partners throughout its operational model. These options should demonstrate a meaningful response to country needs as central focus, and should support in-country accountability and dialogue mechanisms throughout grant processes.

A.III. Methodology and approach

It is envisaged that in addition to information provided by the Secretariat (see A.IV), the external contractor will collect and analyse information from a range of sources. The following approaches to data collection will underpin the review methodology:

[5] The changes made to the present Terms of Reference (marked in blue text) are a result of this consultation and represent *additional* tasks (enhanced scope and additional data collection) to deepen the analysis and robustness of findings, while the core of the study design remains the same. The final inception report details the study design in full.

1. Capitalize on the initial mapping of roles and responsibilities done at GPE secretariat level, including DCPs feedback on the effectiveness of the roles performed by key actors in capacity building during GPE grant processes (see Stage I), as well as on readily available data generated through a separate but interlinked work stream on LEGs, which includes i) a (draft) literature review on LEG effectiveness, and ii) data from an online survey conducted across LEG members in GPE DCPs (August-Sept 2017), which includes responses to a set of questions designed to examine constituent member views on roles and responsibilities, and capacity-building within GPE grant processes.

2. Based on items 1 and 2 outputs, undertake semi-structured interviews with CA and GAs at headquarter level, to explore strengths and capacity gaps of actors in performing their expected roles within the different grant processes, including grant application, implementation and monitoring, in-country quality assurance of grant applications, and facilitation of LEG engagement across these processes. The external contractor will also be responsible for preparing: i) a preliminary questionnaire for GAs and CAs to be sent in advance of interviews to allow for aggregate responses per agency, as well as ii) semi-structured interview questions.
3. Conduct interviews with a number of DCP focal points (both in French and English) to complement and deepen the information obtained through the preliminary DCP consultation (see Stage I). Considering DCPs at the centre of the model, DCPs will be a core respondent for the findings on the other actors. The external contractor will also conduct a face to face consultation with DCPs on preliminary findings to enhance DCP voice and validate findings, at the GPE meeting in May 2018.

4. Conduct web-based consultations with CSOs and other development partners to reach out to additional actors and bilateral partners, not being reached through individual interviews, to get their views on the operational model and the key actors that are within the focus of analysis.

5. Conduct a consultation collecting written contributions from GPC members and their respective constituencies on the role of the Secretariat. This will include consideration of what the Secretariat's roles are (what it does; what it should do more of; what it should do less of); on areas where the Secretariat has clear added value, and where there are perceived duplications and ambiguities.

A. IV. Input documents provided by the Secretariat

Stage II will build on the Stage I mapping exercise, as well as existing work undertaken by the Secretariat. The following inputs will be provided to the external contractor:

- Mapping of roles and responsibilities of key country-level actors focusing on key entry points for capacity development, as outlined in GPE guidance for its grant processes and country level actors (guidance, ToRs for CA and, GPE Charter..);

- Mapping of roles and responsibilities of the Secretariat, as well as how it has evolved and is expected to evolve. Secretariat will conduct this mapping internally, using the GPE Charter approved by the Board to outline what it currently does. The external firm will use this mapping as a basis for consultation with partners and formulate questions to guide the consultation.

- Summary report of the DCP session, held at the Secretariat late September, summarizing participants' feedback on the effectiveness of the roles performed by key actors in capacity building during GPE grant processes.

- Data generated through the above-mentioned survey of LEG actors, including specific responses to questions on their role and involvement in GPE grant processes (conducted in Sept 2017);

- Literature review of LEG effectiveness (draft), undertaken the above-mentioned LEG work stream to ensure complementarity and avoid overlap of analytical and data collection efforts.

- List of GAs and CAs from currently active GPE grants, to inform interview selection (see Annex).

In addition to the above, the Secretariat will also provide a select number of relevant documents, i.e. previous evaluations, for review by the external contractor as background information and contextualisation.

A.V. Deliverables

Intermediary outputs:

- Inception report with approach, methodology, and core issues to be addressed and interview questions, resulting from consultation with and oversight by GPC – January 2018 (draft) for GPC call and March (final) 2018.
- Draft report and initial recommendations based on an analysis of all sources and findings from interviews undertaken with GAs, CAs, and DCPs upon completion of interviews, web-based consultations with CSOs and other development partners; and consultation through GPC members and their respective constituencies on the role of the Secretariat, for DCP meeting in May; and subsequent audio call with GPC in mid-May – due early May
- Draft report including DCP feedback on findings, and feedback from GPC review of report for submission to Board – due 23 May 2018

Final deliverable:

- Final consolidated report, including incorporation of any Board observations from June meeting, consisting of i) a summary of findings; ii) with recommendations to the Board, and iii) the detailed diagnosis in Annex – due end June 2018.

The above deadlines are sequenced so that, upon completion, the GPE Secretariat is to able to process the document on time for the Board (translation, dissemination).

A.VI. Work stream A period and level of effort

Timeframe: Workstream A should commence in early December 2017 and be finalize end June 2018.

Level of effort: The level of effort is estimated at 151 person days, with a breakdown as follows:

Estimate of person days against tasks		**Days as per TOR**
Steps	**Description of tasks**	**LoE**
1. Preparations	1.1. Review of key GPE policy and grant documents (guidelines, FFF, GPE strategy etc):	3
	1.2. Review of capacity review initial mapping	1
	1.3 Review of LEG survey data and literature review:	3
	1.4 Review of summary report of feedback session with DCPs	1
	1.5. Development of questionnaire and interview protocol for GA, CA, DCPs	4
	1.6. Inception report with core issues to be addressed and interview questions to be validated by the Secretariat and discussed with the GPC	6
	1.7 Additional scoping and revision in inception report	9
	1.8 Call with GPC	0.5
	1.9 Revisions following GPC call and Board comments	7
	1.7 Logistics of questionnaire distribution and scheduling of interviews:	5
	Subtotal:	**39.5**
2. GA, CA, DCP interviews	2.1 14 interviews balanced across a representative set of GAs and CAs - estimated at 30 hours (approx. one-hour interviews/two people):	10

	2.2 Data analysis of interviews - immersion	6
	2.3 Interviews with DCPs (12)	7
	2.4 Online consultations with CSOs and additional development partners (bi-laterals not being interviews) – design - set-up - holding	5
	2.5 Analysis of online consultations	5
	2.6 Preparation of preliminary findings	0
	2.7 Mapping of Secretariat roles	9
	2.8 Seeking, analyzing, integrating GPC comments on Secretariat role against mapping	4
	2.9 Review of previous documentation/evaluations	3
	Subtotal:	**49**
3. Consolidated report with recommendations	3.1 Draft report for GPC	23
	3.2 Further engagement of committee chair(s)	6
	3.3 Integration of feedback received and finalization of report	9.5
	3.4 Preparation of Board materials/iteration with GPC members	5
	3.5 Presentation to DCPs – preparation and write up of consultations	9
	3.6 Preparation and presentation to the Board - with Q&A	4
	3.7 Finalization of report integrating DCP and Board feedback	6
	Subtotal:	**62.5**
Total person days		**151**

Possible follow-up work to Stage II:

The external contractor may be called upon to undertake further work relevant to Workstream A, pending discussion with the Board in June on the basis of the above-mentioned deliverable, and further deliberations on the scope of the effective Partnership review within the Secretariat. This might include additional targeted investigation to ensure that study findings are sufficiently robust as a technical input document for the planned Board retreat in November. Decision by the Board on additional investigation is contingent to the work carried out in exploratory review of Stage II.

Annex B Consultation on scope and methodology

B.1 Consultation and iteration in inception phase

This table sets out the stages in the iteration of the inception phase and development of the inception report. Each version of the inception report that was submitted to the Secretariat is briefly summarised. The guidance and/or response given by GPE is outlined.

Inception Report Version	Stage	Detail
	Guidance documents	Terms of reference. See annex A.
0	OPM/Dalberg's first draft inception report submitted 19 December 2017	**Scope**: Specific focus on capacity development, in terms of how CD spans across the responsibilities, and therefore investigating how key actors (GAs, CAs and LEGs) understand and approach CD: how they plan for it, conduct it, and assess their progress. **Methodology**: interviews with country actors themselves: 5x countries sampled with CA, GA and DCP interview, plus 5 follow-up interviews with HQs of major agencies. Secondary data: 4 key documents.
	Comments from GPE Secretariat	**Scope:** to be widened to roles and responsibilities in general throughout the operational model for implementing GPE 2020. The exercise should explore what the roles of key actors are; whether these roles are well defined; the extent to which they are well understood by respectively GAs, CAs, LEGs; how these roles are working for them; and what is needed to make it work effectively, including support from the Secretariat, to deliver on the common objectives of the Partnership. **Methodology**: country interviews useful for having an objective/ independent diagnosis of how the roles are fulfilled at country level, but the goal of this study is more to have consultation with a larger number of agencies for understanding their expectations and perceptions. This exercise will not try to reconcile inconsistent positions within agencies.
1	(Draft submitted 8 January, further revised following Secretariat comments and inputs) Draft inception report presented in PowerPoint at GPC meeting, 18 January 2018	**Scope**: independent collation and analysis of the perceptions and expectations of GAs, CAs and DCPs. Key actors' roles as focus: GAs, CAs and LEGs as multi-actor platform. Roles relative to the Secretariat. DCPs' perspectives as the centre of the process. Capacity development as one responsibility identified to focus on (whereas no other responsibilities highlighted specifically). **Methodology**: 14 interviews with HQs of GAs/CAs, 6 interviews with DCPs. Secondary data: 4 key documents.
	Secretariat provided collated comments from GPC, Board and written comments, and gave steer on changes.	**Scope**: Make the problem statement clearer. However the approach is inductive rather than deductive – i.e. we look to hear what issues respondents raise, rather than asking leading questions and validating issues we've heard elsewhere. Emphasise the question of duplication of roles. **Methodology**: Include INGOs who are GAs in the HQ interviews. Include online consultation with wider stakeholders: DPs who are less regularly CAs/GAs, and CSOs. Include workshop with the Secretariat as a feedback loop on findings (rather than as an initial respondent). Case studies not to be considered as part of the methodology. Given the constraints of timeframe, and the fact that other in-

		depth analysis is ongoing, the proposed balance between breadth and depth will be kept.
2	OPM/Dalberg's revised draft inception report, submitted 31 January 2018 and re-submitted on 2 February 2018	Inception report re-drafted with clarified **scope** (GAs, CAs and LEGs as the focus in terms of responding to their roles and responsibilities, but with questions of duplication and cooperation system with Secretariat and DCP). Other points in comments above addressed including **methodology**. Secretariat provided input to section on other workstreams alongside this study.
	GPC meeting (audio call) held on 21 February 2018, Secretariat collation of GPC written comments	To consider: more interviews with DCPs, more inclusion of Secretariat in the respondents, inclusion of DCP and secretariat roles/responsibilities in the scope, more 'views from the field.'
	Further discussion with Secretariat	Secretariat managers have indicated preferences to OPM in order to meet as many GPC suggestions as possible and keep to the initial timeline. This includes GPC consultation on the Secretariat's roles.
	Options note for responding to GPC, 8 March 2018	OPM shared an options note for discussion with the Chair of the GPC in response to the Secretariat's direction. This included the proposed option for a Phase 2 which would allow follow up data collection and analysis.
3	Final inception report, submitted 21 March 2018	This inception report which responds to agreement with the GPC on this Phase 1. Changes from Inception Report version 3: **Scope:** Include Secretariat in scope through a mapping of Secretariat roles and written consultation with GPC. **Methodology:** Add more interviews with DCPs. Use the DCP meeting in May for further consultation and validation. Remove Secretariat 'feedback loop'. Include consultation on Secretariat roles. Review additional background documents for context. Finalise the final report following Board feedback.

B.2 Options for further work in a Phase 2

This inception report focuses only on work currently contracted. The partners have discussed an option of considering this as 'Phase 1' and having a 'Phase 2' after the June Board meeting if specific gaps in topics or respondents are identified. Some potential options for this which have been discussed are given below, but the details, if any Phase 2 takes place, will depend on the results of the final report.

Objective	Possible options
Getting the 'view from the ground'	Review the findings of the in-depth country evaluations as an additional source of evidence on the realities of the country-level operating model.
Getting the 'view from the ground'	If the responses from interviews and consultation with GPE partners does not appear to reflect 'reality on the ground', OPM could analyse the pre-questionnaires ourselves. Depending on how many were collated by GAs/CAs, we could select a limited number from each partner. Scoping would be needed to consider what the objective is: to sense check some findings? Presumably not to verify if the HQs did an 'accurate' job in representing their colleagues' views. This would also still not be evaluative: it is not an investigation of what really happens on the ground, but still what respondents tell us.

Putting the DCP in the focus	At the moment the roles/ responsibilities as per the guidance documents are only mapped for GAs, CAs and LEGs. They would also need to be mapped for the DCPs.
	Hold additional interviews with DCPs to ask them about their own role (their own responsibilities, challenges and successes in carrying them out).
Understanding variation in context	This could be further investigated in Phase 2. The respondents and interview questions will depend on what the gaps and issues are. It could be a focused interview on these differences with GA/CA HQs, or with a selection of GAs/CAs/DCPs from the ground.

Annex C MAPPING of key players' roles and responsibilities

[Produced by GPE Secretariat]

Note to the reader

Why this mapping? The mapping is one of four inputs that is being prepared by the Secretariat to inform a capacity review of key actors in the GPE operational[6]. As per the Board request, the objectives of this review are to: i) examine the **efficiency and effectiveness of GAs, CAs and LEGs** to deliver on GPE 2020; ii) examine their respective **roles in providing capacity building and technical advice;** identify **options to clarify or adjust these roles** including provision of additional support as needed; and iv) make **improvements to the provision of capacity building and technical assistance** throughout the model[7].

The mapping is thus part of the preparations of the actual review, which is planned to begin in November/December 2017, and run until June 2018 and will be undertaken by an external firm working closely with the Secretariat. It is expected to result in a **diagnosis** of the efficiency and effectiveness of key actors at country level vis-à-vis their intended roles, with special focus on national capacity strengthening, with **actionable recommendations** to leverage the implementation of the operational model.

Use of mapping: The mapping is intended to facilitate the initial steps of the actual review and further analysis in that it:

- Creates an overview and baseline for how the core operational model is intended to work at country level and what it promotes;
- Captures both roles, and the inter-relations of actors, mapping them side by side at specific steps in the policy cycle and grant processes;
- Highlights and lays out the entry points for capacity strengthening as embedded in the grant processes;
- Provides a reference tool to help identify angles of analysis for interviews with key actors, as well as inconsistencies, overlaps, lack of clarity in functions and lines of accountability.

For its intended purpose, the mapping is descriptive, organizing contents to facilitate the further analysis; but does not seek to draw findings.

Basis and limitation of mapping: The operating model was reviewed in 2015, and guidance and normative texts were accordingly revised in 2016 including GPE Charter, ToR for GAs, ToR for CAs, grant guidelines and all related forms (internal and external); and since operationalized, implemented and finetuned through grant processes and GPE supporting activities. While these texts themselves are not the primary object of the analysis, they are used as the basis and backbone for the mapping to understand how the model is intended to work and what and how it promotes the distribution of roles and responsibilities among key stakeholders including lines of accountabilities.

In line with the board request, this exercise focuses exclusively on the country level partners – GAs, CAs and LEGs (as a body) – and thus not on the role of the Secretariat, nor the specific roles of the different members of the LEG (done in a different work stream on LEG effectiveness). While it does not examine the

[6] The three other document inputs prepared by the Secretariat for the review are: Summary of DCP consultation; LEG literature review, and LEG survey.
[7] BOD/2017/03 DOC 03 - Annex 1, p.14.

actors' relations with the Secretariat, the actual CD review will be based on the analysis of country-level identify what areas in which support from the Secretariat would be beneficial for strengthening the effective/intended functioning of the actors' and for how the operating model unfolds at country level.

Documents used: Grant guidelines (ESPDG, ESPIG, PDG), ToR for GAs, ToRs for CAs, GPE Charter, GPE 2020, Operational Platform-OP (2015) and Financing and Funding Framework-FFF (2017).

Introduction

> *GPE 2020 requires clarity about roles, responsibilities and accountabilities. Therefore, we will promote and coordinate consistent country-level roles, responsibilities and accountabilities among governments, development partners, grant agents, civil society, teachers' organizations and the private sector, through strong coordination mechanisms and a strengthened operational model (GPE 2020, p.16).*

A key distinguishing feature of GPE's approach to impact is that both accountability and authorities are highly distributed. Successful realization of results relies upon all constituencies fulfilling their roles[8]. The roles and responsibilities of the different constituencies are embedded in the partnership compact of mutual accountabilities, and intended to enhance sector dialogue under government leadership and collaboration among all actors involved in education sector development and implementation.

The following summarizes the intended and expected roles of the in-country key players being examined – Grant Agents, Coordinating Agencies, and Local Education Groups[9] - based on the normative texts and guidance that are embedded in the operating model. It does so in two parts:

I. **Narrative summaries of key players' general positioning in the operational model**, outlining i) their respective roles in general terms, and highlighting/summarizing their ii) specific entry points for supporting national capacity strengthening (based on mapping in B)

II. **Detailed mapping of the roles and responsibilities** of key players along the policy cycle and core grant processes - ESPDG and ESPIG (the latter including PDG) - with focus on capacity development as embedded in the grant processes. This mapping also refers in footnotes to available tools and resources as relevant to the different stages.

In addition, given that the review is expected to consider current and future evolutions in GPE's operational model, the last part briefly maps selected elements from the FFF that are directly relevant to the capacity review, as they indicate anticipated capacity implications for the enhancements of the core funding model[10] in general and in relation to each of the key actors [11].

III. **Enhancement of the core funding model through the FFF – and capacity implications.** This part regroups elements available in the FFF (general and per actor). For ease of reference, it also regroups all direct Board language directly related to the capacity review exercise.

[8] From initial technical proposal by firm, 2 October.
[9] For brevity, these will be referred to as GAs, CAs and LEGs throughout the mapping, also when written out in cited document.
[10] i.e. through enhancement of the ESPIG (*DRM, Results Based Funding and Data requirements) and through the more differentiated funding mechanisms (*ESIC, multiplier, KIX, ASA).
[11] The mapping is limited to the FFF in this regard, and is thus general, but indicates some initial considerations. These have matured since the drafting of the FFF in the context of the conceptualization and finetuning of the various elements of the FFF.

Throughout the mapping, the elements that are relevant to national capacity strengthening are **highlighted in dark blue**, to facilitate the review's needed focus on national capacity strengthening and the role of each actor and their collaboration in this regard.

I. Narrative summaries of key players' general positioning in the operational model

I.1. Grant agents

> *Definition: The GA supports (a) the government in the development, implementation and monitoring of the GPE-funded ESPs and education sector programs, and (b) GPE in the development and implementation of research, capacity development and knowledge-sharing activities at the regional and global levels. In the case of country-level education sector programs, in accordance with the Standard Selection Process for GAs, the government approves the final selection of the GA, endorsed by the other LEG members. The Board, in consultation with the trustee, approves the GA for each proposal (GPE Charter p.9-10).*

The GA has very specific roles and responsibilities throughout the grant cycle with its main counterpart at country level being the DCP. As an integral part of its designated roles and the operational model, it also needs to work closely with CA and the broader group of development partners, as the grant processes, in which the GA is positioned as a key driver, require and promote sector dialogue through the LEG or equivalent body at strategic points in time, both in grant design, implementation and monitoring.

GA's primary responsibility is *to ensure that GPE funds are used effectively and efficiently to support national education sector plans.* It must ensure that funds are appropriately managed and fully aligned with broader education sector developments and add value to the country-level processes and results. Its operational role is to disburse the GPE transferred funds to the implementing partners, generally the DCP, and provide fiduciary oversight and technical support as appropriate to the context and in line with the specific purpose of the grant (ToR, p.1).

The selection process of the GA should consider the capability of interested agencies or organizations to meet mutually agreed criteria, including the most appropriate implementation modality, in terms of alignment, for providing support in the given context, as well as the added value that each interested agency can provide, such as sectoral knowledge and experienced personnel and ability to offer technical resources (ToR GA, p.2).

| TABLE I.1.a:

In general, as per the TOR for GAs, the GA is generally expected to[12]:

- *….prepare grant application packages following the respective grant guidelines in close collaboration with the government and in consultation with the CA and the other members of the LEG' (ToR GA, p.5)*
- *….ensure that..grant and program designs are relevant and technically strong and are built on realistic assessments of what is achievable in the timeframe proposed and on a solid understanding of the capacity of partners involved and any fiduciary risks (ToR, p.2).*

[12] Specific roles along the policy cycle and grant processes are mapped in detail in the Matrix in II, Table II.1 & Table II.2

- *…use the operational and fiduciary mechanisms with which it normally operates in the given context. The GA should therefore be selected on the basis of how well these arrangements and capacities meet GPE objectives around systems building and capacity strengthening relative to the context (idem 1)*
- *….utilize, and align with, country procedures and systems to the largest extent possible and as agreed with the LEG and approved by the Board (ToR GA, p.5)*
- *…. offer technical resources and expertise as agreed during the GA selection and grant proposal development and as relevant to the specific country context for effective implementation of the relevant grant. It is expected that the GA be responsive to evolving situations and ready to adapt its role according to emerging needs, if for instance a situation calls for more flexibility in terms of time and/or technical assistance (TOR GA, p.5)*
- *….Participate fully and meaningfully in country-led dialogue mechanisms for planning, implementing, monitoring and evaluating the ESP | TEP, as a member of the LEG. This includes supporting the CA in promoting annual JSRs, and supporting the government in taking a leading role and in providing information on progress (ToR, p.5).*

GA's functional entry points for supporting CD:

In line with GA's general roles outlined above (I), and based on the mapping of key actors' specific roles and collaboration along the policy cycle and through grant processes (see II), the operating model positions the GA to contribute to capacity strengthening at many different levels, especially *technical* capacity, in the following areas and points in time, as summarized below:

| TABLE I.1.b:

Entry points through which GA is expected to support capacity development, as embedded in the country operational model:

During ESPDG:

- *Use the ESPDG process to build government capacity and provide technical support in planning and sector analysis*
- *Foster full ownership and leadership, working closely with the government in government-led planning process*
- *Demonstrate in the ESPDG application that activities will lead to strengthening of the national systems responsible for sector analysis and planning*
- *Consider whether capacity assessments are relevant in the specific context as part of the regular sector dialogue (as eligible expenditure under grant)*
- *Raise awareness around the quality standards for ESPs/TEPs to ensure that the plan meets this requirement for GPE membership and funding (if eligible)*
- *Engage in policy dialogue and work with the LEG throughout, incl. in organizing/following up on independent assessment (as GA/LEG member)*
- *In fragile contexts:*
  - *- collaborate with institutions at technical levels to optimize capacity building and the use of national structures, strategies, and programs.*
  - *- ensure a strong focus on developing national capacity to take on implementation in the future.*

During ESPIG (+PDG):

- *Develop a program with government for ESPIG funding that is consistent with the ESP and supports system strengthening*
- *Pay attention to the selection of strategies for the variable part, and DLIs, ideally as part of the ESP development process, and validate within the LEG*
- *Allocate technical resources for developing a program that meets GPE and GA quality standards, through a consultative process [enabled through PDG]*

- *Work with the CA to solicit LEG members in the program development process for coordination, harmonization and quality enhancement.*
- *Source domestic or regional expertise as relevant and appropriate to foster capacity development [enabled through PDG]*
- *Ensure that program design is sustainable after the implementation, in terms of both financial resources and institutional/administrative capacity (QAR II);*
- *Identify capacity risks (personnel, skills and system) with mitigation measures as part of program design (QAR II)*
- *Ensure use and development of existing country systems (technical/administrative /financial) in defining implementation arrangements (QAR II)*
- *Plan for and ensure a transfer of skills during grant implementation (QAR II)*
- *Demonstrate its sufficient capacity and experience with selected implementation arrangements (QAR II)*
- *Provide continued technical support, fiduciary oversight, and corrective action in support of the implementation by the DCP of the ESP and programs*
- *Respond to evolving situations and adapt its role according to emerging needs, i.e. in contexts calling for flexibility in terms of technical assistance*
- *Use of harmonized approaches to monitoring and reporting of the grant*

I.2. Coordinating agencies

Definition: The CA is selected by the LEG and facilitates the work of the LEG. The CA acts in accordance with operational procedures as determined by the LEG. In cases where no CA is in place, the LEG designates one (GPE Charter, p.9).

The CA plays a facilitating role in implementing the core guiding principles of the Partnership as outlined in the GPE Charter, especially those related to ensuring an inclusive, evidence-based policy dialogue, engaging the government and international development partners, as well as civil society, teachers and the private sector. In doing so, it is expected to play a key role in ensuring harmonized support for for the government's education plans and programs; as well as promoting and fostering mutual accountability and transparency across the Partnership (ToR p.1)

In line with the above, the CA facilitates the work of the LEG, and promotes the inclusion of non-governmental organizations in the work of the LEG. In countries where civil society, the private sector, and/or non-governmental organizations are not engaged in the LEG, the CA promotes dialogue regarding their inclusion (ToR CA, p. 3). Moreover, the CA serves as a communication link between the Secretariat and the LEG, including the government, and as such is at the very centre of the operational model and how it unfolds country level.

| TABLE I.2.a:

Based on the ToR for CA (and Charter), the CA is generally expected to[13]:

[13] Specific roles along the policy cycle and grant processes are mapped in detail in the Matrix in II, Table II.1 & Table II.2

- *….facilitate the work of the LEG in all aspects to enable in-country development partners to collectively support the government, and the government to lead and interact with partners effectively, with low transaction costs' (ToR CA, p.2)*
- *….Fosters and further develops the relationship between the development partners and the developing country partner government, promotes the inclusion of nongovernmental organizations in the work of the LEG, and helps mobilize development partners and, to the extent possible, other LEG partners for meetings (Charter, p.9)*
- *….foster open and inclusive dialogue among members of the LEG in the context of the preparations of applications for GPE financing, developed by the GPE GA in close collaboration with the government' (TOR CA, p.6). It facilitates [in general for each of the three grants] discussion towards consensus around GPE financing and support, so that the LEG can endorse the application prior to its submission to the Secretariat (TOR CA, p.4)*
- *….work with the GA and the rest of the local education group to facilitate in-country quality assurance tasks and processes as described in the specific grant guidelines, and to ensure that these steps are included in the LEG's own work plan' (ToR CA, p.4)*
- *…serve as a communication link between the Secretariat and local education group, including the government. As such, most of the information from the Secretariat is channeled through the CA, while the Secretariat relies on the CA for prompt and smooth information sharing on all GPE-related matters and sector developments in general (ToR CA, p.4)*
- *If required or requested by partners, the CA may facilitate the implementation of the GPE conflict resolution procedures to solve any GPE-related challenges that may emerge within the multi-stakeholder partnership (ToR CA, p.3)*

CA's functional entry points for supporting CD:

In line with CA's general roles outlined above (I), and based on the mapping of key actors' specific roles and collaboration along the policy cycle (see II), the operating model positions the CA to contribute to capacity strengthening at many different levels, especially *organizational* capacity, in the following areas and points in time, as summarized below:

| TABLE I.2.b

Entry points through which the CA is expected to support capacity development, as embedded in the country operational model:

During ESPDG:

- *Facilitate ESPDG GA selection process, which should ensure that the criteria on GA ability to build capacity in analysis and planning are being met*
- *Facilitates inclusive consultation and coordination among partners within the LEG in the preparation of the ESPDG application package*
- *Coordinate the initial comments on the draft ESP/TEP from development partners, generating technical support and advice to the government*
- *Lead or facilitate the tasks of development partners in the context of the independent assessment of the ESP/TEP, including readiness check of the draft*
- *Facilitate the discussion of the follow-up to the recommendations to support the government in finalizing the plan that meets expected quality standards*
- *Discuss and compile feedback on lessons learned from the plan development process as part of the wider sector dialogue*

During ESPIG (+PDG):

- *Facilitate discussions with the government within the LEG about the country-level readiness to respond to requirements of the GPE funding model*
- *Strongly support the DCP in the identification of funding modalities for greatest alignment with country systems*
- *Facilitate partner collaboration through the LEG, incl. engagement of civil society organizations, and transparent and consensual program preparation*
- *Work with the GA to ensure that the LEG members have all necessary information to contribute meaningfully to the ESPIG program development process*
- *Works with the GA to facilitate in-country quality assurance tasks and processes through the LEG to ensure that program is aligned with expected standards*
- *Ensure that dialogue takes place within the LEG on the strategies and indicators to select for the variable part and how the variable mechanisms will work*
- *Support the government in organizing effective government-led joint sector reviews*
- *May support the government in preparing the annual sector plan implementation report as a basis for the joint sector review discussions*
- *May also take the lead in or otherwise support the elaboration of the Aide Memoire on the joint sector review*
- *Invites members of the LEG to share lessons learnt regarding grant implementation to inform future country processes/strategies to support the government*

I.3. Local Education Groups

> *Definition: The LEG lies at the heart of GPE and is founded on the principle of collective support for a single country-led process toward the development, endorsement and implementation of an ESP. GPE's intent is to strengthen country-owned coordinating structures and decision-making processes for effective and inclusive policy dialogue. The LEG is therefore a collaborative forum for education sector policy dialogue under government leadership, where the primary consultation on education sector development takes place between a government and its partners (GPE Charter, p.4)*

At the country level, the LEG forms the foundation for GPE's governance, and composed of a wide cross-section of actors: It comprises the government of the DCP, donors present in the country, multilateral agencies, nongovernmental organizations (including international and local CSOs), representatives of the teaching profession, the private sector and private foundations, and others supporting the education sector.

The GPE operational model hinges on the effective functioning of the LEG to positively impact GPE member countries. The LEG desk-based review[14] concludes that 'effective LEG focuses on a clear mandate of policy dialogue, anchored around the Education Sector Plan. All tasks, roles and responsibilities serve the preparation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of this plan, including GPE-related tasks that should not preempt the main LEG mandate of dialogue. A representative forum of stakeholders with adequate capacities to participate meaningfully should be organized according to the needs and objective of the policy dialogue. All stakeholders should be able to serve the LEG's interest and follow key aid effectiveness principles. Leadership is necessary to create a conducive environment where institutional dynamics are based on trust and mutual accountability'.

[14] Draft desk-based review on LEGs, September 2017.

| TABLE I.3.a:

Based on the GPE Charter, the LEG as a body is generally expected to[15]:

- *…. Be founded on the principle of collective support for a single country-led process toward the development, endorsement and implementation of an ESP.' (Charter p.4) ..and 'adopt and make publicly available a clear terms of reference (Charter, p.5)*
- *Provide a collaborative forum for education sector policy dialogue under government leadership, where the primary consultation on education sector development takes place between a government and its partners.' (Charter, p.4)*
- *….[Be] first and foremost accountable to the citizens of the country it serves, promoting sector progress and transparent reporting of sector results, including on learning outcomes (Charter p.5)*
- *….[Operate] through planning, monitoring, and review mechanisms and procedures that are both transparent and inclusive (Charter, p.5)*
- *….[Designate the CA] through consensus (including the government), and define the tasks, accountabilities, and operational procedures of the CA in light of the existing country-level arrangements of the education sector (TOR CA, p.2)*
- **…** *Apply GPE's conflict resolution procedures to resolve disagreements related to GPE-related processes (Charter, p.5)*

LEG's functional entry points for supporting CD:

In line with LEG's general roles outlined above (I), and based on the mapping of key actors' specific roles and collaboration along the policy cycle processes (see II), the operating model positions the LEG to contribute to capacity strengthening at different levels, especially *organizational and institutional* capacity, in the following areas and points in time, as summarized below:

| TABLE I.3.b:

Entry points through which the LEG is expected to support capacity development, as embedded in the country operational model:

During ESPDG:

- *Provide collective support and a collaborative mechanism for a single country-led process toward the development and endorsement of an ESP/TEP*
- *Provide a consultative forum to define and plan the ESPDG activities which should be part of a roadmap for how the country teams will develop the ESP/TEP*
- *Contribute to evidence-based education sector dialogue, bringing technical expertise, voice, innovation and experience*
- *Endorse the selection of the ESPDG GA ensuring that it can provide technical support and build capacity for analysis and planning*
- *Determine when an early draft of the ESP/TEP is sufficiently ready to solicit initial comments from development partners, and advice accordingly if not ready*
- *Make a readiness check based on checklist to verify that the draft ESP/TEP is ready for the independent assessment, and advice accordingly if not ready*

[15] Specific roles along the policy cycle and grant processes are mapped in detail in the matrix in II, Table II.1 & Table II.2

- *[DPs] Commission reviewers, ensuring they are/become trained in the mandatory methodology for assessing ESP/TEPs against quality standards*
- *Provide a consultative and advisory forum for the discussion of the results of the independent assessment*
- *Agree on improvements required in the short term (prior to endorsement) and, if needed, during plan implementation.*
- *Provide the forum for DPs endorsement of the plan, which includes partners' commitment to provide technical and/or and financial support*

During ESPIG:

- *Assess the country's readiness to fulfil the three funding requirements: 1) credible ESP/TEP; 2) commitment to finance; 3) critical data (see Table II.2)*
- *Discuss whether the conditions are in place for greater use of country systems and for developing more aligned funding mechanisms*
- *Determine the most appropriate funding modality for ESPIG, balancing risks with the need to optimize capacity development and country ownership*
- *Discuss the scope of the expected work of program to be funded, ideally as part of broader sector dialogue for transparent decision-making*
- *Endorse the selection of the ESPIG GA ensuring that it can provide sectoral knowledge, experienced personnel and ability to offer technical resources*
- *Engage in the program development, led by the government in close collaboration with the GA and the CA, according to an agreed process.*
- *Discuss follow-up of QAR I & QAR 2 recommendations and how these will be taken into consideration in the preparation/finalization of the program*
- *Discuss and validate selected policies, strategies and stretch indicators for the variable part, ideally as an integral part of the sector plan development*
- *Provide meaningful and effective support to the implementation of the ESP, bringing technical expertise, voice, innovation and experience*
- *Provides a regular forum for joint monitoring of ESP/TEP and corresponding commitments, including agreement on adjustments for progress*
- *Contribute to compilation of reports on education sector progress and challenges, and on education sector financing from all sources, domestic and external.*
- *Contribute to the organization of effective government-led joint sector review or equivalent mechanisms to monitor the implementation of the ESP/TEP*

II. Matrix – Actors' specific roles along the policy cycle and grant processes, including roles in CD

The following is a detailed mapping, capturing the intended and expected roles and responsibilities of key players by grant – ESPDG and ESPIG (+PDG). Apart from the short summaries, the mapping is based on direct extracts from normative texts and guidance, relevant for each stage of the different grant processes. Roles that are relevant for supporting **CD are highlighted in blue** – and referred to as 'entry points for CD' (these are summarized above in respectively I.1.b; I.2.b; I.3.b).

Roles and responsibilities that contribute to 'capacity development' may either relate to technical capacity strengthening of individuals to carry out certain functions and tasks (people), organizational capacity strengthening such as through sector dialogue (processes, tools, cooperation and interactions among stakeholders), and institutional capacity strengthening such as through policies, plans, programs, norms, and values.

II.1 ESPDG

'The grant adds value to sector planning and implementation, because it helps ensure that education aid, including that from GPE, is based on a solid, nationally owned analysis of the challenges in delivering quality basic education, and at the same builds institutional capacity to deliver education services equitably and efficiently' (ESPDG, p.1).

While developing country governments take the lead in planning and are accountable for delivery, GPE enables needs analysis, works to strengthen technical capacity, and brings in the talent and resources of others (GPE 2020). The ESPDG application needs to demonstrate how the proposed activities lead to strengthening of the national systems responsible for sector analysis and planning (FFF, Annex 1, p.14).

TABLE II.1:		
GA	**CA**	**LEG**
1.1 Relating to GA selection		
	In summary: • Supports consensus-building around GA selection process	**In summary:** • Provides a consultative and advisory forum for selecting the ESPDG grant agent
.	*The CA plays an important role in supporting the development of multi-stakeholder consensus during the GA selection process' (ToR CA p.4)*	*[The LEG] serves as a consultative and advisory forum for the government for setting criteria for the ESPDG GA selection.* *The selection is decided by the government and endorsed by the other members of the LEG based on the capacity of the agency to provide technical support and build capacity for planning and analysis' (ESPDG, p.7).*
1.2 Relating to the ESPDG application		
In summary: • Prepares ESPDG application with government, including the four ESPDG deliverables: Concept note, ToR for technical expertise, ESP/TEP development roadmap and budget. • Works with CA to ensure consultation with the LEG during the above	**In summary:** • Facilitates inclusive consultation and coordination among partners within the LEG in the preparation of the ESP/TEP development roadmap and ESPDG application package	**In summary:** • Serves as a consultative and advisory forum for defining the ESP/TEP development roadmap and for validating the ESPDG application package
While the government leads the planning of the ESP | TEP development process in close consultation with the in-country development partners, the GA has delegated responsibility for developing the ESPDG application based on the agreed process (ESPDG, p.9).	*The CA supports the government in ensuring that the consultative process is transparent and sufficient (ESPDG, p.8)'* *[The CA] facilitates discussions around the ESPDG application and endorses it on behalf of the development partners prior to its submission by the Government.' (ESPDG, p.8).*	*The consultative process within the LEG is particularly critical to the development of the ESPDG application (ESPDG, p.8)* *The activities of the ESPDG are expected to be defined and planned through a consultative process within the LEG led by the government, and be part of a broader **roadmap** that outlines the key phases, quality assurance milestones and activities for how the country teams will develop the ESP or TEP. (ESPDG, p.4).*

The GA prepares grant application package following the respective grant guidelines in close collaboration with the government and in consultation with the CA and the other members of the LEG' (ToR GA, p.5). *Four deliverables to scope the process and frame the ESPDG application:* 1. ***A concept note*** *defining how the education sector analysis, education plan development, and independent assessment will be approached and coordinated* [16] 2. ***Terms of reference for the technical assistance*** *needed to support the education sector analysis and education sector plan tasks* [17]. 3. ***An integrated roadmap*** *reflecting a coherent set of activities to implement the tasks set in the concept note, together with sources of funding and a timeline*[18]. 4. ***A budget*** *that details the costs of the activities for which GPE | ESPDG financing is requested, and which represents value for money (ESPDG, p.10)*[19] *The GA will work with the government and partners, possibly through the establishment of a steering committee, to ensure that the four above-mentioned deliverables are prepared in accordance with the agreed scope, technical decisions and complementary funding from the GA and other partners (ESPDG, p.10).*		*[The LEG] serves as a consultative and advisory forum for validating the ESPDG (ESPDG, p.8)*
1.3 Relating to sector analysis[20] [21]		
[See 1.4 for GA's general role in ESPDG]	**In summary:** • Facilitates inclusive consultation and coordination among partners within the LEG during sector analysis process	**In summary:** • Serves as a consultative and advisory forum for supporting the government in the sector analysis, bringing technical expertise, innovation and experience to address the complex challenges
[See 1.4 for GA's general role in ESPDG]	*[The CA] facilitates and supports the sector analysis and ESP development (ESPDG, p.8)* *In addition:* *As other in-country development partners and as a regular member of the LEG, it is expected that the CA provides technical and/or financial support to the education sector analysis… in line with the CA's comparative advantages and agreements with the government (ToR CA, p.4)*	*[The LEG provides a] forum of discussion and agreement for policy dialogue, including sector analysis, data and implications for ESP development and endorsement (Operational framework, p.20)* *The LEG as a group... reviews and discusses sector diagnostics and analysis (Charter, p.4)* *[The LEG] serves as a consultative and advisory forum for the government for generally supporting the sector analysis (ESPDG, p.8)* *Through inclusive, government-led policy and monitoring dialogue mechanisms, [LEG members] provide meaningful and effective support*

[16] GUIDANCE: Guiding questions for the preparation of the concept note, Annex 3 of ESPDG.

[17] ESP | TEP development process and technical assistance needs - The concept note should outline the key steps of ESP | TEP development process, including consultations and the independent assessment. The terms of reference, annexed to the concept note, should specify the technical assistance requested to be financed through the ESPDG to support the education sector analysis, the ESP | TEP development process, and the independent assessment (ESPDG, p.11)

[18] Template provided.

[19] Template provided.

[20] GUIDANCE: Education Sector Methodological Guidance, Volume 1 & Volume 2

[21] The ESPDG activities and technical services under this financing window [sector analysis – maximum 250,000] should serve to fill existing gaps and seek, whenever feasible, to build government capacity in different aspects of sector. Activity may cover: i) Comprehensive analysis - e.g. country status report, and diagnostics and analysis of the country's current education system; ii) Targeted analysis – e.g. needs diagnosis and/or policy assessments, including public finance analysis (PFM) or service delivery studies, in view of improving the ESP | TEP in areas related to equity, efficiency and learning outcomes; iii) Capacity building in specific methodological approaches, monitoring and evaluation; iv) Consultations to ensure a participatory process; v) Technical services; vi) Peer review arrangements, and vii) Dissemination a knowledge exchange (ESPDG, p.5)

		*to **sector analysis**…., bringing technical expertise, voice, innovation and experience to address the complex challenges of delivering education (Charter p.5).*
1.4 Relating to plan development, including quality assurance[22] [23]		
In summary: • Work with government in a government-led process • Uses ESPDG process to build capacity in analysis and planning • Monitors the ESPDG-funded activities ensuring high-quality work, including process and outputs	**In summary:** • Facilitates inclusive sector dialogue and coordination among country development partners during plan development process especially at key stages	**In summary:** • Assesses readiness for initial comments • Assesses readiness for independent assessment • Discusses the results of the independent assessment and adjustments for the finalization of the plan • Serves as a forum for the organization of partner endorsement
*'In general, a key role of the GA is to work closely with the **government to ensure full leadership** and ownership of the ESPDG supported activities and to use the process to build government capacity.' (ESPDG, p.15)* *The GA is responsible for the implementation and monitoring of the ESPDG. It works closely with the government within a government-led planning process, engages in policy dialogue, and provides technical support as needed, including support to enhancing the planning capacity of the government.' (ESPDG, p.14)* *The GA will use its own monitoring system, policies and procedures to ensure that high quality work is carried out in accordance with the approved application.' (ESPDG, p.14)* *A key objective in monitoring the grant is to detect issues that may arise during implementation as early as possible and to resolve them. If there are delays or issues that may adversely affect the quality and timing of the work, it is the responsibility of the GA to inform the Secretariat and the LEG.' (ESPDG, p.15)*	*The CA facilitates the work of the LEG in all aspects to enable in-country development partners to collectively support the government (ToR for CA, p.2).* *Support to the three Quality Assurance milestones for the ESP/TEP development include facilitation of:* *1. Soliciting **initial comments on draft** ESP/TEP from development partners, including GPE[24].* *2. Commissioning of **independent appraisal,** and supporting government in discussion on follow-up to appraisal recommendations towards finalization of the plan* *3. Development partners' **endorsement** of the plan of (summarized from ESPDG, Annex 4):* *'The CA leads or facilitates the tasks of the in-country development partners in the context of the independent appraisal …. This entails monitoring that the quality assurance requirements for selecting the reviewers are met' (ToR CA, p. 5)* *It also entails supporting or facilitating the discussions within the LEG on the recommendations of the appraisal and the Secretariat's comments.* *'The CA leads or facilitates the tasks of the in-country development partners in the context of the endorsement of the education plan (ToR CA, p. 5)* *The CA generally calls the endorsement meeting, during which the in-country development partners sign the endorsement letter, and subsequently sends the endorsement letter to the Secretariat on behalf of the in-country partners (TOR CA, p.5).* *In addition:*	*Through inclusive, government-led policy and monitoring dialogue mechanisms, [LEG members] provide meaningful and effective support …the **development** of the ESP, bringing technical expertise, voice, innovation and experience to address the complex challenges of delivering education (Charter p.5)* *[Initial comments]: The members of the LEG determine when an early draft is sufficiently ready to solicit initial comments from development partners including the Secretariat..' …Feedback from development partners on an early draft is strategically important as suggestions can be considered early and collectively in the ESP | TEP development process (ESPDG, annex 4, p.25)* *[The independent appraisal] is commissioned by the in-country development partners who select certified reviewers from a roster of experts, trained in the mandatory methodology for assessing ESP | TEPs. Before engaging the reviewers, the LEG makes a 'readiness' check based on a standard checklist to verify that the draft is ready for the assessment' (ESPDG, p.25)[25]* *[The LEG] serves as a consultative and advisory forum for the government for … discussion of the results of the independent appraisal of the draft ESP | TEP (ESPDG, p.8).* *'The appraisal report is reviewed and discussed by the LEG, to agree on improvements required in the short term (prior to endorsement) and, if needed, during plan implementation. Areas for immediate improvement must be addressed before the ESP | TEP can be considered finalized' (ESPDG, p.25)* *[Endorsement]: The LEG as a group…serves as an advisory forum for the government on adjustments for the finalization of the ESP or TEP [and] serves as a forum for the organization of ESP or TEP endorsement by partners' (Charter, p.5]*

[22] GUIDANCE: For ESPs: GPE/IIEP Guidelines for Education Sector Plan Preparation & Appraisal; for TEPs: GPE/IIPE Guidelines for Transitional Education Plan Preparation & Appraisal

[23] The second financing window [Maximum of 250.000 USD) provides funding for the activities that logically follow the completion of the sector analysis, and supports the development of an ESP or a TEP, and the organization, conduct, and follow-up of the independent assessment. As above, activities and technical services under this financing window should seek, whenever feasible to build government capacity, and may cover: i) Development or revision of sector strategy, programs and actions; ii) Development of multi-year operational plans and medium-term expenditure frameworks; iii) Technical services; iv) Capacity-building in specific areas related to planning, monitoring and evaluation; v) Consultations to ensure a participatory process; vi) Independent assessment of the ESP or TEP and follow up of its recommendations; vii) Dissemination of the ESP | TEP or operational plans to a broader audience (ESPDG, p.6).

[24] CA's specific role in facilitating this step does not come out explicitly in the ESPDG guidelines, although it is key in the in-country quality assurance mechanisms as stated in Annex 4 (see 1.4, under LEG)

[25] TOOL: Appraisal readiness check. For ESPs: Annex in GPE/IIEP Appraisal Guidelines for ESPs, p.22-24; for TEPs, Annex in GPE/IIEP Appraisal Guidelines for TEPs, p. 27-28.

	As other in-country development partners and as a regular member of the LEG, it is expected that the CA provides technical and/or financial support to the education sector plan development… in line with the CA's comparative advantages and agreements with the government (ToR CA, p.4)	
1.6 Capitalization of lessons learnt through ESPDG		
In summary: • Establishes ESPDG completion report	**In summary:** • Facilitates discussion within the LEG on lessons learnt from the plan development process	**In summary:** • Provides feedback and lessons to the Secretariat
GAs are requested to provide an ESPDG completion report within six months after the grant closing date for accountability purposes and to assist the Secretariat in monitoring and knowledge-sharing (ESPDG, p.16)	*The CA will distribute the ESPDG report to the LEG; discuss and compile feedback on lessons learned as part of the wider sector dialogue, and share these with the Secretariat (ESPDG, p.17)*	*[The LEG] provides feedback to the Secretariat on the lessons learnt regarding the ESPDG (ESPDG, p.8).*

II.2. ESPIG (and PDG)

'The roles and responsibilities vis-à-vis the ESPIG are embedded in the partnership compact of mutual accountabilities, and intended to enhance sector dialogue under government leadership and collaboration among all actors involved in education sector development and implementation. + PDG and its added value…

With regard to the ESPIG application, three quality assurance phases mark the core milestones and are intended to technically support the grant development process and enhance the quality of programs. QAR 1 assesses country readiness to meet funding requirements; and initial program design; and QAR 2 consisting of a technical assessment of the draft program to inform its finalization. The latter assesses among others the extent to which the program has been designed to be sustainable in terms of institutional capacities in the medium to long-term; and the extent to which there will be a transfer of skills and administrative capacity (FFF, Annex 1, p.14). QAR 3 is the final readiness review, assessing the final proposal against the standards for programs and for the variable part (also used in previous phases).

TABLE II.2:		
GA	**CA**	**LEG**
2.1 Relating to supporting country readiness to meet requirements		
	In summary: • Facilitates dialogue around requirements and monitoring of related milestones in meeting them.	**In summary:** • Assesses country readiness to meet the three funding requirements
	The CA facilitates discussions with the government within the LEG about ... the country-level readiness to respond to requirements of the GPE funding model (ToR for CA, p.5). *[The CA] facilitates requirements dialogue and monitoring of related milestones in the QAR process with support from the Secretariat (Operational framework, p. 20)*	*The LEG as a group… engages in processes to apply for GPE funding (Charter, p.5)*

		[The LEG assesses] the country's readiness to fulfil the three requirements by the time of the estimated application submission (ESPIG, p.11)[26]: 1. ***Independently appraised and endorsed quality ESP/TEP[27]*** 2. ***Evidence of commitment to finance*** *the endorsed ESP/TEP, including both government commitment and development partners' commitment.* 3. ***Availability of critical data and evidence*** *for data planning, budgeting, managing, monitoring and accountability or alternatively, a strategy to develop capacity to produce and effectively use critical data[28]. The requirement is divided into three sub-components concerning the availability of:* *a) An education sector analysis[29] [30]* *b) Basic financial and education data* *c) A system or mechanisms to monitor learning outcomes (ESPIG, p.11-12)* *Commitments and progress on requirement-related actions will be monitored throughout ESP or TEP implementation by the LEG through joint sector reviews or similar country-led monitoring mechanism…(Operational framework, p.9) – see also 2.8.*
2.2 Relating to identification of funding modalities for greatest alignment with country systems[31]		
	In summary: • Supports the government in ensuring aid alignment and harmonization with the ESP	**In summary:** • Provides a forum for discussion on alignment and choice of the most appropriate funding modality for the context
[See 2.7 for GA's role regarding alignment]	*Overall, the developing country partner takes the lead in … ensuring alignment with the ESP|TEP, while being strongly supported by the GA and by other development partners of the LEG, in particular the CA.' (ESPIG, p.8)*	*[The LEG provides]…a forum for discussion on alignment and harmonization to ESP (Operational framework, p.20).* *The choice of the funding modality for the ESPIG support should be underpinned by the principles of aid effectiveness, and is made through the LEG based on existing fiduciary risks (ESPIG, p.6)* *'LEG determines the most appropriate way to channel the ESPIG to the education sector, balancing risks with the need to optimize capacity development and country ownership.' (ESPIG, p.15)[32]* *The LEG should have a discussion on the scope of the expected work, use of and/or alignment with country systems, capacity*

[26] TOOL: *Fixed Part Requirements Matrix* - The Secretariat provides this tool to guide the assessment and the identification of any existing gaps to meet the funding requirements

[27] GUIDANCE: GPE/IIEP Guidelines for the preparation and appraisal of respectively ESPs and TEPs

[28] If relevant, financing from the ESPIG can be used to implement plans related to the data requirements, such as sector analysis, developing or strengthening of EMIS, or the development of measures to assess learning outcomes (Operational framework, p.23).

[29] GUIDANCE: Methodological guidelines for Education Sector Analysis, volume 1 & 2.

[30] The ESA should include context analysis, including demographic analysis, as well as analysis of existing policies, costs and financing, system performance and system capacity (Operational framework, p. 8)

[31] **Budget support** is the preferred modality where conditions permit to allow for full use of country systems. In countries with an operational **joint financing** mechanism (pooled fund), GPE financing will be expected to co-fund. In other instances, a **project** in support of the ESP/TEP may be the appropriate option where a more aligned modality is not considered to be viable. In the last case, it is encouraged to envisage co-financing mechanism.

[32] Best practice is to include this discussion within the ESP/TEP development process and determine whether the conditions are in place for greater use of country systems and for developing more aligned funding mechanisms (ESPIG, p.15)

		building needs, and which funding modalities are possible within the given country context (ToR GA, p.3)
2.3 Relating to scoping of work		
	In summary:	**In summary:** • Provides a consultative forum for the government to discuss the overall scope of the work to be funded through the ESPIG
		The LEG provides a forum to ensure that this initial step unfolds as part of the broader sector dialogue, and that tasks are completed and decisions are taken in a transparent manner (ESPIG, p.15) *Based on a general discussion within the LEG, the government identifies the overall scope of work to be funded through the ESPIG, in alignment with the ESP/TEP and a mapping of funding needs (ESPIG, p.15)*
2.4 Relating to GA selection[33]		
	In summary: • Supports and facilitates consensus-building and transparency regarding GA selection	**In summary:** • Engages in the process of GA selection and ensures that the decision is being taken in a transparent manner.
	The CA plays an important role in supporting the development of multi-stakeholder consensus during the GA selection process (ToR CA, p.4).	*'[The LEG as a group] engages in processes to apply for GPE funding, including the selection of a grant agent.' (Charter, p.5)* *The selection should take into account the capability of interested agencies or organizations to meet mutually agreed criteria, including the most appropriate implementation modality for providing sector support in the given context, as well as the added value that each interested agency can provide, such as sectoral knowledge and experienced personnel and ability to offer technical resources (TOR GA, p.2)* *'The final selection of the grant agent must be approved by the government and endorsed by the in-country development partners, including civil society representation' (ToR GA, p.10)*
2.5 Relating to program development and ESPIG grant application[34] – including support of PDG[35]		
In summary: • Applies for a PDG if relevant, to ensure a consultations and technical support for program development process	**In summary:** • Facilitates constructive, transparent and inclusive dialogue through the LEG, throughout the application process • Works with the GA to ensure that LEG members have sufficient information to make meaningful contributions	**In summary:** • Incorporate the milestones of the program development process into the broader timeline of the ESP/TEP development process • Discuss QAR I recommendations

[33] GUIDANCE: '*Standard Selection Process for Grant Agents*'

[34] The application process is supported by the Secretariat through a quality assurance process, providing three milestones: **QAR 1**: Review of requirements for the fixed part and initial program outline **QAR 1**: Review of the draft program & proposal for the variable part; **QAR 3**: Final readiness review.

[35] The GA can apply for a Program Development Grant (PDG) to cover the costs for developing the ESPIG application. PDG up to $ 200,000 (400,000 in exceptional cases). The purpose is to enable the GA to effectively develop and prepare a program that will support the implementation of the ESP or TEP (PDG p.1). Eligible expenditure include: i) Stakeholder consultations; ii) Analytical work, such as needs and capacity assessments, context-specific risk assessments, gender and fragility analyses; iii) fiduciary assessment or any technical appraisal that can help illustrate implementation readiness and inform program design; iv) Knowledge exchange and dissemination, v) Preliminary designs for infrastructure; vi) Development of implementation manuals, preparation of procurement processes, etc (PDG, p.3)

• Develops the application package under the leadership of the government, and in consultation with the CA and the LEG, especially leading up to the various quality assurance stages (QAR 1-3) • Develops justification for the Variable Part, including selected strategies and indicators.	• Submits final application package.	• Discuss QAR 2 recommendations
The GA can apply for a program development grant (PDG) to allow the GA to allocate technical resources for developing a program that meets GPE and grant agent quality standards (PDG, p.1) *The Secretariat encourages grant agents to source domestic or regional expertise as relevant and appropriate in order to foster local or regional capacity development.' (PDG, p.16)* *Program outline/concept note: The GA prepares a written outline for the program to be funded following its own processes, and based on the identified scope of work and timeline agreed within the LEG and synchronized with the ESP/TEP process (ESPIG, p.16);* ***[Subject to QAR 1 + Variable Part, see below]*** *Taking into consideration the agreed scope of work, technical decisions and the recommendations of QAR I, the GA under the leadership of the government is responsible for developing the application package according to the agreed process' (ESPIG, p.17)* *Draft program document: The GA shares the draft program document with the LEG, and invites the CA and other LEG members (according to the agreed process) to provide feedback on the draft at an appropriate stage aligned with its internal review process (ESPIG, p.17)* *The GA, copying the government, CA, and GPE country lead, should submit the draft ESPIG application package to the Secretariat* ***[subject to QAR 2 + Variable Part, see below]*** *Final application: Based on the inputs and recommendations provided in the QAR II report, the GA, in close collaboration with the government and in consultation with the LEG, reviews and finalizes the ESPIG application package (ESPIG, p.18)* ***[subject to QAR 3 + Variable Part, see below]***	*'The CA plays a key role in facilitating a constructive dialogue throughout the application process' (ESPIG, p.15)'* *'[The CA] ensures that key milestones in the process, go through consultation with the LEG to facilitate partner collaboration, including engagement of civil society organizations, and transparent and consensual program preparation' (ESPIG guidelines, p.8)* *[The CA] works with the GA to ensure that the LEG is updated regularly and has all necessary information to contribute to the ESPIG program development process.' (PDG, p.10)* *The CA is instrumental in ensuring that members have sufficient information to make meaningful inputs (ToR CA, p.4)* *It also works with the GA and the rest of the LEG to facilitate in-country quality assurance tasks and processes as described in the specific grant guidelines…' (ToR CA, p.4)* *The CA submits the final ESPIG application package to the Secretariat* ***[Subject to QAR 3]***	*The program developed with support of the PDG is expected to …be based on a consultative process led by the Government in close collaboration with the GA and the CA, and with engagement of the LEG, according to an agreed process (PDG, p.2).* *From the outset, the LEG needs to make a sensible and realistic scoping and assessment to build these arrangements [ESPIG Quality Assurance Reviews] into the broader timeline of the ESP|TEP development process.' (ESPIG, p.11)* *It is expected that the* ***QAR I recommendations*** *will be discussed within LEG and taken into consideration in the preparation of the draft program document and the draft ESPIG application (ESPIG, p.16)* *It is expected that the* ***QAR 2 recommendations*** *will be discussed within the LEG and taken into consideration in the finalization of the ESPIG application package to ensure a successful submission (ESPIG, p.18)* *The government should validate the completed application, the development partners should endorse it, as should the GA, before its submission by the CA (ESPGIG)*
2.6 Relating to the variable part justification[36]		
In summary: • Develops the justification for the variable part, ideally as part of the ESP/TEP development process, in close collaboration with the government and in consultation with the LEG	**In summary:** • Facilitates the discussion around and validation of the variable part within the LEG on strategies and indicators to select	**In summary:** • Discusses and validates the justification of the variable part as integral part of sector plan development, ensuring its quality and alignment with the ESP
Additionally, if the developing country partner intends to apply for the Variable Part, [the above draft application package from the GA also includes]: *A description of the strategies to access the Variable Part of the MCA, with related actions, indicators, targets and a results chain… (ESPIG, p. 17) –* ***subject to QAR 2***	*'Under the leadership of the government, the CA facilitates the discussion within the LEG on whether, how and when to apply for the incentives-based Variable Part of the Maximum Country Allocation' (ToR CA, p.5).*	*Selected policies or strategies must be discussed with and validated by the LEG as an integral part of the sector plan development, or alternatively, through the review and revision of a sector plan. In general, targets set through this process should be above and beyond a mere continuation of current trends—a stretch, but*

[36] **GUIDANCE**: Additional country guidance for the development of the Variable Part will be developed, following a request from the GPC, Oct. 2017.

[The GA has the] primary responsibility for negotiating agreement on actions and modalities, and for monitoring results (Operating framework, p.20) *Based on the inputs and recommendations provided in the QAR 2 report, the GA, in close collaboration with the government and in consultation with the LEG, reviews and finalizes the ESPIG application package (ESPIG, p.18) -* ***subject to QAR 3***	*This entails country ownership and consensus building on what indicators to use to best measure transformative strategies to improve equity, efficiency and learning outcomes in basic education, including a results chain with indication of when and how the intended results will be assessed (idem).*	*achievable, and be integrated within the broader ESP framework (Operational framework, p.12)* *The developing country partner in consultation with the LEG identifies existing or new priority policies and strategies for 1) equity, 2) efficiency and 3) learning outcomes, from which actions and indicators to access the Variable Part will be chosen. Context and capacity will impact the suitability of indicators and payment modalities, and therefore indicators may be process, output, or outcome-related (ESPIG, p.12).* *Process and output level indicators should be accompanied by a robust theory of change to demonstrate how these will lead to the desired outcomes for the sector (ESPIG, p.12)*[37] *It is expected that the QAR 2 recommendations [- including the recommendations regarding the Variable Part -] will be discussed within the LEG and taken into consideration in the finalization of the ESPIG application package to ensure a successful submission (ESPIG, p.18)*
2.7 Relating to program/grant implementation		
In summary: • Provide fiduciary oversight of grant implementation and continued technical support to the government and implementing entities	**In summary:** • Stays informed of progress in implementation and disbursements • Ensures that the LEG is consulted regarding any needed revisions	**In summary:** • Monitors program implementation and reviews requests for program revisions • Brings technical expertise, experience and innovation as relevant to the implementation of the ESP.
[The GA aligns with country procedures and systems to the greatest extent possible' (ToR GA p.5) *[The GA]…provides fiduciary oversight and continued technical support and corrective action in support of the implementation by the government of the ESPs and programs…. (Charter, p.10)* *The GA adjusts planned activities and budget when unforeseen circumstances, capacity gaps, or other situations arise that affect implementation (ToR GA, p.5)* *The GA is responsible for the use of the grant carried out in accordance with: (i) its own policies and procedures; (ii) the Board's Approval; (iii) the applicable GPE policies and guidelines; and (iv) the Financial Procedures Agreement (ESPIG Policy, p.5)* *The GA disburses the Variable Part in accordance with the terms of the application package as approved by the Board if the GA in consultation with the LEG concludes that (some of the) indicators have been reached (ESPIG Policy, p.6).* *[The GA] follows and implements the ESPIG Policy, which details specific directions for this grant with respect to approval and notification processes, implementation period, reporting requirements, revisions, and amendments.* *GAs will have processes and procedures to reflect mutual agreement between themselves and the developing country partner government to undertake revisions to programs or activities, including required approvals*	*The CA also stays informed of grant implementation and funding commitments and timely and efficient disbursements* *[The CA] ensures that the LEG is consulted with regard to necessary program revisions before the GA submits the request to the Secretariat.* *In addition:* *As other in-country development partners and as a regular member of the LEG, it is expected that the CA provides technical and/or financial support to… the education sector plan implementation in line with the CA's comparative advantages and agreements with the government (ToR CA, p.4)*	*Through inclusive, government-led policy and monitoring dialogue mechanisms, [LEG members] provide meaningful and effective support to… the* ***implementation*** *of the ESP, bringing technical expertise, voice, innovation and experience to address the complex challenges of delivering education (Charter, p.5).*

[37] Best practice is to integrate the identification of the policies and strategies and related indicators into the ESP/TEP development or revision.

within their agencies. They should follow the processes and procedures in this policy, in addition to their own (ESPIG Policy. P.8) *[The GA takes] corrective action to ensure effective implementation in accordance with the GA's own oversight policies and procedures including those related to audit, eligible expenditures, employment and supervision of consultants and the procurement of goods and works, and in accordance with GPE policies (ToR, GA p.5)*		
2.8 Relating to (grant and sector) monitoring, including Joint Sector Reviews[38]		
In summary: • Reports to the LEG on GPE investments at least three times/year. • Provides implementation report to the LEG (and Secretariat) annually • Supports CA in promoting effective JSRs and the government in taking a leading role.	**In summary:** • Supports governments in organizing effective JSR process (preparation, process and follow-up) • Facilitates gathering of feedback and lessons learnt from the LEG on grant implementation	**In summary:** • Contributes to the organization of JSRs to jointly monitor plan implementation and ensure responsive planning. • Monitors the financial commitments made by the Government and partners and data strategies • Monitors needs for remedial actions regarding ESP implementation, continued relevance of ESP or any deviations from the ESP; • Monitors grant implementation and reviews needs for revisions according to established process.
[The GA] reports at least three times per year to the LEG on outputs, outcomes and impact of GPE investments, following agreed standards and timeline for monitoring and evaluation (ToR GA, p.6). *No later than one year after the approval date, and annually thereafter, the GA will provide to the LEG and the Secretariat as part of their regular implementation report, an update on progress' (ESPIG Policy, p.6)* *[The GA] participates fully and meaningfully in country-led dialogue mechanisms ...This includes supporting the CA in promoting annual joint sector reviews, and supporting the government in taking a leading role and in providing information on progress (TOR GA p.5).* *[The GA] promotes transparency and proactively shares evidence and lessons learned with the LEG …..(Charter, p.10)*	*The CA supports the government in organizing joint sector reviews by promoting an inclusive approach and helping ensure that they are well prepared, organized and followed up so that expected results are achieved and effectively support the joint monitoring of education plans and policies (ToR CA p.3).* *Depending on in-country arrangements, the CA may support the government in preparing and/or distributing the annual sector plan implementation report as a basis for the joint sector review discussions (TOR CA, p.3)* *[The CA] supports [the Variable Part] so that discussion around results are integrated in joint monitoring mechanisms (Operational framework, p.20).* *The CA may also take the lead in or otherwise support the elaboration of a report or Aide Memoire on the joint sector review (TOR CA, p.3)* *'The CA invites members of the LEG to share lessons learnt regarding grant implementation to inform future country processes and strategies to support the government effectively, and in support of the GA in charge of gathering information on lessons learnt from the grants and preparing grant completion and/or progress reports' (ToR for CA, p.6)*	*[The LEG provides a] forum for joint monitoring of ESP and corresponding commitments, including agreement on to adjustments for progress (Operational framework, p.20).* *Through inclusive, government-led policy and monitoring dialogue mechanisms, [LEG members] provide meaningful and effective support to …the **monitoring** of the ESP, bringing technical expertise, voice, innovation and experience to address the complex challenges of delivering education (Charter p.5)* *The LEG as a group…contributes to the organization of a government-led joint sector review or equivalent mechanisms to jointly monitor the implementation of the ESP or TEP (GPE Charter, p.5)* *Progress on data strategies and the implementation of ESPs, as well as financial commitments made by Government and development partners, will normally be monitored by the LEG through the country's joint education sector review or similar country-owned mechanisms for monitoring the implementation of sector plans (Operational Framework, p.9)* *The LEG as a group… contributes to compilation of reports to the Board through the Secretariat on education sector progress and challenges, and on education sector financing from all sources, domestic and external (Charter, p.5)* *In line with the GPE Funding Model, it is expected that these reports **[reports/aide memoires of the joint sector review]** examine causes of major deviations from endorsed plans and commitments - including significant gaps between financing commitments and execution that threaten implementation of the ESP or TEP, or shifts in policy priorities that render the endorsed plan irrelevant or*

[38] GUIDANCE AND TOOLS: Joint Sector Review Guidelines, including tools, are expected to be made available before the end of 2017.

		*considerably weaken its implementation - and **LEG-recommended remedial actions** (ESPIG Policy, p.6)* *The LEG should examine causes for these deviations to determine whether they undermine the mutual accountability on which the GPE support was agreed. LEG-recommended remedial actions should be integrated in joint sector review reports/aide memoires (Operational framework, p.10)*

III. Enhancement of the core funding model through the FFF – and capacity implications

The Financing and Funding Framework (FFF) seeks to diversify and increase GPE's resources. 'By creating a platform for resource mobilization and deployment that locks into GPE's current operating model, GPE will be better able to make improvements in capacity, data, innovation, and governance and maximize its impact on education systems' (FFF, *BOD/2017/03 DOC 02,* p.3). The FFF builds on the solid foundation of GPE's current operational model and theory of change, but positions GPE to play a broader role – drawing on the strengths of a growing partnership to mobilize more and better financing, ideas and commitment in support of educational achievement (FFF-*BOD/2017/03 DOC 03, p.2).*

The following briefly maps selected elements from the FFF that are directly relevant to the capacity review, as they indicate anticipated capacity implications for the enhancements of the core funding model[39] in general and in relation to the key actors.

| TABLE III.a

Needs in capacity strengthening in relation to the enhancements of the core funding model

General:

*At country-level, the FFF's more diverse array of financing sources and more differentiated funding mechanisms imply both changes and enhancements to current processes…Therefore, the implementation of the FFF will require increased capacity, expertise, planning, coordination, and consultation across the Partnership – including for DCPs, LEGs, and Grant Agents. **On the funding side**, enhancements to the core ESPIG funding mechanism will have some capacity implications on DCPs, GAs, CAs, and LEGs to comply with the strengthened provisions. (FFF-BOD/2017/03 DOC 03, p.16);*

Increased capacity and expertise to comply with enhancements to the ESPIG, notably around DRM, Results Based Funding and Data requirements - To mitigate capacity constraints, the FFF also calls for a review of capacity building mechanisms to identify ways that GPE can more effectively support in-country capacity to deliver on Education Sector Plans and ESPIGs (FFF-BOD/2017/03 DOC 03, Annex 2, p.11)

***On the financing side**, participation in new financing approaches will require additional time and effort from DCPs – as well as an understanding of the tools being deployed. In particular, the proposal to adopt an "education sector investment case" approach increases capacity requirements for the Secretariat, DCPs, and potentially the LEG – but offers benefits in return (FFF-BOD/2017/03 DOC 03, p.16)*

[On ESIC] The investment case approach aims to strengthen the finance and investment aspects of education sector planning (e.g., engaging Ministries of Finance early on in the process). This part of the approach applies to all countries developing ESPs, as proposed enhancements will become a standardized part of the GPE country-level processes (FFF-BOD/2017/03 DOC 03, Annex 1, p.51).

The Secretariat may consider rolling out this approach (ESIC) in a few countries in 2018 to help build an evidence base before scaling up. Regardless, GPE should aim to support partners with the capacity development and technical assistance required to access the FFF offerings (FFF-BOD/2017/03 DOC 03, p.17)

Successful execution of the investment case approach will require increased capacity for the GPE Secretariat and other actors across the Partnership – including DCPs, Coordinating Agencies, Grant Agents, and LEGs more broadly, including civil society (FFF-BOD/2017/03 DOC 03, Annex 1, p.45).

[39] i.e. through enhancement of the ESPIG (*DRM, Results Based Funding and Data requirements) and through the more differentiated funding mechanisms (*ESIC, multiplier, KIX, ASA).

'For many countries, additional capacity building and technical assistance related to resource mobilization will be needed; one key need is equipping the Ministry of Education with tools to engage effectively with the Ministry of Finance to present a strong case for investment. Best practices may emerge from a more standardized way of organizing investments in education. These efforts could link to the broader KIX funding mechanism (FFF-BOD/2017/03 DOC 03, Annex 1, p.46)

[On KIX] Increased capacity and expertise required to properly vet and provide input to proposals for new reinforcement funding mechanisms – To mitigate capacity constraints, GPE must ensure that DCP involvement in knowledge and innovation exchange activities is well-coordinated and complements existing processes and activities (e.g. supports sector plan development and implementation and does not distract from it) *(FFF-BOD/2017/03 DOC 03, Annex 2, p.11)*

TABLE III.b:		
GA	**CA**	**LEG**
'GAs are a key lever to providing in-country technical advisory and capacity building – but there is limited evidence on efficacy of their efforts' (FFF-BOD/2017/03 DOC 03, Annex 1, p.14) *[On ESIC] GAs supervising ESPDGs will need to be aware of and understand the "investment case" approach given it is part of and builds education sector planning; training and updated information on the approach will be required (FFF-BOD/2017/03 DOC 03, Annex 1, p.46)* *Greater upfront planning and coordination between GPE Secretariat and GAs required to systematically pursue co-financing arrangements. This could increase upfront investment costs during the design phase. However, co-financing could reduce transaction costs during implementation (FFF-BOD/2017/03 DOC 03, Annex 2, p.12)* *Increased coordination between GA and other financiers making commitments to the investment case; however, the investment case process aims to crowd in resources around the ESP; it does not bring more financing to the GPE ESPIG managed by the GA. Nonetheless, GAs for ESPDGs should be aware of the approach and what it seeks to achieve (FFF -BOD/2017/03 DOC 03, Annex 2, p.12)*	*[On ESIC] CA may require additional training and/or support to participate in this approach (requires further consideration via ongoing design work throughout 2017; the ongoing review of the capacity needs of Grant Agents, LEGs, and Coordinating Agencies may help guide this design work) (FFF-BOD/2017/03 DOC 03, Annex 1, p.46)* *Increased DCP capacity-building required for the enhancements to the core funding model and for the new reinforcement mechanisms that require engagement with national governments – To mitigate, CAs with GA(s) – if there are multiple – should work closely together to reduce duplication, ensure strong synergies, and maximize linkages across all GPE funding mechanisms accessed by the DCP' (FFF -BOD/2017/03 DOC 03, Annex 2, p.11)* *Improved LEG & development partner coordination and planning needed to crowd in financial support for the education sector investment case. The CA could also play a large role in this process (FFF -BOD/2017/03 DOC 03, Annex 2, p.12)*	*'[On ESIC] Further work to enhance the capacity of LEGs to engage in discussions on public financing and budgeting will be required. In some cases, more could be done to bring key partners that work in these areas into the education sector dialogue.' (FFF-BOD/2017/03 DOC 03, Annex 1, p.47).* *[On ESIC] Consideration of the establishment of funding mechanisms such as pooled funds that ease the inflow of additional donor funds through shared risks and fiduciary management would also require particular negotiation skills among key LEG members, which are not always present (FFF-BOD/2017/03 DOC 03, Annex 1, p.47).* *Monitoring financing commitments: GPE will strengthen and build on its monitoring of financing commitments via joint sector reviews, which should include a thorough assessment of domestic and external financing commitments. Access to strong financial data is a key part of this (FFF-BOD/2017/03 DOC 03, Annex 1, p.47).* *Given the focus on country leadership, the investment case approach will require a country-level platform to drive efforts. The goal is to build on existing country-level structures, in particular the LEG where possible, to avoid a one-size-fits-all approach (FFF-BOD/2017/03 DOC 03, Annex 1, p.47).*

Annex D Participants for interviews and online consultations - [produced by the Secretariat]

INTERVIEWS – 26

Developing country partners - 12

		ESPDG	PDG	ESPIG	ESPIG (USD$)	Modality	Observations
Africa 1	Zambia	2016-17		2013-18	35,200,000	Stand Alone	CA: UNICEF & Ir. Aid - GA: DFID
	Kenya	2013-14	2014-15	2015-19	88,400,000	Stand Alone	CA: Canada - GA: WB
Africa 2	Chad	2016-17	2016-17	2017	54,155,170	Stand Alone	CA: Swiss - GA: UNICEF
	Madagascar	2012-14	2017-18	2013-17	85,400,000	Stand Alone	CA: UNICEF - GA: WB
Africa 3	Liberia	2016-17	2016-17	2017	11,900,000	Stand Alone	CA: USAID - GA: WB
	So. Sudan	2015-17		2013-17	36,100,000	Project Pooled	CA: NORAD - GA: UNICEF
Asia and the Pacific	Pakistan	2017	2013	2015-[40]	100,000,000	Stand Alone	CA: UNICEF/USAID - GA: WB
	Bangladesh		2015	2016-18	100,000,000	Sector Pooled	CA: ADB - GA: WB
E. Eur, M. East, C. Asia	Tajikistan	2017	2013	2013-17	16,200,000	Stand Alone	CA: UNICEF - GA: WB
	Afghanistan	2016	2017-18	2012-18	55,700,000	Stand Alone	CA: USAID & UNIECF - GA: WB
Latin America	Haiti	2013	2014	2014-18	24,100,000	Project Pooled	CA: UNESCO - GA: WB
	Nicaragua	2015-17		2013-17	16,700,000	Project Pooled	CA: USAID & Presidency - GA: WB

Agency interviews with most experience as GA and CA - 6

		CA	GA	Observations
Multi-laterals	WB	CA	GA	GA in 37 countries; CA in 8 countries
	UNICEF	CA	GA	GA in 18 countries; CA in 41 countries
	UNESCO	CA	GA	GA in 3 countries; CA in 7 countries
Bi-laterals	DFID	CA	GA	GA in 3 countries; CA in 4 countries
	AfD	CA	GA	GA in 1 countries; CA in 4 countries
	USAID		GA	CA in 7 countries

Additional agency interviews, including INGOs - 8

		CA	GA	Observations
Bi-laterals	DFAT	X		CA in 3 countries
	CAG	X		CA in 2 countries
	EU	X		CA in 2 countries
	BMZ	X		CA in 2 countries
	Norad	X		CA in 2 countries
	SDC	X	X	GA in 1 country; CA in 3 countries
INGOs	Save the Ch.		X	GA in 3 countries
	Care		X	GA in 1 country

WEB-BASED CONSULTATIONS

CSOs

	Organisations
CSO 1	ActionAid, Oxfam Ibis, Results Education Fund
CSO 2	COSYDEP Senegal, Education Coalition of Zimbabwe, Pakistan Coalition for Education, Campaña Latinoamericana por el Derecho a la Educación, Networks and Engagement Coordinator Global Campaign for Education
CSO 3	Education International, Uganda National Teachers Union

Other DPs

	Observations
Spain	CA in 1 country
Japan	CA in 1 country
Sweden	CA in 1 country
Ireland	CA in 1 country
Italy	
Denmark	
Belgium	

[40] Pakistan (Balochistan) ESPIG = $34,000,000 (2015-19); and Pakistan (Sindh) ESPIG = $66,000,000 (2015-17)

General selection strategy: The suggested participants for interviews and online consultations are, as a point of departure, drawn from GPE technical committees. Both for agencies and for DCP focal points, corresponding board members and/or alternate board members are given when relevant, and will be copied in introductory mail for information/internal consultation and coordination. In case no committee member exists for a certain agency, the board or alternate board member is given instead; in case the latter does not exist, a name within the given agency is given as per PERT (or other Secretariat team) recommendation. Communications focal points are also given and sometimes happen to be the same as the committee member selected.
In all cases, the pre-selection is not set in stone - it is up to the addressees to decide at what level they want to engage and whether they want to delegate to a colleague. For CSOs, participants are drawn from across the committees and the Board and represent both international and national organizations.

I. INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEWS: 12 DCP interviews and 14 agency interviews – 26 interviews in total

I.1. Developing Partner Interviews (12)

Selection strategy and criteria: Targeting DCP focal points representing each of the constituencies (and corresponding to the Board members and Alternate Board members). The DCP focal points can choose to delegate the interview to another DCP focal point or identify somebody else within the constituency to do the interview. The respondents are expected to speak to their own experience as DCP within the LEG and discuss the role of the CA/GA, as well as that of the Secretariat (where is its added value/ where does it do too much/too little…). The DCP representative agreeing to the interview should therefore have considerable experience with the operational model including with the LEG and with any of the grant processes as relevant for the country.

I.2. Agency interviews - with most experience as GAs and/or CAs (6)

Selection strategy and criteria: Targeting multi-and bi-lateral agencies with the most experiences in the respective roles of GAs and CAs, collectively representing a large portion of GPE grants and countries. Agency representatives will be HQ-based, and will be asked to aggregate an institutional response based on agency experiences from across countries. The pre-identified representative will be asked to confirm his/her availability readiness for the interview including internal preparations, or can decide to delegate as appropriate within the agency in consultation with agency colleagues, cc in mail and beyond. Interviews will cater for the two different roles, and also relate to roles of others in particular the Secretariat, and length will be adapted accordingly. Agencies may comment not only in their capacity as GA and CA but in their own agency/organization's capacity (as donor/multilateral/Ingo in the partnership, and also share their view on the role of the Secretariat (where is its added value/ where does it do too much/too little…), as relevant.

I.2 Additional agency interviews, including INGOs (8)

Selection strategy and criteria: Targeting agencies with some experiences in the respective roles as GA/CAs, including INGOs. As above, agency representatives will be HQ-based, and will be asked to aggregate an institutional response based on agency experiences, incl. as LEG member. The pre-identified representative will be asked to confirm his/her availability and readiness for the interview including internal preparations, and can decide to delegate as appropriate within the agency in consultation with agency colleagues, cc

in mail and beyond. As above, agencies may comment not only in their capacity as GA and CA but in their own agency/organization's capacity (as donor/multilateral/Ingo in the partnership, and also share their view on the role of the Secretariat (where is its added value/ where does it do too much/too little…), as relevant.

II. TWO WEB-BASED CONSULTATIONS: i) one with development partners; and ii) one with CSOs

II.1. Development Partners

Selection strategy and criteria: Targeting development partners with some experience as a GA and/or CA and other development partner who are part of GPE committees, but not functioning as GA or CA. Agency representatives will be Headquarter-based. They will be invited to participate in a consultation and expected to contribute to the discussion on the role of CAs/GAs within the LEGs on behalf of their respective agencies and based on experiences across countries. The pre-selected will confirm availability and can choose to delegate to an agency colleague. The representative can complement his/her contributions in writing.

II.2 Civil Society Organizations

Selection strategy and criteria: Targeting Civil Society Organization representatives across the three Board CSO constituencies. Representatives will be invited to participate in a web-based consultation and expected to contribute to the discussion on the role of CAs/GAs within the LEGs and to contribute based on their general insights into and experience with and perspectives on LEGs. Participants can also send contributions in writing.