System Capacity Grant Completion Report Template

Status: Accepted

Country
Liberia

Grant ID
GPE0000822

Grant Agent
World Bank

Grant Type
SCG

Grant Effectiveness / Start Date
01/16/2023

Grant Closing Date
09/30/2023

Grant Amount
166,640 (USD)

Date of Report Submission
07/09/2024

Area(s) and activity group(s) covered by grant (check all that apply):

Window 1: Strengthen gender-responsive planning and policy development for system-wide impact

- System diagnostics, compact development and education sector analyses

Grant Implementation

Assessment of Grant Implementation: Relevance

Overall Relevance

Level of Overall Relevance 1
High

Detailed Description
The Partnership Compact developed through Tranche 1 of the System Capacity Grant (SCG) was aligned the recently completed Education Sector Plan (ESP). The enabling factors analysis reflected the findings of the recent Education Sector Analysis (ESA) and other relevant analytical work from the Ministry of Education (MoE) and development partners. The priority reform and high priority enabling factors are relevant for the context and grounded in the latest available evidence.

Beneficiaries' Views on Relevance

Detailed Description
The grant's activities and deliverables were demand-driven as per GPE requirements. The MoE chaired the representative Partnership Compact Task Force and led the dialogue between government, development partners and civil society. The Compact selects and implements priority activities in the ESP demonstrating strong alignment with national needs. There was strong engagement from the Local Education Group (LEG) through the process and the final Compact was approved by government, endorsed by the LEG, and accepted by the GPE Board.

Assessment of Grant Implementation: Efficacy

Overall Efficacy

Level of Overall Efficacy 2

High

Detailed Description

The System Capacity Grant (SCG) Tranche 1 achieved its objectives. The process took longer than originally planned (9 months instead of 5 months) due to the need for additional dialogue and agreement on more complex actions, including responding to changing requirements and discussing the top-up triggers. The Partnership Compact priority reform focuses on the most disadvantaged children, especially girls, children from poor and rural families, out-of-school children, and children living with disability. The gender and poverty dimensions of the learning are detailed in a strong rationale and addressed through selected ESP actions. The Liberia Compact also includes a section describing the global and local effectiveness evidence underpinning the selection of the actions.

Efficacy by capacity area window

Detailed Description

The grant completed the deliverables and increased understanding of the purpose of the Compact, its links with the ESP, and potential GPE grants. The members of the Task Team were involved in multiple workshops and analytical activities. The government acknowledged the consistent engagement from LEG members who provided feedback on draft sections. The Partnership Compact's theory of change and results framework were strongly aligned with government priorities.

Contribution to system capacity to deliver reforms

Detailed Description

The grant laid the foundations for the forthcoming SCG, System Transformation Grant (STG), and Multiplier by identifying the system capacity gaps and weaknesses, identifying priority actions, and outlining the essential education reforms from the ESP to improve foundation learning service delivery and systems. The process of updating the Domestic Financing Matrix and completing the self-assessment for the enabling factors was valuable to MoE senior officers.

Conditions which Affected the Grant

Detailed Description

The length of time involved in orientating the Task Team and stakeholders, developing the Partnership Compact, and conducting extensive rounds of consultation and feedback (including with GPE and ITAP) was a potential risk to the deliverable. The country also had to navigate different guidelines and advice, which added complexity. Furthermore, as Task Team members were selected as experts, they have many tasks to attend to. To mitigate the risk of loss of momentum, the grant agent supported the MoE to circulate regular updates to stakeholders, kept detailed changelogs at each draft stage, and structured the writing workshops to tackle sections in a logical order. There were no risks identified for SEAH and no safeguarding incidents reported to MoE or the grant agent.

Lessons and recommendations, successful practices and innovative interventions

Detailed Description

The development of the Partnership Compact is a complex process and requires participants to understand the rationale, process, terminology, and GPE requirements. There was considerable demand on the workload of Task Team members as the country strongly followed a locally owned solution rather than one which was consultant-led. As the Compact occurred soon after Liberia's ESA and ESP development

there was initially reluctance to engage with a duplication of the analytical dialogue and a risk of “planning fatigue” among core constituents.

Impact stories

Detailed Description

N/A

Other Effects

Detailed Description

N/A

Tangible outputs and knowledge products

#	File Name	Document Type	Description

The documents listed were submitted with the progress report. If you’d like access to them, please contact the grant operations officer for your country.

Efficiency, Sustainability and Grant Management

Assessment of Project Implementation: Efficiency

Overall Efficiency

Level of Overall Efficiency 3

Substantial

Detailed Description

N/A

Timeliness

Detailed Description

No delays at grant start.

Detailed Description

The development fo the Compact took longer than planned due to the complexity of the guidelines and the length of time required to reach consensus and complete writing. The timeframe could have been reduced and simplified through a consultant-led approach, but the country rightly took a more inclusive, participatory approach.

Grant costs

Detailed Description

Developing the Partnership Compact was the deliverable. The costs by category were the following:

- Staff Costs 53,437.76
- Consultant Fees 76,934.46
- Associated Overhead Costs 1,293.50
- Travel Expenses 29,529.42
- Media Workshop 3,969.75
- Contractual services 1,440.00

Total 166,604.89

Partnerships and Inclusive Dialogue

Detailed Description

A representative of the philanthropic foundations funding the LEAP PPP was an active member of the LEG and provided feedback and data to the Task Team. The LEG was briefed regularly by MoE on grant progress, agreed the enabling factor ratings, agreed on the priority reform shortlist, discussed the top-up triggers, and provided multiple rounds of feedback and endorsement to the Compact document.

Use of data and Evidence for Improvement

Detailed Description

The Compact drew on the latest data from the ESA, Joint Education Sector Analysis, National Primary Learning Assessment, and latest Annual School Census. The Task Team was able to use impact evaluation data from USAID projects and analytical evidence from UNICEF and the World Bank, including the draft Education Sector Public Expenditure Review. The detailed theory of change was developed and refined early in the process to build a shared understanding of the root causes, barriers and evidence-based actions required for the priority reform.

Use of GPE Processes

Detailed Description

The ITAP Report did not add sufficient value as it mostly repeated analysis which was well known to the in-country partners.

Sustainability

Detailed Description

Ultimately, the value of the Compact in future decision-making, resource allocation (outside of GPE project design), and sector review remains to be seen as it is not yet embedded in the government’s formal planning, budgeting, and reporting cycle as the ESP is the medium-term planning document to which development partners align aid and projects. The analysis, discussions and consensus in the Compact will have value in the development of the future SCG, STG and Multiplier grants.

Grant Management and Use of Funds

Unspent Funds

Amount of funds that were not spent by grant closing

35.11

Detailed Description

(i) All funds were spent except for US$35.11, which were due to financial system rounding and limitations.

Management Performance

Level of Management Performance [4]

Satisfactory (S)

Detailed Description

No management issues with Tranche 1 aside from the delay in submission of the Compact described previously.

Annexes

Annex 1: List of Acronyms

Acronym	Description

Annex 2: Efficacy by Grant Window

Capacity Area Window

Window 1: Strengthen gender-responsive planning and policy development for system-wide impact

Level of Achievement at End of Grant

High

Detailed Description:

All intended outcomes were achieved, although it did take a few more months than originally envisioned.

---

[1] High - There were no shortcomings or at most minor shortcomings in the continued alignment between grant activities and the capacity needs/priorities. The grant provided clear evidence of such alignment. If circumstances changed, the objectives were changed accordingly to keep objectives fully relevant. Substantial - There were moderate shortcomings in the continued alignment between grant activities and the capacity needs/priorities. The grant provided limited information on such alignment. If circumstances changed, the objectives were changed accordingly to keep objectives fully relevant. Modest - There were significant shortcomings in the continued alignment between grant activities and the capacity needs/priorities. The project provided limited information on such alignment. If circumstances changed, the objectives were not changed accordingly to keep objectives fully relevant. Negligible - There were severe shortcomings in the continued alignment between grant activities and the capacity needs/priorities. The grant differed from those current needs or did not provide information to assess such alignment. If circumstances changed, the objectives were not changed accordingly to keep objectives fully relevant.

[2] High-The project exceeded or fully achieved its objectives (intended outcomes) or is likely to do so. Substantial -The project almost fully achieved its objectives (intended outcomes) or is likely to do so. Modest- The project partly achieved (or is expected to partly achieve) its objectives (intended outcomes). Negligible-The project barely achieved or did not achieve (minimal achievement, if any) its objectives (intended outcomes).

[3] High-Efficiency exceeded expectations. Substantial-Efficiency was what would be expected in the sector.Modest-Efficiency was below expectations in the sector. Negligible- Efficiency was very low compared to both the benefits (if any) and recognized norms in the sector.

[4] Highly Unsatisfactory – Overall grant management performance prevented the achievement of one or more outputs. Unsatisfactory – Overall grant management performance limited or jeopardized the achievement of one or more outputs. Moderately Unsatisfactory – Overall grant management performance delayed the achievement of one or more outputs, but issues were resolved during the grant life cycle. Moderately Satisfactory – Overall grant management performance supported the grant to achieve most of its major outputs efficiently with moderate shortcomings. Satisfactory – Overall grant management performance supported the grant to achieve almost all of its major outputs efficiently with only minor shortcomings. Highly Satisfactory – Overall grant management performance supported the grant to achieve or exceed all of the major outputs efficiently without significant shortcomings.