GPE RESULTS FRAMEWORK 2030

TECHNICAL GUIDELINES

APRIL 2026

DRAFT

CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS iv
INTRODUCTION 1
GPE2030 HEADLINE INDICATORS FROM GPE GRANTS AND CO-FINANCING 3
INDICATOR H1 3
INDICATOR H2 1
INDICATOR H3 6
INDICATOR H4 11
INDICATOR H5 18
GPE 2030 RESULTS FRAMEWORK INDICATORS 23
INDICATOR RF 1 23
INDICATOR RF 2 26
INDICATOR RF 3 29
INDICATOR RF 4 34
INDICATOR RF 5 37
INDICATOR RF 6 42
INDICATOR RF 7 46
INDICATOR RF 8 49
INDICATOR RF 9 53
INDICATOR RF 10 56
INDICATOR RF 11 59
INDICATOR RF 12 63
REGULAR REPORTING INDICATORS 66
INDICATOR RR 1 66
INDICATOR RR 2 69
INDICATOR RR 3 76
INDICATOR RR 4 79
INDICATOR RR 5 82
VALUE FOR MONEY INDICATORS 87
INDICATOR VFM ECO-P1 87
INDICATOR VFM ECO-F1 87
INDICATOR VFM ECO-F2 88
INDICATOR VFM ECO-S1 90
INDICATOR VFM EFF-P1 92
INDICATOR VFM EFF-F1 92
INDICATOR VFM EFF-S1 95
INDICATOR VFM EFFEC-P1 97
INDICATOR VFM EFFEC-F1 97

DRAFT

INDICATOR VFM EFFEC-F2 97
INDICATOR VFM EFFEC-S1 97
INDICATOR VFM EQY-P1 100
INDICATOR VFM EQY-F1 100
INDICATOR VFM EQY-F2 102
INDICATOR VFM EQY-F3 102
INDICATOR VFM EQY-F4 102
INDICATOR VFM EQY-F5 102
INDICATOR VFM EQY-S1 105
INDICATOR VFM SUS-P1 106
INDICATOR VFM SUS-P2 106
INDICATOR VFM SUS-F1 106
INDICATOR VFM SUS-F2 106
INDICATOR VFM SUS-F3 106
ANNEX A 107

DRAFT

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

ACG SmartEd	Arab Coordination Group Smart Education Initiative
AF	Accelerated Financing
CEL	Country Engagement Lead
CPO	Country Program Officer
CSO	Civil Society Organization
CY	Calendar Year
Debt2Ed	Debt to Education initiative
EMIS	Education Management Information System
EOL	Education Out Loud
ESPIG	Education Sector Program Implementation Grant
FCAS	Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations
FTE	Full-Time Equivalent
GA	Grant Agent
GEA	Girls' Education Accelerator
GOP	Grant Operations Practice
H	Headline Indicator
IDP	Internally Displaced Person
ISCED	International Standard Classification of Education
JSR	Joint Sector Review
KIX	Knowledge and Innovation Exchange
KPI	Key Performance Indicator
LEG	Local Education Group
LIC	Low-Income Country
MEL	Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning
MTR	Partnership Compact Midterm Review
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OOSC	Out-of-School Children
PCFC	Partner Countries Affected by Fragility and Conflict
PD	Professional Development
PILC	Performance, Impact and Learning Committee
QA	Quality Assurance
QAR	Quality Assurance Review
RF	Results Framework Indicator
RR	Regular Reporting Indicator
SAP	Systems Applications and Products
SCG	System Capacity Grant
STG	System Transformation Grant
TAI	Technical Assistance Initiative
TMIS	Teacher Management Information System
UIS	UNESCO Institute of Statistics
VfM	Value for Money
WB	World Bank

DRAFT

INTRODUCTION

The GPE Board adopted GPE 2030 Results framework and corporate indicators part of this workbook in December 2025[1].

The GPE 2030 Indicators Methodology Workbook provides consolidated technical guidance for producing and interpreting all GPE corporate indicators, including those in the GPE 2030 Results Framework. It sets out indicator purpose, definitions, data requirements, calculation methods, disaggregation, data sources, and interpretation considerations to support consistent Secretariat reporting. Including:

- **Headline Results from GPE Grants and Co-financing (H):** Covers counts and percentages of children supported with improved quality of education, gender-equality interventions, support for out-of-school children, learning outcomes, and teacher professional development.
- **GPE 2030 Results Framework (RF):** Includes indicators per GPE 2030 Strategy on reform implementation, sector planning and monitoring, data systems, domestic financing, co-financing mobilization, partnership functioning, sector coordination, and policy influence.
- **Value for Money (VfM) framework and other regular reporting indicators:** Provides indicators from grant monitoring (including grant performance and standard outputs such as textbooks distributed and classrooms constructed), GPE annual monitoring, and value-for-money dimensions across economy, efficiency, effectiveness, equity, and sustainability. Indicators that are included in previous sections and in the VfM framework are not included fully.

SDG 4 Goal-Level Indicators, which measure progress towards the GPE 2030 goal, are excluded from this workbook as these are prepared and made publicly available by the UNESCO Institute of Statistics (UIS). These indicators are included to track progress on SDG-related outcomes such as learning, participation, completion, and school service provision.

[1] See link to Performance, Impact and Learning Committee decision on GPE 2030 Results Framework https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/decision-gpe-2030-results-framework-october-2025. Also see link to GPE 2030 Results Framework and corporate indicators proposed: https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/gpe-2030-results-framework-annexes-decision

DRAFT

Where applicable, indicators include disaggregation by country characteristics (e.g., fragility status, refugee and IDP context) and individual characteristics (e.g., sex, disability, location), depending on data availability.

Baseline Values

Baseline values will be established for indicators where historical data are available. The baseline year and data source for each indicator will be added once agreed. For new indicators without historical data, baselines will be marked as not applicable until initial reporting cycles generate sufficient information.

Benchmarks

Benchmarks will be introduced for selected indicators to track expected performance. These will be set together with indicator baselines. Benchmarks may vary depending on indicator type (e.g., grant-related, or enabling-factor indicators, etc) and largely remain constant over time, with assessment focused on whether they are met rather than on progress over time.

Milestones/Targets

Milestones and targets will be defined where applicable, taking into account indicator type, data availability, and alignment with GPE 2030 priorities. Some indicators will be assessed through increasing or decreasing trends with milestones leading into a target, while others may not have defined targets (and fixed target values may not apply).

DRAFT

GPE2030 HEADLINE INDICATORS FROM GPE GRANTS AND CO-FINANCING

INDICATOR H1

Number and proportion of children and youth supported with improved quality of education.

Purpose: To monitor the reach of GPE grant and co-financed interventions supporting improved quality of education for children and youth.

Definition: The number of children and youth that directly benefit from interventions[2], financed wholly or in part by GPE grants and/or co-financing from partners, that improve the quality of education, in line with SDG 4 definitions of education quality. Direct beneficiaries are all children and youth that directly participated in project activities, received project-supported incentives or services or benefited from project interventions by GPE grants and cofinancing, as reported in grant progress reports and completion reports. For instance, benefit from community and school-based interventions such as teacher training, textbook distribution, school construction, school grants, school improvement, community mobilization, accelerated education programs, and other applicable interventions.

Unit of measurement: Number (cumulative) and percentage of children and youth.

Calculation method: *At the program level*[3]:

- *For programs approved under GPE 2025 Strategy or after, count* cumulative direct beneficiary children and youth reached through quality-improving activities, consistent with SDG4 definitions [4]of education quality. Beneficiaries are counted only once: the first time they participate in any eligible activity under the program, to prevent double counting across activities. Programs report cumulative beneficiary counts, adding only newly reached individuals in each reporting period. While programs should take reasonable steps to reduce double counting, full identification of unique beneficiaries may not always be possible.

[2] GPE grant-funded programs also benefit children and youth as indirect beneficiaries through policy/capacity building efforts such as public financial management reforms, curriculum reforms, policy reforms, etc. These indirect beneficiaries do not have to be reported for this indicator.
[3] Percentages are not reported at the program level and therefore not calculated; only counts are made available.
[4] Definitions of quality-improving education activities align with guidance from the UIS and the GEM Report, which provide globally agreed methodologies and technical standards for monitoring progress toward SDG 4.

DRAFT

At the country level:

- The *count* reflects cumulative beneficiary totals aggregated across all applicable programs active since 1 January 2026 for each country, including those counted earlier for grants that remain active. These totals represent country level- cumulative counts from each grant's start date. Wherever feasible, steps should be taken to minimize double counting across programs, though some residual double counting may remain[5]. Country level- totals must not exceed the relevant school-age population (e.g., total number of children and youth eligible for quality improving- interventions).

- The *country-level percentage* is calculated based on this count, as the cumulative total divided by the relevant target population.

At the aggregate/portfolio level,

- The *count totals* are obtained by summing country-level cumulative beneficiary totals for grants that were active at any point since 1 January 2026**.** These represent cumulative beneficiaries reached through all quality-improving interventions supported by GPE grants and co-financing.

- The *aggregate-level percentage* is the sum of country-level beneficiary totals divided by the sum of the corresponding countries' target population, multiplied by 100.

Formula:

Program level

Unique beneficiaries are summed across all activities in program p in country c:

$$\mathrm{B}_c^p = \sum_{i=1}^{A_{p,c}} B_c^{(i,p)}$$

B_c^p Total cumulative unique direct beneficiaries reached by program p in country c

$B_c^{i,p}$ Total unique direct beneficiaries reached through activity i under program p in country c

$A_{p,c}$ Number of activities in program p in country c

[5] Where overlap across programs is possible and cannot be ruled out, use the highest single value and note the double-counting risk

DRAFT

Country level

Count

Post computing program-level beneficiary totals, aggregate within each country for programs active since 1 January 2026, remove cross-program double counting, where feasible, and cap at the target population Pc:

$$B_c = \min\left\{ \sum_{p \in P_{c_{2026}}} \mathrm{B}_c^p \, , P_c^{cap} \right\}$$

where:

B_c	Total country-level cumulative beneficiaries for all applicable active since 1 Jan 2026, after cross-program deduplication and population capping
$P_{c_{2026}}$	Set of programs in country c active at any time since 1 January 2026
B_c^p	Number of unique beneficiaries reached by program p in country c
P_c^{cap}	Target population cap for country c (cannot exceed total children/youth eligible for quality-improving interventions)

Percentage

Divide the country-level total cumulative beneficiaries for all applicable active since 1 Jan 2026 by the corresponding school-age population, P_c^{cap}:

$$\%B_c = \frac{B_c}{P_c^{cap}} \times 100$$

Aggregate level

Count

Aggregate across all countries the calculated country-level cumulative beneficiaries:

$$B_{portfolio} = \sum_{C \in C_{2026}} B_c$$

where:

$B_{portfolio}$	Total direct cumulative beneficiaries across portfolio

DRAFT

C_{2026} Set of countries with at least one program active since 1 Jan 2026

N Number of GPE partner countries with active programs

Percentage

Divide the sum of country-level cumulative beneficiaries for all applicable active since 1 Jan 2026 by the sum of corresponding countries' school-age population, P_c^{cap}, and multiply by 100:

$$\%B_{portfolio} = \left(\frac{\sum_{c \in C_{2026}} B_c}{\sum_{c \in C_{2026}} P_c^{cap}} \right) \times 100$$

where:

$\%B_{portfolio}$ Aggregate portfolio-level percentage of children and youth reached across programs

Interpretation: Higher values indicate that GPE is reaching more children and youth with interventions that improve education quality. The number shows scale of reach, the percentage shows coverage relative to the target population. Over time, increasing cumulative values demonstrate GPE's expanding contribution to quality education. Values represent results for programs approved under GPE 2025 Strategy or after.

Reporting timeframe: Annually via standard grant reporting templates (progress and completion reports), aligned with CY reporting cycle.

Data source: Results Framework section of implementation grant progress and completion reports, complemented by information from program monitoring frameworks, such grants' results framework supplementary documentation shared with the Secretariat (in separate annexes), and school-age population data (from UIS). Where results from the program co-financing is reported separately, reports from cofinanciers will be used.

Data required: Number of direct beneficiary children and youth by programs, breakdowns for required disaggregation (sex, disability, location, refugee and IDP children and youth where applicable, and level of education if available), and corresponding school-age population, where available, to calculate coverage as a share of the targeted population.

DRAFT

Disaggregation: Required disaggregation: PCFC [6], sex, children and youth with disabilities. If applicable (i.e., if targeted by the program): location (e.g., rural or disadvantaged regions), refugee, and IDP children and youth (all categories disaggregated by sex).

Quality standards: Secretariat CPOs verify quality of reports submitted based on the verification guidance. This includes checking that reported figures fall within the expected reporting timeframe for the calendar year, do not exceed relevant population counts, and address risks of double counting, and that required data disaggregation is available, supported by documented beneficiary assumptions and methods across programs.
Grant Agents are responsible for applying quality standards as set out in the grant monitoring and reporting guidelines. See link to implementation grant guidelines and grant annual and completion reporting templates here.

Limitations: Beneficiary counting approaches may differ across programs and country contexts, which can affect comparability. In cofinanced operations, estimates of the GPE-attributable share may be required. Additionally, fully verifying unique beneficiaries may not always be feasible, particularly in settings where data systems cannot track individuals or where multiple grant agents contribute to overlapping activities.

DRAFT

[6] The GPE's list of PCFC is based on the World Bank's list of fragile and conflict-affected situations and the UNESCO Global Monitoring Report's list of conflict-affected states and is updated yearly. See Annex A for more details.

INDICATOR H2

Number and percentage of children and youth that benefit from interventions that promote gender equality.

Purpose: To monitor the reach of GPE grant-financed and co-financed interventions that support children and youth through activities that explicitly aim to reduce gender disparities and address barriers that disproportionately affect girls and other marginalized groups, based on the indicative list of interventions (see Definition section).

Definition: The number of children and youth that benefit from predefined categories of interventions that promote gender equality through GPE grants and partner co-financing. The Secretariat provides an indicative list of interventions that promote gender equality, including but not limited to: gender-responsive curricula and teaching materials, community and classroom activities that address negative gender stereotypes, addressing school-related gender-based violence (SRGBV), mentorship programs for at-risk girls and boys, addressing gender-related financial barriers through scholarships and cash transfers, improving school sanitation facilities that enhance safety and dignity, particularly for girls. Interventions outside the indicative list may be counted if the grant agent demonstrates their contribution to promoting gender equality.

Unit of measurement: Number (cumulative) and percentage of children and youth.

Calculation method: *At the program level:*

- For programs approved under GPE 2025 Strategy or after, count cumulative direct beneficiaries reached through gender-equality activities under programs with at least one component assigned a gender marker of 1 (significant objective) or 2 (principal objective).[7] Beneficiaries are counted once at the point they are first reached, with only newly reached individuals added in subsequent reporting periods. Where feasible, unique direct beneficiaries should be identified within the program.

At the country level:

[7] These programs are required to report the number of beneficiaries reached through gender equality–related activities. See gender marking in grant thematic coding framework in Annex C forthcoming.

Official Use Only

- *Count* cumulative beneficiary across all applicable active at any point at any point since 1 January 2026, including beneficiaries counted earlier for grants that remain active. These totals represent country-level cumulative counts from each grant's start date. Where feasible, efforts should be made to identify unique individuals and reduce double counting across programs. Country-level totals must not exceed the relevant target school-age population for the country and must also not exceed the value reported for indicator H1 (children and youth benefiting from quality-improving interventions).

- The *country-level percentage* is calculated as the number of gender-equality beneficiaries divided by the corresponding target population, multiplied by 100.

At the aggregate/portfolio level:

- *Count* totals are obtained by summing country-level cumulative beneficiary totals across programs with at least one component assigned a gender marker 1 or 2 .

- The aggregate percentage is calculated as the sum of country-level beneficiary totals divided by the sum of the corresponding countries' target populations, multiplied by 100.

Formula:

Program level

Unique beneficiaries are summed across all activities in program p in country c that target beneficiaries reached by gender-equality activities:

$$\mathrm{B}_{GE,c}^{p} = \sum_{i=1}^{A_{GE,p,c}} B_{GE,c}^{(i,p)}$$

$\mathrm{B}_{GE,c}^{p}$ Total cumulative unique beneficiaries reached by gender-equality activities in program p in country c

$B_{GE,c}^{(i,p)}$ Total beneficiaries reached through activity i under program p in country c

$A_{GE,p,c}$ Number of gender-equality activities in program p in country c

Country level

Count

Aggregate total beneficiaries across all active programs in country c, remove

Official Use Only

cross-program double counting, and cap the total at the target population:

$$B_{GE,c} = \min\left\{\sum_{p=1}^{N_c} \mathrm{B}_{GE,c}^{p}, P_c^{cap}\right\}$$

Percentage

Divide the country-level total cumulative beneficiaries for all applicable active since 1 Jan 2026 by the sum of corresponding target population, P_c^{cap}:

$$\%B_{GE,c} = \frac{B_{GE,c}}{P_c^{cap}} \times 100$$

where:

$B_{GE,c}$	Total count of beneficiaries of gender-equality interventions/activities in country *c*
N_c	Number of active GPE programs in country *c*
$\%B_{GE,c}$	Percentage of beneficiaries of gender-equality interventions/activities in country *c*
P_c^{cap}	Target population cap for country *c*

Aggregate level

Count

Aggregate across all countries the calculated country-level cumulative beneficiaries:

$$B_{GE,portfolio} = \sum_{C \in C_{2026}} B_{GE,c}$$

where:

$B_{GE,\mathrm{portfolio}}$	Total beneficiaries of gender-equality interventions across GPE portfolio
C_{2026}	Set of countries with at least one program active since 1 Jan 2026
$\lvert C_{2026} \rvert$	Number of such countries (used as the upper bound in the summation)

Percentage

Divide the sum of country-level cumulative beneficiaries for all applicable active since 1 Jan 2026 by the sum of corresponding countries' target population, and multiply by 100:

DRAFT

Official Use Only

$$\%B_{GE,\,portfolio} = \left(\frac{\sum_{c \in C_{2026}} B_{GE,c}}{\sum_{c \in C_{2026}} P_c^{cap}}\right) \times 100$$

where:

$\%B_{GE,\,portfolio}$ Aggregate portfolio-level percentage of children and youth reached across the GPE portfolio through gender-equality interventions

Interpretation: Higher values indicate that GPE is reaching more children and youth with gender-equality-focused interventions addressing barriers to access and learning linked to gender inequality, including harmful gender norms, early marriage and adolescent pregnancy, school-related gender-based violence, and inadequate water, sanitation, and hygiene facilities. The number reflects scale, while the percentage reflects coverage relative to the target population. Increasing cumulative values over time indicate expanded support for gender equality across the portfolio. Values represent results for programs approved under GPE 2025 Strategy or after.

Reporting timeframe: Annually via standard grant reporting templates (progress and completion reports), aligned with CY reporting cycle.

Data source: Gender marking classifications by program's components. Results Framework section of grant progress and completion reports, any additional information from program monitoring frameworks, such grants' results framework supplementary documentation shared with the Secretariat (in separate annexes), and headline indicator 1 data for setting caps. Where results from the program co-financing is reported separately, reports from cofinanciers will be used.

Data required: Counts of beneficiaries including disaggregation by sex, education level, disability, location, highly marginalized girls where available sex, education level, disability (if applicable); program/activity-specific classification of each activity against the gender equality classifications (gender marker scores (1 or 2) for each sub-component); and corresponding school-age population, where available, to calculate coverage as target population denominators for program areas and population caps.

Disaggregation: Required disaggregation: PCFC, sex (including further disaggregation by highly marginalized girls[8]). If applicable and available, by level of education, location

[8] Referring to girls who face one or more additional disadvantage e,g, girls with a disability, girls living in remote locations.

Official Use Only

(e.g., rural/urban), children and youth with disabilities, refugee and IDP children and youth (all disaggregated by sex), and corresponding school-age population, where available, to calculate coverage as a share of the targeted population.

Quality standards: Secretariat CPOs verify quality standards of reports submitted based on the verification guidance. This includes checking that reported figures fall within the expected reporting timeframe for the calendar year, do not exceed relevant population counts, address risks of double counting, and that required sex-disaggregated data are available. Verification ensures that gender marker coding is applied consistently across programs and sub-components (gender marker 1 or 2). Grant Agents are responsible for applying quality standards in line with the grant monitoring and reporting guidelines, including implementation grant guidelines and grant progress and completion reporting templates.

Limitations: Incomplete coverage of gender equality activities, as the indicative list may miss relevant interventions, leading to undercounts. Beneficiary data for many activities—especially system level reforms—are often unavailable or lack direct counts, requiring the use of estimates. Disaggregated data for marginalized groups such as children with disabilities, refugees/IDPs, or highly marginalized girls are frequently unavailable, making subgroup estimates unreliable. Finally, substantial overlap across gender equality activities and programs can result in unavoidable double counting, particularly where multiple interventions target the same schools or districts; Secretariat CPOs, with support from Secretariat thematic leads and gender equality and inclusion specialists, verify and clarify these risks with Grant Agents to the extent possible.

DRAFT

Official Use Only

INDICATOR H3

Number and percentage of out-of-school children and youth provided education and/or training.

Purpose: To monitor the reach of GPE grant-financed and co-financed interventions that support out-of-school children and youth.

Definition: Out-of-school children (OOSC) and youth of the official age range for a given level of education who are not enrolled in education, who benefit from education and training provided through GPE grant- or co-financed programs. Age ranges for each level of education are in line with the International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED) levels 1 (primary), 2 (lower secondary), and 3 (upper secondary). Although normally up to and including 18-year-olds, an exact age is not given, as this can vary by country, and marginalized and out-of-school youth may be over-aged due to uneven attendance at lower levels of education.

Unit of measurement: Number (cumulative) and percentage of total out-of-school children.

Calculation method: *At the program level*:

- For programs approved under GPE 2025 Strategy or after, *count* the cumulative unique number of OOSC reached, including through education and/or training activities such as accelerated learning programs, non-formal education, remedial instruction, or skills training, among others. Only activities that explicitly target OOSC are included, and if the program documentation does not specify that OOSC were targeted, the program is assumed to have reached none. Within each program, beneficiaries reported across different activities must be reviewed to ensure that individuals are not double-counted.

At the country level:

- *Count* totals are cumulative OOSC beneficiaries from all applicable active grants at any point since 1 January 2026, including beneficiaries counted earlier for grants that remain active. These totals represent country-level cumulative counts from each grant's start date. Wherever feasible, steps should be taken to minimize double counting across programs, though some residual double counting may

DRAFT

Official Use Only

remain [9]. Country-level totals must not exceed the eligible out-of-school population, which acts as a cap.

- The *country-level percentage* are calculated as the cumulative number of OOSC beneficiaries divided by the relevant-target population, multiplied by 100.

At the aggregate/portfolio level:

- *Count totals* are obtained by summing country-level cumulative beneficiary totals for grants that were active at any point since 1 January 2026. These represent cumulative beneficiaries supported by GPE grants and co-financing.
- The aggregate-level percentage is the sum of country-level beneficiary totals divided by the sum of the corresponding countries' target population, multiplied by 100.

Formula:

Program level

Unique beneficiaries are summed across all activities in program p in country c that target out-of-school beneficiaries:

$$\mathrm{B}^{p}_{OOSC,c} = \sum_{i=1}^{A_{OOSC,p,c}} B^{(i,p)}_{OOSC,c}$$

where,

$\mathrm{B}^{p}_{OOSC,c}$	Total out-of-school beneficiaries supported by program p in country c
$B^{(i,p)}_{OOSC,c}$	Out-of-school beneficiaries from activity *i* in country *c* (avoiding double-counting)
$B^{(i,p)}_{OOSC,c}$	Number of activities within program p in country c that provide education or training to OOSC.
$A_{OOSC,p,c}$	Number of activities within program p in country c that provide education or training to OOSC.
i	Activity index

[9] Where overlap across programs is possible and cannot be ruled out, use the highest single value and note the double-counting risk

Official Use Only

Country level

Count

Post computing program-level beneficiary totals, aggregate within each country for programs active since 1 January 2026, remove cross-program double counting, where feasible, and cap the total at the target population:

$$B_{OOSC,c} = \min\left\{\sum_{p=1}^{N_c} \mathrm{B}_{OOSC,c}^{p}, P_{OOSC,c}^{cap}\right\}$$

Percentage

Total beneficiaries calculated divided by the corresponding population:

$$\%B_{OOSC,c} = \frac{B_{OOSC,c}}{P_{OOSC,c}^{cap}} \times 100$$

where:

$B_{OOSC,c}$	Total count of cumulative country-level unique number of out-of-school children and youth provided education/training
$\sum_{p=1}^{N_c} \mathrm{B}_{OOSC,c}^{p}$	Combined total across all applicable before capping
N_c	Number of GPE programs targeting out-of-school children in country c
$\%B_{OOSC,c}$	Percentage of the out-of-school population supported in country *c*
$P_{OOSC,c}^{cap}$	Maximum eligible out-of-school population in country *c*

Aggregate level

Count

Aggregate across all countries the calculated country-level cumulative beneficiaries:

$$B_{OOSC,portfolio} = \sum_{C \in C_{2026}} B_{OOSC,c}$$

where:

$B_{OOSC,\mathrm{portfolio}}$	Total out-of-school beneficiaries across the portfolio

DRAFT

Official Use Only

C_{2026} Set of countries with at least one active program since 1 Jan 2026.

$|C_{2026}|$ Number of such countries (used as the upper bound in the summation)

Percentage

Divide the sum of country-level cumulative beneficiaries for all applicable active since 1 Jan 2026 by the sum of corresponding countries' eligible out-of-school population cap, and multiply by 100:

$$\%\ B_{OOSC,portfolio} = \left(\frac{\sum_{c \in C_{2026}} B_{OOSC,c}}{\sum_{c \in C_{2026}} P_{OOSC,c}^{cap}} \right) \times 100$$

where:

$\%B_{portfolio}$ Aggregate portfolio-level percentage of out-of-school children and youth supported across the GPE portfolio

Interpretation: Higher values indicate greater reach of GPE-support to out-of-school children and youth with education and training opportunities. The percentage shows coverage relative to the target population. Over time, increasing cumulative values demonstrate GPE's expanding contribution to reducing out-of-school children. Values represent results for programs approved under GPE 2025 Strategy or after.

Reporting timeframe: Annually via standard grant reporting templates (progress AND completion reports), aligned with CY reporting cycle.

Data source: Results Framework section of grant progress and completion reports, any additional information from program monitoring frameworks, such grants' results framework supplementary documentation shared with the Secretariat (in separate annexes), and), out-of-school-age population data (from UIS), and headline indicator 1 data to set caps. Where results from the program co-financing is reported separately, reports from cofinanciers will be used.

Data required: Number of out-of-school children and youth by activity, Number of out-of-school beneficiaries who enroll/reenroll in formal education after completion of training, Total out-of-school population, Disaggregation by sex, age group, disability, location where available

Disaggregation: Required disaggregation: PCFC, sex, number of out-of-school

Official Use Only

beneficiaries who enroll/reenroll in formal education after completion of training, children and youth with disabilities, age group. If applicable, by location (e.g., rural/urban), refugee and IDP children and youth (all disaggregated by sex), and corresponding out-of-school population, where available, to calculate coverage as a share of the targeted population.

Quality standards: Secretariat CPOs verify quality of reports submitted based on the verification guidance. This includes checking that reported figures fall within the expected reporting timeframe for the calendar year, do not exceed relevant population counts, and address risks of double counting, and that required data disaggregation is available, supported by documented beneficiary assumptions and methods across programs. CPO also check whether programs explicitly target out-of-school children in program documentation and that reported output indicators (e.g. enrolment in accelerated learning, participation in remedial instruction or skills training) provide reporting of OOSC beneficiaries. Where programs include interventions that support pathways to re-enrolment in formal education, re-enrolment outcomes are tracked and reported.
Grant Agents are responsible for applying quality standards as set out in the grant monitoring and reporting guidelines. See link to implementation grant guidelines and grant annual and completion reporting templates here.

Limitations: Limitations include variation in how "out-of-school" children are defined across program contexts, which affects consistency in reporting. Data on out-of-school populations are often limited at sub-national levels where programs operate, reducing accuracy in estimating the target population. Many programs also lack systems to track whether children re-enroll in formal education, making it difficult to verify longer-term outcomes. In addition, some interventions reach children who are only temporarily out of school rather than long-term dropouts, complicating classification. Disaggregation often relies on estimation methods that may be inconsistent across contexts.

DRAFT

Official Use Only

INDICATOR H4

Number and percentage of children with improved learning outcomes

Purpose: To monitor the reach of GPE grant- and co-financed interventions supporting improved learning outcomes among children and youth.

Definition: This indicator counts beneficiary children with improved learning based on results from learning assessments. National learning assessments are preferred, but program-specific assessments may be used when national data are unavailable. Improvement is defined in two ways: (i) children who meet the proficiency benchmark reported in the most recent assessment; or (ii) children represented by assessments showing a positive, statistically significant gain in average scores across two comparable assessments. If the assessment report provides an estimate of the number and percentage of students who improved, that estimate is used; otherwise, all beneficiaries represented by the assessment sample—or all assessed learners in the case of a census—are counted as having improved.

The indicator applies only to programs aiming to improve learning outcomes, with potential exceptions for programs in fragile or conflict-affected contexts. Any subject or holistic learning domain at any primary or secondary grade level may be used, and no psychometric or content standards are applied. Examinations are excluded from this indicator because they are not usually designed to measure learning improvement.

The assessment are not required to be reported through the program funded by GPE grants/multiplier co-financing, i.e., existing learning assessments can be used, if they relate to the program activities and representative of at least a subset of program beneficiaries, as follows: (i) If the population for whom the learning assessments are representative is a superset of program beneficiaries, and these assessments show improvement, program beneficiaries will be assumed to have improved in the same proportion as the population. If the proportion that improved is not specified (i.e., only averages are reported), all program beneficiaries will be considered to have improved. (ii) If the population for whom the learning assessments are representative is a subset of program beneficiaries, and these assessments show improvements, that subset of program beneficiaries will be considered to have improved (with appropriate assumptions made to calculate the size of that subset, if not provided in the assessment report).

DRAFT

Official Use Only

Unit of measurement: Number (cumulative) and percentage of children, with improved learning outcomes relative to the assessment-represented beneficiary population.

Calculation method:

At the program level:

- For programs approved under GPE 2025 Strategy or after, the indicator counts the cumulative unique number of beneficiary children who demonstrate improved learning based on an eligible learning assessment. Improvement is determined using one of two accepted approaches:

  1. Proficiency Approach: Count all beneficiary children who meet the proficiency benchmark in the most recent assessment.

  2. Score-Improvement Approach

  - If the assessment report provides the number or proportion of children who improved, use that estimate.
  - If the report only shows a statistically significant positive average score gain between comparable assessments, count all beneficiary children represented by the assessment.
    - For sample-based assessments: count all beneficiaries represented by the sample.
    - For census assessments: count all assessed learners.

  3. Adjustment Based on Assessment Coverage. Assessments may represent a superset of program beneficiaries, a subset, or an exact match. Adjust learning-improvement will be counted as follows:

  - Superset: Apply the proportion who improved in the assessment to all program beneficiaries.
    If no proportion is provided (only mean score improvement), assume 100% of program beneficiaries improved.
    - Subset: Count only the children represented by the assessment.
    - Use the assessment results directly.

At the country level:

- *The* cumulative count of beneficiaries with improved learning outcomes are aggregated across all applicable active at any point since 1 January 2026.

  - If programs reach distinct beneficiaries, sum program-level totals.

Official Use Only

- If overlap between program beneficiaries cannot be ruled out, use the maximum program-level value to avoid double counting across programs.
- Country-level totals must not exceed the total number of program beneficiaries represented by the relevant assessments, which functions as a cap.

- The *country-level percentage* is calculated by dividing the cumulative number of children with improved learning by the relevant assessed population (e.g., enrolled population or assessment-represented population) and multiplying by 100.

At the aggregate/portfolio level:

- totals are produced by summing country-level cumulative beneficiary totals across all countries with at least one active program since 1 January 2026. These represent the cumulative number of children with improved learning attributable to GPE-supported interventions.

- The aggregate-level percentage is calculated by dividing the sum of countries' cumulative totals by the sum of the corresponding countries' relevant populations and multiplying by 100.

Formula:

Program level

Count

$$\mathrm{L}_c^p = \sum_{i=1}^{A_{L,p,c}} L_c^{(i,p)}$$

where:

L_c^p Total number of beneficiary children with improved learning under program *p* in country *c*

$L_c^{(i,p)}$ Number of children showing improved learning in activity *i* under program p

$A_{L,p,c}$ Number of learning-related assessment activities under program *p*

Determine $L_c^{(i,p)}$

(a) Proficiency benchmark Approach

$$L_c^{(i,p)} = B_{prof}^{(i,p)}$$

where:

$B_{prof}^{(i,p)}$ Children who met the proficiency benchmark.

(b) Score-Improvement Approach

Official Use Only

If assessment reports number or percentage improved:

$$L_c^{(i,p)} = N_{improved}^{(i,p)}$$

If only average score improvement is reported:

$$L_c^{(i,p)} = B_{represented}^{(i,p)}$$

where:

$N_{improved}^{(i,p)}$ Number (or proportion × assessed sample) reported as improved

$B_{represented}^{(i,p)}$ Beneficiaries represented by the assessment (sample population or census).

Adjustment for assessment coverage (superset/subset)

Let $L_{raw}^{(i,p)}$ be the unadjusted improvement count:

Superset (assessment population > program beneficiaries):

$$L_c^{(i,p)} = B_{total}^{(i,p)} \times \frac{L_{raw}^{(i,p)}}{B_{assessed}^{(i,p)}}$$

where:

$B_{total}^{(i,p)}$ Total program beneficiaries for activity i.

$B_{assessed}^{(i,p)}$ Children represented by the assessment.

Subset (assessment population = program beneficiaries):

$$L_c^{(i,p)} = L_{raw}^{(i,p)}$$

Country level

Count

Unadjusted Country-Level Improvement Count

If overlap across programs can be ruled out:

$$L_{country,c} = \sum_{p=1}^{N_c} L_{adjusted,c}^{p}$$

DRAFT

Official Use Only

If overlap across programs cannot be ruled out:

$$L_{country,c} = \max\left(L^{p}_{adjusted,c}\right)$$

Apply cap based on total program beneficiaries in the country

$$L_{country,c} = \min(L_{country,c}, B_{total,c})$$

where:

$L^{p}_{adjusted,c}$	Adjusted learning improvement from program p
N_c	Number of programs with learning-related assessments in country c
$B_{total,c}$	Total number of beneficiaries supported by all applicable in country c

Percentage

$$\%L_c = \frac{L_{country,c}}{B_{assessed,c}} \times 100$$

where:

$B_{assessed,c}$	Total number of beneficiaries represented by the assessment(s) used in country c.
$B^{p}_{represented,c}$	Beneficiaries represented by the assessment

Aggregate level

Count

Aggregate across all countries the calculated country-level cumulative beneficiaries (for programs active since 1 January 2026) with improved learning outcomes:

$$L_{\text{portfolio}} = \sum_{c \in C_{2026}} L_{\text{country},c}$$

where:

$L_{portfolio}$	Total children with improved learning across all countries
C_{2026}	Set of countries with at least one active program since 1 Jan 2026
$\lvert C_{2026} \rvert$	Number of such countries (used as the upper bound in the summation)

DRAFT

Official Use Only

Percentage

Divide the total number of children with improved learning outcomes across all countries (for programs active since 1 January 2026) by the sum of the corresponding countries' relevant assessed populations, and multiply by 100:

$$\% \, L_{portfolio} = \left(\frac{L_{portfolio}}{\sum_{c \in C_{2026}} B_{assessed,c}} \right) \times 100$$

where:

$\% \, L_{portfolio}$ Aggregate portfolio-level percentage of children with improved learning outcomes across the entire GPE portfolio

Interpretation: Higher values indicate that GPE-supported programs are reaching more children and youth with interventions that contribute to improved learning outcomes. The number shows the scale of children with improved learning, while the percentage reflects coverage relative to the assessed population. Over time, increasing cumulative values demonstrate GPE's expanding contribution to improving learning through its supported programs. Interpretation should still consider the type of assessment, whether it covers all beneficiaries or a subset, whether improvement is measured through proficiency benchmarks or score gains, and whether the assessment design supports meaningful conclusions about learning change. Values represent results for programs approved under GPE 2025 Strategy or after.

Reporting timeframe: Annually via standard grant reporting templates (progress and completion reports), aligned with CY reporting cycle.

Data source: Grant progress and completion reports, any additional information from program monitoring frameworks, complemented by information from program monitoring frameworks, such grants' results framework supplementary documentation shared with the Secretariat (in separate annexes), national learning assessments when available, or from program-specific learning assessments when national assessments are not available, enrolment data (from UIS), and headline indicator 1 data to set caps. These sources include assessment reports that provide proficiency benchmark results, score changes, or estimates of the proportion of children whose learning improved, and total beneficiary population, where available, to calculate coverage as a share of the targeted population.
Where results from the program co-financing is reported separately, reports from cofinanciers will be used.

Official Use Only

Data required: Required data includes proficiency benchmark results or statistically significant changes in average scores; the number or proportion of children meeting those criteria; the size of the assessment population represented; and any disaggregation provided by the assessment. When program-specific assessments exist, the grant agent must provide the relevant reports and data.

Disaggregation: Required disaggregation includes sex and level of education. Where programs target specific subgroups, further disaggregation includes location (e.g., rural/urban), disability status, and refugee or internally displaced status (all disaggregation must be broken down by sex), and corresponding school-age population, where available, to calculate coverage as a share of the targeted population.

Quality standards: Secretariat CPOs verify quality standards of reports submitted based on the verification guidance. This includes checking comparable assessments measure the same subjects using the same scoring scale and reference population. Improvement must be based on a proficiency benchmark or a statistically significant change in average scores. Where sex disaggregation is missing and assessment datasets are unavailable, the proportion of girls and boys whose learning improved must be assumed to match the sex distribution of program beneficiaries or, if needed, the broader population.
Grant Agents are responsible for applying quality standards as set out in the grant monitoring and reporting guidelines. See link to implementation grant guidelines and grant annual and completion reporting templates here.

Limitations: Limitations include reliance on learning assessment data that may be limited, inconsistent, or unavailable across countries—particularly in fragile or conflict-affected contexts where national assessments are often missing. Assessments may represent only subsets of beneficiaries. Sex disaggregation may be missing in some assessment reports, and other disaggregation cannot be estimated unless explicitly provided. The exclusion of examinations limits available data sources, and the absence of psychometric standards for acceptable assessments may introduce variations across programs, and attribution challenges when using national assessments that are not program specific.

DRAFT

Official Use Only

INDICATOR H5

H5. Number and percent of teachers who benefit from professional development programs/activities

Purpose: To monitor the reach of GPE grant- and co-financed interventions supporting strengthening teaching quality by measuring the scale of teachers reached with professional development (PD) opportunities.

Definition: Teachers and school leaders who benefit from activities and support to build teachers' professional knowledge, skills, and other qualities. This includes training, coaching, and other professional support structures for practicing teachers.

Teachers are professional teaching/instructional personnel directly involved in teaching students, including classroom teachers, special education teachers, and others who teach students in classrooms, small groups, or in one-to-one settings, inside or outside regular classrooms. Teaching and instructional staff exclude nonprofessional personnel who support teachers in providing instruction to students, such as teachers' aides and other paraprofessional personnel. Professional development includes pre-service training, in-service training, pedagogical coaching and mentoring, professional learning communities, subject-matter training, training on inclusive education, gender-responsive pedagogy.

Unit of measurement: Number (cumulative) and percentage of all teachers teaching (eligible for GPE support in the program area or country).

Calculation method: *At the program level*:

- For programs approved under GPE 2025 Strategy or after, *count* the cumulative unique number of teachers who benefit from eligible professional development (PD) activities supported by the program. PD activities supported by the program (see definition section).
  Programs report cumulative totals, adding only newly reached teachers during each reporting period to avoid within-program double counting.

At the country level:

- *Count* the cumulative teachers across all applicable active at any point since 1 January 2026 for each country, including those counted earlier for grants that remain active. These totals represent country-level cumulative counts from each

Official Use Only

grant's start date. Where unique teachers can be identified across programs, counts are summed; otherwise, the highest program-level value is used to avoid double counting. In all cases, the country-level value is capped at the total number of teachers in the relevant targeted population.

- The *country-level percentage* is calculated as the cumulative number of teachers benefiting from PD divided by the relevant teacher population (e.g., total number of pre-primary, primary, lower secondary, or upper secondary teachers, depending on program scope) and multiplying by 100.

At the aggregate/portfolio level:

- The totals are obtained by summing country-level cumulative teacher totals across all countries with at least one program active since 1 January 2026. These totals represent the cumulative number of teachers supported by GPE-funded or co-funded PD activities.
- The portfolio-level percentage as the aggregate total divided by the sum of the corresponding national teacher populations, multiplied by 100.

Formula:
Program level

Count

Count cumulative unique teachers benefiting from PD activities, adding only newly reached individuals and avoiding double counting within each program.

$$T_{PD,c}^{p} = \sum_{i=1}^{A_{PD,p,c}} T_{PD,c}^{(i,p)}$$

where:

$T_{PD,c}^{p}$	Total cumulative unique teachers benefiting from professional development (PD) under program p in country c. If the program includes no PD activities, then $T_{PD,c}^{p} = not\ applicable$
$T_{PD,c}^{(i,p)}$	Unique teachers benefiting from PD activity i in country c (avoiding double counting)
$A_{PD,p,c}$	Number of PD activities within program p in country c
i	Activity index

Official Use Only

Country level

Aggregate across program-level PD beneficiaries within each country, applying caps and adjustments to avoid double counting.

Count

$$T_{PD,c} = \min\left\{\sum_{p=1}^{N_c} T_{PD,c}^{p}, T_c^{cap}\right\}$$

or, when double counting across programs cannot be ruled out, use the highest program-level values

$$T_{PD,c} = \min\left\{\max\left(T_{PD,c}^{p}\right), T_c^{cap}\right\}$$

Percentage

$$\%T_{PD,c} = \frac{T_{PD,c}}{T_c^{cap}} \times 100$$

where:

$T_{PD,c}$	Total country-level unique teachers benefiting from PD in country c (after duplication and capping)
$\sum_{p=1}^{N_c} T_{PD,c}^{p}$	Combined teacher totals across all applicable before capping
N_c	Number of programs providing PD activities/programs in country c
T_c^{cap}	Maximum eligible teacher population (total teachers at relevant levels in country c)
$\%T_{PD,c}$	Percentage of teachers benefiting from PD in country c

Aggregate level

Aggregate across all countries with programs active since 1 January 2026 to obtain the total number of teachers benefiting from PD:

Count

$$T_{PD,portfolio} = \sum_{C \in C_{2026}}^{m} T_{PD,c}$$

DRAFT

Official Use Only

Percentage

Divide the sum of country-level totals of teachers benefiting from PD by the sum of the corresponding teacher population caps for those countries, and multiply by 100:

$$\%T_{PD,portfolio} = \left(\frac{\sum_{c \in C_{2026}} T_{PD,c}}{\sum_{c \in C_{2026}} T_c^{cap}} \right) \times 100$$

where:

$\%T_{PD,portfolio}$	Percentage of teachers benefiting from PD across the portfolio
$T_{PD,portfolio}$	Total teachers benefiting from PD across the portfolio
C_{2026}	Set of countries with at least one active program since 1 Jan 2026
$\|C_{2026}\|$	Number of such countries (used as upper bound in the summation)

Interpretation: Higher values indicate that GPE programs are reaching more teachers with PD opportunities, contributing to improved teaching quality. The number shows scale of reach, the percentage shows coverage relative to teachers in countries. Over time, increasing cumulative values demonstrate GPE's expanding contribution to teacher professional development efforts. Values represent results for programs approved under GPE 2025 Strategy or after.

Reporting timeframe: Annually via standard grant reporting templates (progress and completion reports), aligned with CY reporting cycle.

Data source: Grant progress and completion reports, , complemented by information from program monitoring frameworks, such grants' results framework supplementary documentation shared with the Secretariat (in separate annexes), and teacher workforce data (from UIS). Where results from the program co-financing is reported separately, reports from cofinanciers will be used.

Data required: Number of teachers who benefit from PD activities supported by the program. Data on the relevant teacher population at all levels, whether national or program-specific to calculate percentages and apply caps where necessary. Disaggregated data by sex, education level taught, location, disability where available. Program documentation describing the PD activities to determine whether outputs can be used to estimate beneficiary numbers. Additionally, program-level output

Official Use Only

indicators such as the number of schools where teachers received training are needed when available to derive beneficiary estimates and avoid double counting.

Disaggregation: Required disaggregation categories include PCFC, sex, level of education, location (such as rural/urban), and disability status, and corresponding teacher population, where available, to calculate coverage as a share of the targeted population. Where disaggregation is unavailable, assume proportional distribution based on national teacher workforce composition.

Quality standards: Secretariat CPOs verify quality standards of reports submitted based on the verification guidance. This includes checking that reported figures fall within the expected reporting timeframe for the calendar year, do not exceed relevant population counts, and address risks of double counting, , and that required data disaggregation is available, supported by documented beneficiary assumptions and methods across programs.
Grant Agents are responsible for applying quality standards as set out in the grant monitoring and reporting guidelines. See link to implementation grant guidelines and grant annual and completion reporting templates here.

Limitations: Teacher PD activities vary widely in intensity, duration, and quality, and the indicator captures participation rather than the effectiveness of training or its impact on teaching practices and student learning. Verification of unique teacher beneficiaries may be incomplete in contexts where data systems do not track unique identifiers and overlap across grants can occur when multiple implementing partners operate simultaneously, creating a risk of double counting. Moreover, national teacher workforce data may not be available at sub-national (program area) level, and disaggregated data is often unavailable or inconsistently reported. Where disaggregation is missing, proportional assumptions based on national teacher workforce composition are used, introducing approximations that may not fully reflect actual distributional effects.

DRAFT

Official Use Only

GPE 2030 RESULTS FRAMEWORK INDICATORS

INDICATOR RF 1

Percent of partner countries whose priority reform is making demonstrable progress in improving key education system components.

Purpose: To track country-level progress in implementing priority education reforms and achieving improvements in key education system components.

Definition: The indicator is based on government self-assessment of overall reform progress with LEG review. Progress is reported on countries' identified priority reform actions in Question I.2 of GPE annual monitoring questionnaire [link to guidelines][10], supported by narrative and evidence.

The Secretariat categorizes[11] the reported actions by reform objectives or thematic areas pertaining to the following domains: teachers and teaching quality, foundational learning, access to education including quality infrastructure, administrative capacity, curriculum and learning materials, early learning and school readiness, gender equality and inclusion (including addressing gender-based violence). Gender equality and inclusion are also applied as a cross-cutting dimension across all actions.[12]

Unit of measurement: Percentage of partner countries/ subnational entities.

Calculation method:

At the country/subnational level: Progress in improving key education system components is identified using the monitoring questionnaire (Question I.2). For each thematic area, review the performance rating assigned to each priority action. A country or subnational entity is making demonstrable progress when *at least one priority action* identified by country partners, mapped to the different thematic areas, is rated as making progress (mostly achieved or achieved).

At the aggregate level: For each thematic area, the percentage is calculated as the

[10] Questionnaire used during GPE Annual Monitoring exercise or partnership compact midterm review.
[11] Each priority action is thematically coded by the Secretariat using the partnership compact thematic coding framework (i.e. tags) See Annex B forthcoming.
[12] Results available on actions integrating gender equality and inclusion, in additional to the reporting by thematic area.

Official Use Only

number of partner countries/subnational entities with at least one priority action rated "achieved" or "mostly achieved", divided by the total number of partner countries/ subnational entities with priority actions in that thematic area, multiplied by 100.

Formula:

Country/subnational level

For each country or subnational entity, identify whether the progress in at least one priority action by thematic area (priority actions are thematically coded by reform objective) considered on track, rated as "achieved" or "mostly achieved".

$$Progress^{c} = \begin{cases} 1 \; if rating \; is \; achieved \; or \; mostly \; achieved \\ \\ 0 \; if \; rating \; is \; partly \; achieved \; or \; not \; achieved \end{cases}$$

Aggregate level

$$Progress\ (\%) = \left(\frac{\sum_{c=1}^{n} Progress^{c}}{n}\right) \times 100$$

$Progress\ (\%)$	Percentage of partner countries/subnational entities making demonstrable progress
$Progress^{c}$	The review by country/subnational entity c rated the overall progress as "achieved" or mostly achieved
c	Country or subnational entity
n	Total number of partner countries/subnational entities with a monitoring questionnaire and reported at least one priority action in the thematic area.

Reporting timeframe: CY. Data reported annually is based on reform monitoring cycle.

Data source: Question I.2 of GPE annual monitoring questionnaire submitted by country partners and reviewed by Secretariat, including any supporting evidence (policy documents, plans, JSRs, performance reports), and compact coding framework.

Data required: List of priority actions or system components reported by partners countries; and Secretariat categorization of these to report progress.

DRAFT

Official Use Only

Types of disaggregation: PCFC, and by countries hosting the highest number of refugees, by key thematic areas per compact coding framework.

Interpretation: Higher values indicate that more GPE partner countries are showing progress in implementing reforms that improve education system components. This reflects the effectiveness of country-owned reform strategies in strengthening education delivery.

Quality standards: Secretariat Country Engagement Leads (CELs) review reported progress against minimum verification criteria, including completeness, timeliness, and soundness, with support from Secretariat thematic teams and gender and inclusion specialists, where needed. GPE annual monitoring questionnaire submitted includes reviews from the country's LEG and is supported by evidence.

Limitations: Self-reported progress can introduce reporting bias. Progress measured annually for some system improvements may require longer timeframes to materialize, and indicator binary reporting (on/ off track) may not capture gradual changes of progress.

DRAFT

Official Use Only

INDICATOR RF 2

Percent of partner countries improving education planning, budgeting, and monitoring that is gender responsive and inclusive.

Purpose: To track country-level progress in gender-responsive and inclusive education sector planning, budgeting, and monitoring systems.

Definition: The indicator is based on government self-assessment of overall reform progress in education planning, budgeting, and monitoring that is gender responsive and inclusive, with LEG review. Progress is assessed across a set of dimensions in the GPE annual monitoring questionnaire (Question II.1) [link to guidelines][13], including but not limited to:

- Legislative frameworks ensuring 12 years of free, quality public primary and secondary education, of which at least 9 years are compulsory
- Legislative frameworks ensuring at least one year of free and compulsory, quality pre-primary education without discrimination
- Government-endorsed education sector plans or policy frameworks addressing gender inequality and exclusion
- Plans to maintain the provision of core education services during crises
- Operational planning instruments and practices
- Reporting on sector performance
- Alignment of education plans or policies with budgets
- System capacity for gender-responsive and inclusive planning, budgeting, and monitoring.

For each dimension, countries report one of three responses: *achieved, in progress, or not applicable*. "Achieved" reflects full implementation of the dimension, "In progress" reflects partial implementation, and "Not applicable" indicates that the dimension does not apply to the country context. Governments provide narrative descriptions and supporting evidence for each dimension, which are reviewed by the Secretariat. The combined assessment across all applicable dimensions is used to determine the progress rating on the enabling factor ("satisfactory," "somewhat satisfactory," or "unsatisfactory", or "somewhat unsatisfactory"), from which the indicator value is derived.

Unit of measurement: Percentage of partner countries/subnational entities.

[13] Questionnaire used during GPE Annual Monitoring exercise or partnership compact midterm review.

Official Use Only

Calculation method: *At the country/subnational level*: Identify whether countries' report indicates demonstrable progress in education planning, budgeting, and monitoring that is gender responsive and inclusive. A country/subnational entity is classified as making progress when its monitoring rating indicates progress in gender-responsive and inclusive planning, budgeting, and monitoring as "somewhat satisfactory" or "satisfactory.

At the aggregate level: Calculated by dividing the number of partner countries/subnational entities making progress in education planning, budgeting, and monitoring that is gender responsive and inclusive by the total number of partner countries/subnational entities with monitoring data, multiplied by 100.

Formula:

Country/subnational level

For each country or subnational entity, identify whether the progress in gender-responsive and inclusive planning, budgeting, and monitoring is rated as "somewhat satisfactory" or "satisfactory".

$$Progress^{c} = \begin{cases} 1\ (On\ track), if\ rating\ is\ somewhat\ satisfactory\ or\ better \\ in\ the\ enabling\ factor \\ \\ 0\ (Off\ track), if\ rating\ is\ \ somewhat\ unsatisfactory\ or\ worse \\ in\ the\ enabling\ factor \end{cases}$$

Aggregate level

Calculate the percentage of partner countries/subnational entities with annual monitoring data that are making progress:

$$Progress\ (\%) = \left(\frac{\sum_{c=1}^{n} Progress^{c}}{n}\right) \times 100$$

where:

$Progress^{c}$	The review by country/subnational entity *c* rated the overall progress in the enabling factor "somewhat satisfactory" or better
c	Country or subnational entity
n	Total number of partner countries/subnational entities with monitoring data available

DRAFT

Official Use Only

$Progress$	Percentage of countries/subnational entities with the progress in the enabling factor rated "somewhat satisfactory" or better by country's review

Reporting timeframe: CY. Data reported annually is based on reform monitoring cycle.

Data source: Question II.1 of GPE annual monitoring questionnaire submitted by country partners and reviewed by Secretariat, including any supporting evidence (policy documents, plans, JSRs, performance reports).

Data required: Countries must submit any progress and rating narrative for the progress reported against the selected dimensions covered, documentation of policy frameworks, plans, and monitoring systems.

Types of disaggregation: PCFC, and by countries hosting the highest number of refugees.

Interpretation: Higher values mean that more partner countries are strengthening their education planning, budgeting, and monitoring systems with attention to gender responsiveness and inclusion. This reflects capacity to develop and implement evidence-based, equitable education policies and track progress effectively.

Quality standards: Secretariat Country Engagement Leads (CELs) review reported progress against minimum verification criteria, including completeness, timeliness, and soundness, with support from Secretariat thematic teams and gender and inclusion specialists, where needed. GPE annual monitoring questionnaire submitted includes reviews from the country's LEG and is supported by evidence.

Limitations: Self-reported progress may introduce reporting bias. Progress is measured annually, but some system improvements may require longer timeframes to materialize, and indicator's binary reporting (on/ off track) may not capture gradual progress.

DRAFT

Official Use Only

INDICATOR RF 3

(a) Percent of partner countries making progress towards SDG 4.1.1a reporting
(b) Percent of partner countries achieving top-up triggers related to reporting on SDG 4.1.1a

Purpose: Indicator 3.a: To track country-level progress in reporting SDG 4.1.1a (learning outcomes for children in Grades 2 or 3 achieving at least a minimum proficiency level in reading and mathematics).

Indicator 3.b: To track country-level progress in meeting system transformation grant (STG) top-up triggers related to SDG 4.1.1a reporting. The indicator reflects the effectiveness of allocation-linked incentives in strengthening national learning assessment systems and supporting timely SDG 4.1.1a reporting requirements.

Definition: Indicator 3.a: This indicator is based on government self-assessment in developing and institutionalizing learning assessment systems required for SDG 4.1.a reporting, with LEG review. Progress is assessed across a set of dimensions in the GPE annual monitoring questionnaire (Question II.1) [link to guidelines][14], including but not limited to:

- Development of a roadmap or action plan to measure SDG 4.1.1a learning outcomes;
- Implementation of the roadmap or action plan where already developed;
- Publication of at least one SDG 4.1.1a learning outcome data point;
- Use of learning outcome data to improve teaching and learning;
- Establishment or strengthening of a sustainable national or subnational learning assessment system (e.g. policy or framework, funding, and human resources);
- Improved availability of learning outcome data disaggregated by sex, level of education, disability status, and refugee or IDP status.

For each dimension, countries report one of three responses: *achieved, in progress, or not applicable*. "Achieved" reflects full implementation of the dimension, "In progress" reflects partial implementation, and "Not applicable" indicates that the dimension does not apply to the country context. Governments provide narrative descriptions and supporting evidence for each dimension, which are reviewed by the Secretariat. The combined assessment across all applicable dimensions is used to determine the

[14] Questionnaire used during GPE Annual Monitoring exercise or partnership compact midterm review.

Official Use Only

progress rating on the enabling factor ("satisfactory," "somewhat satisfactory," or "unsatisfactory", or "somewhat unsatisfactory"), from which the indicator value is derived .

Indicator 3.b: The indicator is based on Secretariat verification of whether partner countries have achieved the SDG 4.1.1a related top up triggers specified in their system transformation grants. These triggers may include finalization or implementation of an SDG 4.1.1a roadmap, administration of learning assessments in Grades 2 or 3, publication of learning assessment results, establishment of data management systems for learning assessments and use of data to inform policy. A country is considered to have achieved top-up triggers when the GPE Secretariat verifies that the specified conditions have been met based on supporting evidence provided by the government.

Unit of measurement: Percentage of partner countries/subnational entities.

Calculation method: Indicator 3.a:

At the country/subnational level, identify whether the government's self-assessment indicates progress toward SDG 4.1.1a reporting. A country or subnational entity is considered to be making progress when its monitoring rating indicates progress in SDG 4.1.1a reporting as "somewhat satisfactory" or "satisfactory".

At the aggregate level, calculate the percentage of partner countries/subnational entities making progress by dividing the number of countries rated as making progress by the total number of countries/subnational entities with monitoring data, and multiplying by 100.

Indicator 3.b:

At the country/subnational level: For each country or subnational entity c with SDG 4.1.1a top-up triggers due in the reporting period related to SDG 4.1.1a reporting due in the reporting period, determine whether the trigger(s) were achieved within the defined timeline. A country is considered to be making progress when the Secretariat verifies that the required SDG 4.1.1a -related conditions are met and the top-up amount is unlocked.

At the aggregate level: Calculate by dividing the number of partner countries making progress by the total number of countries with SDG 4.1.1a -related triggers due in the reporting year and multiplying by 100.

Official Use Only

Formula:

Indicator 3.a

Country/subnational level

For each country or subnational entity, identify whether the progress on SDG 4.1.1a reporting is rated as "somewhat satisfactory" or "satisfactory".

$$Progress^c = \begin{cases} 1\ (On\ track), if\ rating\ is\ somewhat\ satisfactory\ or\ better \\ in\ the\ enabling\ factor \\ \\ 0\ (Off\ track), if\ rating\ is\ \ somewhat\ unsatisfactory\ or\ worse \\ in\ the\ enabling\ factor \end{cases}$$

Aggregate level

$$Progress\ (\%) = \left(\frac{\sum_{c=1}^{n} Progress^c}{n}\right) \times 100$$

where:

$Progress\ (\%)$	Percentage of countries making progress on SDG 4.1.1a reporting
$Progress^c$	Binary indicator of progress in country/subnational entity *c*, where demonstrable progress means improvements towards reporting on SDG 4.1.1a that are supported by evidence and validated by the LEG
c	Country or subnational entity
n	Total number of partner countries/subnational entities with monitoring data available

Indicator 3.b

Country/subnational level

$$T_c = \begin{cases} 1 & if\ the\ SDG4.1.1a\ top\text{-}up\ trigger\ was\ achieved\ (top\text{-}up\ unlocked) \\ & within\ the\ defined\ timeline \\ 0 & Otherwise\ (not\ achieved) \end{cases}$$

Aggregate level

$$T(\%) = \left(\frac{\sum_{c=1}^{n} T_c}{n}\right) \times 100$$

where:

T	Percentage of countries/subnational entities achieving SDG 4.1.1a top-up triggers

DRAFT

Official Use Only

T_c Trigger achievement indicator for country/subnational entity c (1 = achieved/unlocked, 0 = not achieved)

c Country or subnational entity

n Total number of partner countries/subnational entities with SDG 4.1.1a-related top-up triggers due in the reporting year

Reporting timeframe: CY. Data reported annually is based on reform monitoring cycle and top-up triggers agreed deadlines for achievement.

Data source: Indicator 3.a: Question II.1 of GPE annual monitoring questionnaire submitted by country partners and reviewed by Secretariat, including any supporting evidence (policy documents, plans, JSRs, performance reports).

Indicator 3.b: Board decision documents, Secretariat verification of top-up trigger achievement based on supporting evidence provided by governments

Data required: Indicator 3.a: Countries' self-assessment and evidence demonstrating progress towards SDG 4.1.1a reporting, documentation of policy frameworks, plans, and monitoring systems, Secretariat categorization to report progress.
Indicator 3.b: List of triggers and corresponding top-up amounts related to SDG 4.1.1a reporting for each eligible country/subnational entity at Board approval of system transformation grant stage. Supporting evidence provided by government documenting achievement of each trigger.

Types of disaggregation: PCFC, and by countries hosting the highest number of refugees.

Interpretation: Higher indicator 3.a values indicate that more GPE partner countries are strengthening their national learning assessment systems and moving closer to standardized reporting of foundational learning outcomes aligned with SDG 4.1.1a. This reflects improved national capacity to monitor learning and use assessment results to guide planning and decision-making.

Higher indicator 3.b values indicate a greater share of partner countries are successfully implementing GPE allocation-linked reforms related to SDG 4.1.1a reporting, suggesting effective use of top-up funding incentives to drive assessment system development, strong government commitment to milestones, successful

Official Use Only

partnership compact processes with realistic triggers, institutional capacity progress, and effective coordination among governments, Secretariat, grant agents, and LEGs.

Quality standards: For indicator 3.a, Secretariat Country Engagement Leads (CELs) review reported progress against minimum verification criteria, including completeness, timeliness, and soundness, in line with minimum verification criteria for learning assessment system development and SDG 4.1.1a reporting. GPE annual monitoring questionnaire submitted includes reviews from the country's LEG and is supported by evidence.

For indicator 3.b, quality standards require that trigger achievement be assessed against Board-approved means of verification, using concrete, documented government evidence, and a consistent standard where triggers are either fully met or not met, with independent verification by the GPE Secretariat. Only triggers that officially classified as achieved (the top-up was unlocked) are counted.

Limitations: For indicator 3.a, self-reported progress may not fully capture the quality of learning assessment implementation or the depth of system strengthening. The indicator assesses progress in assessment systems, and indicator's binary reporting (on/ off track) may not capture gradual progress.
For indicator 3.b, implementation of allocation-linked reforms may reflect broader country dynamics beyond the financial incentive; there can be time lags between trigger achievement and formal verification; the indicator only captures countries with relevant top-up triggers and does not assess the overall quality or sustainability of learning assessment systems; countries may comply technically without building lasting institutional capacity.

DRAFT

Official Use Only

INDICATOR RF 4

Percent of partner countries improving the availability and use of data and evidence.

Purpose: To track country level progress in strengthening education data systems and improving the availability and use of evidence.

Definition: The indicator is based on government self-assessment of overall reform progress in the availability and use of data and evidence, with LEG review. Progress is assessed across a set of dimensions in the GPE annual monitoring questionnaire (Question II.1)[15], including but not limited to:

- Publication of a statistical yearbook; development or institutionalization of a data system;
- Improved disaggregation of key education data by sex, level of education, location, disability status, and refugee or IDP status;
- Completion of a sector gender and inclusion analysis; publication of sector diagnostic or analytical reports for planning or monitoring purposes;
- Measures to make data systems more disability inclusive. Governments provide narrative descriptions and supporting evidence, which are reviewed by the Secretariat.

For each dimension, countries report one of three responses: *achieved, in progress, or not applicable*. "Achieved" reflects full implementation of the dimension, "In progress" reflects partial implementation, and "Not applicable" indicates that the dimension does not apply to the country context. Governments provide narrative descriptions and supporting evidence for each dimension, which are reviewed by the Secretariat. The combined assessment across all applicable dimensions is used to determine the progress rating on the enabling factor ("satisfactory," "somewhat satisfactory," or "unsatisfactory", or "somewhat unsatisfactory"), from which the indicator value is derived.

Unit of measurement: Percentage of partner countries/subnational entities.

Calculation method: *At the country/subnational level*: identify whether countries' report indicates demonstrable progress in improving data and evidence. A country/subnational entity is classified as making progress when its annual

[15] Questionnaire used during GPE Annual Monitoring exercise or partnership compact midterm review.

Official Use Only

monitoring rating indicates progress in data availability and evidence use as "somewhat satisfactory" or "satisfactory."

At the aggregate level: calculate by dividing the number of partner countries/subnational entities making progress in the availability of data and evidence by dividing the number of countries with monitoring data and multiplying by 100.

Formula:

Country/subnational level

For each country or subnational entity, identify whether the progress in improving the availability and use of data and evidence is rated as "somewhat satisfactory" or "satisfactory".

$$Progress^{c} = \begin{cases} 1\ (On\ track),\ if\ rating\ is\ somewhat\ satisfactory\ or\ better \\ in\ the\ enabling\ factor \\ \\ 0\ (Off\ track),\ if\ rating\ is\ \ somewhat\ unsatisfactory\ or\ worse \\ in\ the\ enabling\ factor \end{cases}$$

Aggregate level

Calculate the percentage of partner countries/subnational entities with monitoring data that are making progress:

$$Progress\ (\%) = \left(\frac{\sum_{c=1}^{n} Progress^{c}}{n}\right) \times 100$$

where:

$Progress^{c}$	The review by country/subnational entity *c* rated the overall progress in the enabling factor "somewhat satisfactory" or better
c	Country or subnational entity
n	Total number of partner countries/subnational entities with monitoring data available
$Progress\ (\%)$	Percentage of countries/subnational entities with the progress in the enabling factor rated "somewhat satisfactory" or better by country's review

Reporting timeframe: CY. Data reported annually is based on annual reform monitoring cycle.

DRAFT

Official Use Only

Data source: Question II.1 of GPE annual monitoring questionnaire submitted by country partners and reviewed by Secretariat, including any supporting evidence (policy documents, plans, JSRs, performance reports).

Data required Countries' self-assessment and evidence demonstrating progress in data and evidence availability and use, with details on dimensions covered; supporting documents such as EMIS outputs, statistical yearbooks, diagnostic or analytical reports.

Types of disaggregation: PCFC, and by countries hosting highest number of refugees.

Interpretation: Higher values indicate that more partner countries are strengthening their data and evidence ecosystems, including improving the quality, regularity, and inclusiveness of education data, and enhancing the use of diagnostic evidence for planning and monitoring. Improvements in this indicator suggest stronger foundations for evidence-based education management, enabling countries to better monitor progress toward national education goals and support more informed decision making.

Quality standards: Secretariat Country Engagement Leads (CELs) review reported progress against minimum verification criteria, including completeness, timeliness, and soundness, with support from Secretariat thematic teams, where needed. GPE annual monitoring questionnaire submitted includes reviews from the country's LEG and is supported by evidence.

Limitations: Self-reported progress may vary across countries. Annual reporting may not fully capture longer term reforms in data systems, and countries may start from different baselines, affecting comparability. The indicator assesses progress in system strengthening, not the quality of the data products themselves or the depth of evidence use, and indicator's binary reporting (on/ off track) may not capture gradual progress.

DRAFT

Official Use Only

Objective 2: Domestic and external financing mobilized to support and sustain the effective implementation of priority reforms.

INDICATOR RF 5

(a) Percent of partner countries improving in volume, equity, and efficiency of public expenditure on education

(b) Percent of partner countries achieving top-up triggers related to the volume, equity, and efficiency of domestic finance

Purpose: Indicator 5.a: To measure the extent to which partner countries demonstrate improvement in at least one of the three dimensions of domestic public financing for education: volume, equity, or efficiency.

Indicator 5.b: To track the extent to which countries achieve System Transformation Grant (STG) top-up triggers related to domestic finance reforms. This indicator reflects the effectiveness of allocation-linked incentives in advancing policy changes in financing volume, equity, and efficiency.

Definition: Indicator 5.a: The indicator is based on government self-assessment of overall progress in strengthening volume, equity, and efficiency of public expenditure on education, with LEG review. Progress is assessed across a set of dimensions in the GPE annual monitoring questionnaire (Question II.1) [link to guidelines][16], including but not limited to:

- Volume: improved the mobilization of domestic resources, enhanced financial credibility, or secured sustainable financing to increase the adequacy of public education expenditure;
- Equity in allocation: improved how systems equitably allocate resources, including—but not limited to—teacher deployment, school grants, financing formulas incorporating equity considerations, or more equitable distribution of quality learning environments and materials;
- Equity in reach: improved how resources (financial and non-financial) reach specific groups, regions, or schools with higher needs to enable inclusive learning;
- Efficiency in allocation: improved how education resources are managed, including strengthened teacher management and career structures, implementation and execution capacities, or public financial management systems;
- Efficiency in results: maximized the impact of education spending by pursuing

[16] Questionnaire used during GPE Annual Monitoring exercise or partnership compact midterm review.

Official Use Only

cost-effectiveness, improving learning and completion outcomes, and reducing repetition.

For each dimension, countries report one of three responses: *achieved, in progress, or not applicable*. "Achieved" reflects full implementation of the dimension, "In progress" reflects partial implementation, and "Not applicable" indicates that the dimension does not apply to the country context. Governments provide narrative descriptions and supporting evidence for each dimension, which are reviewed by the Secretariat. The combined assessment across all applicable dimensions is used to determine the progress rating on the enabling factor ("satisfactory," "somewhat satisfactory," or "unsatisfactory", or "somewhat unsatisfactory"), from which the indicator value is derived.

Indicator 5.b: This indicator is based on Secretariat verification of whether partner countries have achieved domestic-finance-related STG top-up triggers. Triggers may include reforms in budget execution, equity-oriented allocation formulas, teacher management reforms, or increased expenditure levels tied to domestic commitments. A country is considered to have achieved top-up triggers when the GPE Secretariat verifies that the specified conditions have been met based on supporting evidence provided by the government.

Unit of measurement: Percentage of partner countries/subnational entities.

Calculation method: Indicator 5.a:
At the country/subnational level: for each country or subnational entity, identify whether countries' report indicates demonstrable progress volume, equity in allocation, equity in reach, efficiency in allocation, efficiency in results. A country/subnational entity is classified as making progress when its annual monitoring rating indicates progress in volume, equity, and efficiency of public expenditure on education as "somewhat satisfactory" or "satisfactory".

At the aggregate level: calculate by dividing the number of partner countries/subnational entities making progress in interventions that improve volume, equity, and efficiency of public expenditure on education by the total number of countries/subnational entities with monitoring data and multiplying by 100.

Indicator 5.b:
At the country/subnational level: For each country or subnational entity with domestic-finance-related top-up triggers due in the reporting period, determine

Official Use Only

whether the trigger(s) were achieved within the defined timeline. A country is considered to is considered to be making progress when the Secretariat verifies that the required domestic-finance-related conditions are met and the top-up amount is unlocked.

At the aggregate level: Calculate by dividing the number of partner countries making progress by the total number of countries with domestic-finance-related triggers due in the reporting year and multiplying by 100.

Formula: Indicator 5.a

Country/subnational level

For each country or subnational entity, identify whether the progress in improving volume, equity, and efficiency of public expenditure on education is rated as "somewhat satisfactory" or "satisfactory".

$$Progress^c = \begin{cases} 1\ (On\ track),\ if\ rating\ is\ somewhat\ satisfactory\ or\ better \\ in\ the\ enabling\ factor \\ \\ 0\ (Off\ track),\ if\ rating\ is\ \ somewhat\ unsatisfactory\ or\ worse \\ in\ the\ enabling\ factor \end{cases}$$

Aggregate level

Calculate the percentage of partner countries/subnational entities with annual monitoring data that are making progress:

$$Progress\ (\%) = \left(\frac{\sum_{c=1}^{n} Progres^c}{n}\right) \times 100$$

where:

$Progress^c$	The review by country/subnational entity *c* rated the overall progress in the enabling factor "somewhat satisfactory" or better
c	Country or subnational entity
n	Total number of partner countries/subnational entities with monitoring data available
$Progress\ (\%)$	Percentage of countries/subnational entities with the progress in the enabling factor rated "somewhat satisfactory" or better by country's review

Official Use Only

Indicator 5.b

Country/subnational level

$$T_c = \begin{cases} 1 & \textit{if the domestic finance-related top-up trigger was achieved (top-up unlocked)} \\ & \textit{within the defined timeline} \\ 0 & \textit{Otherwise (not achieved)} \end{cases}$$

Aggregate level

$$T(\%) = \left(\frac{\sum_{c=1}^{n} T_c}{n}\right) \times 100$$

where:

T percentage of countries/subnational entities achieving domestic finance-related top-up triggers

T_c trigger achievement indicator for country/subnational entity *c* (1 = achieved/unlocked, 0 = not achieved)

c country or subnational entity

n number of partner countries/subnational entities with SDG 4.1.1a-related top-up triggers due in the reporting year

Reporting timeframe: CY. Data reported annually is based on annual reform monitoring cycle and top-up triggers agreed deadlines for achievement.

Data source: Indicator 5.a: Question II.1 of GPE annual monitoring questionnaire submitted by country partners and reviewed by Secretariat.

Indicator 5.b: Board decision document, Secretariat verification of top-up trigger achievement based on supporting evidence provided by governments.

Data required: Indicator 5.a: Countries' self-assessment and evidence demonstrating progress in domestic financing, with LEG review.

Indicator 5.b: List of triggers and corresponding top-up amounts related to volume, equity, and efficiency of domestic finance reporting for each eligible

DRAFT

Official Use Only

country/subnational entity at Board approval of system transformation grant stage. Supporting evidence provided by government documenting achievement of each trigger.

Types of disaggregation: PCFC, and by countries hosting the highest number of refugees.

Interpretation: Higher indicator 5.a values indicate that more partner countries are strengthening domestic financing systems in at least one core dimension, signaling improved enabling conditions for system transformation.

Higher indicator 5.b indicate that more partner countries are successfully meeting allocation-linked finance triggers, suggesting effective use of top-up incentives, stronger government commitment to reform milestones, and improved institutional capacity.

Quality standards: For Indicator 5.a, Secretariat Country Engagement Leads (CELs) review reported progress against minimum verification criteria, including completeness, timeliness, and soundness, with support from Secretariat thematic teams, where needed. GPE annual monitoring questionnaire submitted includes reviews from the country's LEG and is supported by evidence.
For indicator 5.b, quality standards require that trigger achievement be assessed against Board-approved means of verification, using concrete, documented government evidence, and a consistent standard where triggers are either fully met or not met, with independent verification by the GPE Secretariat. Only triggers that officially classified as achieved (the top-up was unlocked) are counted.

Limitations: For indicator 5.a, Self-reported progress may introduce reporting bias. Progress is recorded even if only one financing dimension improves, potentially masking stagnation elsewhere. Comparability across years depends on consistent application of ratings and evidence requirements, and indicator's binary reporting (on/ off track) may not capture gradual progress.

For indicator 5.b, implementation of allocation-linked reforms may reflect broader country dynamics beyond the financial incentive; there can be time lags between trigger achievement and formal verification; and the indicator only captures countries with relevant top-up triggers.

DRAFT

Official Use Only

INDICATOR RF 6

Total cofinancing mobilized through GPE grants.

Purpose: To measure and report the amount of co-financing mobilized by the different innovative mechanisms that include the Multiplier (or Multiplier standard), Debt2Ed, GPE Match, Frontloaded or Arab Coordination Group Smart Education Initiative (ACG SmartEd), Enhanced Convening Co-financing, KIX, EOL, and Technical Assistance Initiative[17].

Definition: The indicator measures the amount of additional co-finance mobilized through the different innovative GPE financing mechanisms. The external funding mobilization should align to the needs of the education sector and activities under implementation or planned to be implemented by national authorities and international partners. Details on the relevant mechanisms are as follows:

- For the Multiplier, the co-financing represents the new and additional external funding mobilized by the instrument. A country must now mobilize at least US $4 in new external funding for every US $1 it accesses from its Multiplier allocation. Among other criteria, the external funding mobilized must meet the requirements of additionality, debt sustainability, and co-financing. Additionality means the external funding is unlikely to have been mobilized or mobilized as quickly in the absence of the multiplier.
- Debt2Ed on debt-sustainability means the funding, if mobilized as a loan (for example, IDA), is consistent with the IMF's Debt Limits Policy and /or the World Bank Group's Sustainable Development Finance Policy, as applicable. Debt2Ed will be debt forgiveness with the stipulation that funding that would have been spent on debt service should be invested in education.
- GPE Match enables foundations and private sector partners to help countries access their Multiplier grant with a ratio of 1:1. Their contributions are "matched" by GPE funds at a higher rate of US$ 1 in Multiplier resources for each US$ 1 of partner's resources. Approved partners can mobilize the Multiplier through finance and in-kind contributions.
- Frontloaded cofinancing, (or ACG SmartEd) deploys US$ 400 million in co-financing from the Islamic Development Bank and Arab Coordination Group alongside US$ 100 million in GPE grant finance through the GPE Multiplier. Eligible

[17] Although Debt2Ed, GPE Match, and Frontloaded are all frontends to the Multiplier mechanism, they vary in their design/incentive/ability to attract external finance. Therefore, it is useful to treat them as separate mechanisms for the purpose of tracking the amount of finance mobilized by each instrument.

Official Use Only

partner countries may choose ACG SmartEd as co-financing to unlock their Multiplier allocations. ACG SmartEd requires US$ 4 in co-financing for each US$ 1 from the Multiplier, which is higher than the US$ 3 to US $ 1 required for a standard Multiplier. External funding mobilized through ACG SmartEd already meets the additionality requirement, but Multiplier's debt sustainability and co-financing requirements, among other criteria, continue to apply to Multiplier transactions that use ACG SmartEd as the source of co-financing.

- Enhanced Convening[18] may be deployed alongside other innovative financing mechanisms such as the Multiplier, Debt2Ed, GPE Match, and ACG SmartEd, and resources crowded in from approved partners may include finance and in-kind contributions. When a partner country utilizes Enhanced Convening, as identified via an Engagement Memo, Multiplier EOI or other process, all external resources the Secretariat supports mobilizing for that partner country are attributable to Enhanced Convening as well as any other innovative financing mechanisms utilized (e.g., the Multiplier, GPE Match, etc.), if applicable.
- KIX, EOL and Technical Assistance Initiatives (TAI) largely operate at the global level and may support the mobilization of co-financing from a range of partners in support of their objectives. Any external resources mobilized through these initiatives as part of their implementation will be counted toward this indicator.

Co-financing means the external funding mobilized is channeled through the same program and through the same modality as GPE funding, through a common funding mechanism like a pooled fund, or aligned with the GPE-funded program. In the multiplier application process, the Expression of Interest (EOI) reviews and Quality Assurance Reviews (QARs) verify that the requirements are met. The co-finance mobilized is reported at the EOI stage and confirmed at the Final Readiness Review or equivalent stage of grant QAR.

Unit of measurement: Number (US$ cumulative)

Calculation method: For *each innovative GPE financing mechanism*, sum the amount of mobilized co-financing reported in US dollars in the CY and cumulatively since 1 January 2026.

At the *aggregate level*: *the value* is calculated by adding up the total co-financed mobilized across innovative GPE financing mechanisms in US dollars in the CY and

[18] Enhanced Convening is an approach which leverages Secretariat capabilities to support partner countries with limited external financing for education to implement resource mobilization strategies that crowd in more aligned resources from sovereign and non-sovereign donors for underfunded country-level policy priorities.

Official Use Only

cumulatively by the CY, both minus duplicate values mobilized by more than one innovative mechanism.

Formula:

Innovative GPE financing mechanism level

$$CYAIFM_i$$

$$CUMAIFM_i$$

where:

$CYAIFM_i$	Amount (US $) of reported co-financing mobilized by mechanism *i* in the CY
$CUMAIFM_i$	Amount (US $) of reported co-financing mobilized by mechanism *i* cumulatively by the CY

Aggregate level

$$CYAIFM = \sum_{i=1}^{5} CYAIFM_i - CYAIFM_D$$

$$CUMAIFM = \sum_{i=1}^{5} CUMAIFM_i - CUMAIFM_D$$

where:

$CYAIFM$	Amount (US $) of reported co-financing mobilized by all mechanisms minus duplicate values from more than one innovative mechanism in the CY
$CYAIFM_i$	Amount (US $) of reported co-financing mobilized by mechanism *i* in the CY
$CYAIFM_D$	Amount (US $) of reported co-financing mobilized duplicated from more than one innovative mechanism in the CY
$CUMAIFM$	Amount (US $) of reported co-financing mobilized by all mechanisms minus duplicate values from more than one innovative mechanism cumulatively by the CY
$CUMAIFM_i$	Amount (US $) of reported co-financing mobilized by mechanism *i* cumulatively by the CY

DRAFT

Official Use Only

$CUMAIFM_{ECd}$ Amount (US $) of reported co-financing mobilized duplicated from more than one innovative mechanism *i* cumulatively by the CY

Reporting timeframe: CY

Data source: Cofinancing amounts (in US$) per Secretariat records of approved multiplier expressions of interest (EOI), Innovative financing database (GPExchange) data (i.e. Multiplier, Debt2Ed, GPE Match, Enhanced Convening, and ACG SmartEd application database), KIX, EOL, TAI.

Data required: Expression of Interests from Grant Agents noting additional co-financing leveraged through innovative GPE financing mechanisms.

Types of disaggregation: By innovative GPE financing mechanisms, Multiplier, Debt2Ed, GPE Match, Enhanced Convening, and ACG SmartEd.

Interpretation: Higher values over time reflect progress made by GPE in unlocking additional amounts of co-financing and further investments into education through innovative GPE financing mechanisms. Such data should be complemented with an analysis of each type of mechanism, particularly where Enhanced Convening Co-financing has been deployed alongside other innovative financing mechanisms such as the Multiplier, Debt2Ed, GPE Match, and ACG SmartEd, KIX, EOL and TAI.

Quality standards: The indicator distinguishes the co-financing through Debt2Ed, GPE Match, ACG SmartEd, Multiplier and Enhanced Convening Co-financing mechanism. This is important because the mechanisms differ in their design and therefore ability to mobilize external funding.

Limitations: The indicator measures cofinancing mobilized (committed or pledged) rather than cofinancing disbursed. Actual disbursement may lag commitments due to implementation delays or changing circumstances. Enhanced Convening creates potential for duplicate counting since it may operate alongside other mechanisms. Overlaps will be noted, and double counting will be avoided.

DRAFT

Official Use Only

INDICATOR RF7

Percent of donor commitments to the GPE fund fulfilled.

Purpose: To monitor the payments made by GPE donors compared to what they have pledged to pay, cumulatively across years, as per their publicly announced pledges, as well as the absolute amounts of payments. The data reflects to what extent GPE donors, overall, follow up on their pledges to the Partnership and the financial capabilities of GPE.

Definition: Contributions from donors expressed as a percentage of the pledged funds and in absolute amount. Contributions are cumulative payments received by GPE, while pledges refer to the amounts pledged by donors at replenishment, and any top ups made at a later date. A pledge would be donors publicly announced pledges, rather than the amount in their contribution agreements.

Note that the total amount pledged by donors for GPE 2030 strategy period will be subject to change when donors pledge duration extends beyond the strategy period, or there are potential additional contributions from donors during the strategy period.

Unit of measurement: Number (cumulative) and percentage.

Calculation method: At *the donor-level*, sum cumulative payment amounts (in local currency), and dividing it by the pledge amount (in local currency) for each donor. Determine, thereafter, each donor's payment percentage against pledge by dividing the donor's cumulative actual payment in local currency by the cumulative pledge in local currency, multiplied by 100.

At *the aggregate level*: report (i) the total value of donor payments in US$, calculated as the sum of all donor payments, and (ii) weighted average payment-to-pledge percentage, calculated by weighting each donor's fulfillment rate by the value of their pledge relative to total pledges (in US$).

Formula:

Donor level

$$\%\ paid_i = \frac{paymentLoc_i}{pledgeLoc_i} * 100$$

where:

Official Use Only

$\%\ paid_i$	Payment percentage against pledge of donor *i*
$paymentLoc_i$	Cumulative payment in local currency by donor *i*
$pledgeLoc_i$	Pledge in local currency by donor *i* as per publicly announced pledge

Aggregate level

$$Total\ donor\ payments\ (US\$) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} paymentUS\$_i$$

$$P(\%) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n}(PledgeUS\$_i \times Fulfillment\ rate_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} PledgeUS\$_i}$$

where:

$Total\ donor\ payments\ (US\$)$	Total cumulative donor payments (US$)
$paymentUS\$_i$	Cumulative donor *i*'s payment (US$)
$P(\%)$	Weighted cumulative share of pledge paid by donors
$PledgeUS\$_i$	donor *i*'s pledged amount (converted to US$)
$Fulfillment\ rate$	donor *i*'s payment-to-pledge ratio (calculated in local currency)
n	Number of donors with data available

Reporting timeframe: CY.

Data source: Donor commitments and disbursements to GPE Fund (in US$) per World Bank Trustee (SAP database)

Data required: Publicly announced pledge amount; Cash Receipts Reports (receipts paid in by donors).

Types of disaggregation: N/A

Interpretation: The percentage of donor funding fulfilled indicates the percentage of contributions pledged (to be paid over a given time frame) that were received cumulatively by GPE up to this time period. The indicator value throughout the pledge time frame is more meaningful because the amount of pledged funding received over the pledge time frame may not necessarily be evenly distributed across years in the

DRAFT

Official Use Only

given pledge's time frame. Donors' commitment to follow through with their obligations and provide the necessary financial means for the Partnership to support partner countries is reflected by high values measured for the duration of the pledge time period. Note that caution needs to be exercised in interpreting the indicator value when a donor's pledge duration extends beyond the strategy period or there are potential additional contributions from donors.

Quality standards: The matching of payments received against the pledged amounts should be carried out in the pledging currency, as any losses resulting from currency conversion into US dollars fall outside the donor's control. Additionally, setting milestones for this indicator is not useful because the timing of pledged funding receipts may not follow a uniform annual distribution within the overall pledge period.

Limitations: The cumulative total amount pledged by donors or the target for the strategy period is subject to change due to donors' pledge duration sometimes extending beyond the strategy period, and potential additional contributions from donors during the strategy period.

DRAFT

Official Use Only

INDICATOR RF 8

Percent of GPE implementation grant-funded programs that contribute to the sustainability of priority reforms (PRELIMINARY).

Purpose: The indicator tracks the extent to which GPE-financed implementation grants are designed and are contributing, during implementation, to the sustainability of education sector reforms beyond the grant period. It measures whether grant-funded programs use country systems, build national capacity, strengthen system resilience, and establish mechanisms for post-program monitoring—all of which contribute to lasting system transformation rather than short-term project-based improvements.

Definition: The indicator measures the percentage of GPE implementation grant-funded programs that contribute to the sustainability of priority reforms, based on grant agent self-assessment validated by the Secretariat. Programs report progress against sustainability dimensions, such as:

- Financial Commitment
- Institutional Integration (including use of country systems and harmonized financing modalities)
- Capacity and Systems (including provisions for post-program outcome tracking)
- Stakeholder Ownership
- Scale-up and Continuity Pathways (including post-program outcome tracking provisions)
- Risk Management and System Resilience

Grant agents provide brief descriptions of and supporting evidence for progress achieved for each applicable dimension (in progress report) or achievement and conditions for sustainability (in completion report). As part of this self-assessment, grant agents must assign an overall sustainability rating, selected from the standardized rating scale included in the reporting templates:

Progress report ratings:

- No contribution to sustainability evident to date
- Limited contribution to sustainability
- Moderate contribution to sustainability
- Strong contribution to sustainability

Completion report ratings:

Official Use Only

- Did not contribute to sustainability of the priority reform
- Contributed to sustainability to a limited extent
- Contributed to sustainability to a moderate extent
- Contributed to sustainability to a strong extent

A grant-funded program is considered *on-track* when its reported rating indicates contribution to the sustainability of the priority reform (rated as "*moderate or strong contribution*"). Ratings that reflect limited or no contribution are not considered *off-track*. The indicator only applies to multiplier, system transformation grants, and Girls' Education Accelerator (GEA) grant-financed programs approved under GPE 2030. It excludes accelerated financing.

Unit of measurement: Percentage of implementation grants (excluding Accelerated Funding (AFs).

Calculation method:

At the grant level, for each GPE implementation grant, determine whether the program is *on track* based on the overall sustainability rating provided in its progress report or completion report. A program is counted as contributing to sustainability if its reported rating demonstrates moderate or strong contributions to reform sustainability across the pre-specified dimensions.

At the aggregate level, the value is the total number of *on-track* programs divided by the total number of eligible programs with available reporting (progress and completion), multiplied by 100.

Formula:
Grant level

For each grant-funded program p *in country* c, classify it as on track or off track based on its overall sustainability rating from either the progress report or the completion report:

Progress rating

$$Sustainability_c^p = \begin{cases} 1\ (On\ track) & \text{if program } p \text{ in country } c \text{ demonstrates moderate or strong contributions to reform sustainability} \\ 0\ (Off\ track) & \text{if program } p \text{ in country } c \text{ demonstrates limited or no contributions to reform sustainability} \end{cases}$$

Official Use Only

Completion rating

$$Sustainability_c^p = \begin{cases} 1\ (On\ track) & \text{if program p in country c demonstrates moderate or strong contributions to reform sustainability} \\ 0\ (Off\ track) & \text{if program p in country c demonstrates limited or no contr} \end{cases}$$

Aggregate level

Sum all grant-level classifications of on-track programs across grants in progress and completed, and divide this total by the number of eligible programs with available reporting:

$$\text{RF8} = \frac{\sum_{c=1}^{n} \sum_{p=1}^{m_c} \text{Sustainability}_c^p}{\sum_{c=1}^{n} m_c} \times 100$$

where:

$Sustainability_c^p$	Program p in country c demonstrates moderate or strong contribution to priority reforms
p	Program identifier (grant-funded program)
m_c	Number of eligible grant-funded programs in country c
n	Total number of partner countries with eligible grant-funded programs and reporting data available

Reporting timeframe: CY.

Data source: Grant reporting templates (sustainability section in progress and completion reports, completed by grant agents), GPE Secretariat review and validation of grant agent self-assessments.

Data required: Grant agent self-assessments of program contributions to reform sustainability, including the required overall sustainability rating and accompanying evidence.

Types of disaggregation: PCFC, and by countries hosting the highest number of refugees.

Interpretation: Higher indicator values indicate more GPE-financed programs

Official Use Only

support system transformation beyond short-term outputs. This suggests alignment with national systems/priorities, harmonized funding that reduces transaction costs, capacity investments that outlast grants, resilience-building, post-program outcome tracking, domestic resource scaling, and enhanced government ownership.

Quality standards: Grant agent self-assessments must include verifiable evidence (procurement records, capacity assessments, monitoring plans) against all pre-specified sustainability dimensions, with consistent rating rubrics applied across multiplier, system transformation, and GEA grants. Secretariat validation ensures objectivity; programs must demonstrate actual system use rather than planned intent.

Limitations: Self-assessments by grant agents bias despite validation, the indicator applies only to GPE 2030 grants (excluding AFs), limiting historical comparability, sustainability dimensions vary in measurability, and the indicator doesn't verify if "moderately or strong" contributions sustain long-term or measure post-grant outcomes and exclude programs that may also affect sustainability.

DRAFT

Official Use Only

Objective 3: Reforms driven and sustained by coordinated, effective, inclusive, and accountable partnerships, including core system stakeholders

INDICATOR RF 9

Percent of partner countries where the partnership is demonstrating mutual accountability for effective partnership.

Purpose: To measure the share of partner countries in which the education partnership demonstrates mutual accountability through documented and verifiable partnership activities and actions that support implementation of priority reforms.

Definition: This indicator is based on government reporting through the GPE annual monitoring questionnaire, with LEG review. A country or subnational entity is considered to be demonstrating mutual accountability when the annual monitoring questionnaire provides evidence of at least three documented partnership activities or actions that support the implementation of priority reforms in the reporting period. Partnership activities and actions are collaborative efforts by LEGs and other education partners that demonstrate alignment, coordination, joint accountability, and support to government-led reforms.

Partnership actions cover those listed in the GPE annual monitoring questionnaire (Question III.1.a) [link to guidelines][19] where the response selected is *"yes"* to indicate support to the aligned implementation of the priority reform. These actions can include:

- Non-government partners aligning their programs to the priority reform.
- Partners aligning program reporting requirements and mechanisms.
- Partners providing technical support that is aligned, coordinated, or jointly delivered for the priority reform.
- Partners advocating for policies or programs related to the priority reform.
- Partners creating or enhancing pooled funding for external education financing to support the reform; or any other alignment-related action described by the government.

Partnership major activities—reported in the GPE annual monitoring questionnaire (Question III.1.b) can include:

- Actions to establish or strengthen pooled financing mechanisms supporting sector

[19] Questionnaire used during GPE Annual Monitoring exercise or partnership compact midterm review.

Official Use Only

implementation.

- Actions to align partner resources or capacities with priority reforms identified in sector plans or partnership compacts.
- Joint reviews of reform progress or sector performance (e.g., JSRs, LEG-led monitoring).
- Actions to harmonize reporting requirements across programs to reduce administrative burden.
- Coordinated technical assistance or capacity-building aligned with government priorities.
- Actions to improve data sharing, analytics, or coordination platforms.

Unit of measurement: Percentage of partner countries/subnational entities

Calculation method: *At the country level,* a country/subnational entity is scored as demonstrating mutual accountability if there is documented evidence of three or more partnership major activities and actions in the reporting period.

At the aggregate level, the value is the total number of partner countries/subnational entities meeting the threshold is divided by the total number of countries/subnational entities that submitted an annual monitoring questionnaire with sufficient information, then multiplied by 100.

Formula:

Country/subnational level

$$Partnership_c = \begin{cases} 1 & if\ country/subnational\ entity\ c\ demonstrates\ at\ least\ three\ cases \\ & of\ partnership\ major\ activities\ or\ actions\ in\ the\ reporting\ period \\ 0 & Otherwise \end{cases}$$

Aggregate level

$$Partnership = \frac{\sum_{c=1}^{n} Partnership_c}{n} \times 100$$

where:

Partnership	Percentage of partner countries that demonstrate mutual accountability through major partnership activities.
$Partnership_c$	Country/subnational entity c demonstrates at least 3 cases of partnership

Official Use Only

major activities or actions in the reporting period

n Total number of countries/subnational entities submitting a monitoring questionnaire

Reporting timeframe: CY. Data reported annually is based on annual reform monitoring cycle.

Data source: Question III.1.a and question III.1.b of GPE annual monitoring questionnaire submitted by country partners and reviewed by Secretariat, including any supporting evidence (policy documents, plans, JSRs, performance reports).

Data required: Country evidence entries for qualifying partnership major activities and actions (as defined in the GPE annual monitoring questionnaire), dates and brief descriptions of each item (LEG/JSR meetings, pooled funding steps, alignment actions, joint reviews, harmonized reporting, etc.).

Types of disaggregation: PCFC, and by countries hosting the highest number of refugees.

Interpretation: Higher values indicate that a larger proportion of partner countries are functioning as effective partnerships by taking concrete, documented actions that align stakeholders to priority reforms and strengthen mutual accountability. Because activities vary in scope and influence, this indicator should be interpreted alongside qualitative information from the annual monitoring questionnaire regarding the nature, depth, and contribution of these partnership activities to sector reform.

Quality standards: Secretariat Country Engagement Leads (CELs) review information against minimum verification criteria, including completeness, timeliness, and soundness, with support from Secretariat thematic teams, where needed. Partnership activities must be supported with verifiable documentation—such as meeting records, agreements, or monitoring reports—rather than self-reported claims. GPE annual monitoring questionnaire submitted includes reviews from the country's LEG and is supported by evidence.

Limitations: The indicator captures whether countries report at least three partnership activities but does not assess quality or influence on reform progress. The threshold of three activities may not reflect contextual differences across countries, and annual reporting may not fully capture longer-term partnership dynamics or outcomes.

DRAFT

Official Use Only

INDICATOR RF 10

Percent of partner countries with inclusive local education groups.

Purpose: The indicator assesses whether national civil society organizations (CSOs) and teacher organizations, at least two out of youth and student organizations, private sector, women-led organizations, organizations of persons with disabilities, and external funders of education are represented on local education groups and have the (structured) opportunities to engage in all the functions undertaken by the Local Education Groups (LEGs). For example, consultative and evidence-based policy dialogue and coordinated action including sector monitoring and leveraging social accountability to ultimately enhance the delivery of results. Only countries where LEG exists are eligible for this indicator.

Definition: Percentage of Local Education Groups (LEGs) that meet minimum inclusivity criteria, defined as having representation from:

- National civil society organizations,
- Teacher organizations, and
- Representation from at least two of the following groups: youth and student organizations, private sector, womenled organizations, organizations of persons with disabilities (OPDs), and external funders of education.

Assessment of inclusiveness is informed by country-reported data in the GPE annual monitoring questionnaire, including:

- Stakeholder participation data from Question III.2, which identifies whether specific stakeholder groups participate in the LEG (based on *"Yes"* responses). This includes verification of the presence of a national civil society organization, a teachers' organization, and youth and university groups.
- Data on the quality of participation, drawn from additional questionnaire items and complementary reporting from the Education Out Loud (EOL) program. These data are mapped to country reporting to support corporate-level analysis and results reporting.

Unit of measurement: Percentage of local education groups

Calculation method: *At the LEG level*: for each LEG, determine inclusiveness criteria including representation of stakeholders noted in the definition section, based on "Yes" responses in the questionnaire.

DRAFT

Official Use Only

At the aggregate level: the total value is the number of LEGs that meet the inclusiveness criteria, divided by the total number of LEGs in GPE partner countries, and multiplied by 100.

Formula:

Local Education Group (LEG) level

Define a binary variable for LEG *j* in each partner country *c* where a LEG has been constituted:

$$LEG_c^j = \begin{cases} 1 & \textit{if LEG j in country c meets inclusiveness criteria} \\ 0 & \textit{Otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Aggregate level

$$\text{LEG} = \frac{\sum_{c=1}^{n} \text{LEG}_c^j}{n} * 100$$

where:

LEG Percentage of LEGs with inclusiveness criteria

LEG_c^j Representation of national civil society organizations (CSOs) and teacher organizations, and at least two out of youth and student organizations, private sector, women-led organizations, organizations of persons with disabilities, and external funders of education in LEG *j* in country *c*

n Number of LEGs in GPE partner countries with data available

Reporting timeframe: CY.

Data required: Local Education Group composition.

Data source: GPE Secretariat (documentation and database with relevant LEG membership information), Education Out Loud results framework on meaningful and effective participation, Question III.2 of GPE annual monitoring questionnaire submitted by country partners and reviewed by Secretariat, reporting any changes to LEG composition.

Types of disaggregation: PCFC, and by countries hosting the highest number of

Official Use Only

refugees.

Interpretation: Higher values indicate a strong level of representation of national CSOs, teacher organizations, and at least two additional stakeholder groups, within LEG across the Partnership, enhancing participation and inclusiveness in sector dialogue and coordination. Representation may take different forms and may vary in the extent to which stakeholder groups can meaningfully participate or influence decision-making. Therefore, this indicator should be interpreted alongside qualitative evidence on the quality, depth, and effectiveness of stakeholder engagement, such as how these represented groups contribute to policy dialogue, accountability processes, and education sector planning and monitoring within countries.

Quality standards: Secretariat Country Engagement Leads (CELs) review information against minimum verification criteria, including completeness, timeliness, and soundness, with support from Secretariat thematic teams, where needed. LEG composition information should be regularly updated and reviewed through the GPE annual monitoring questionnaire and Secretariat records. If a teacher organization is considered a CSO from a legal status standpoint, it should be counted under this indicator as a teacher organization instead of a CSO. GPE annual monitoring questionnaire submitted includes reviews from the country's LEG and is supported by evidence.

Limitations: The indicator is limited to capture the level of inclusiveness, nor the frequency of LEG meeting attendance by CSO and TA representatives. The indicator applies only to countries where LEGs have been constituted; countries without LEGs are excluded from the denominator, potentially overstating overall inclusiveness across the partnership.

DRAFT

Official Use Only

INDICATOR RF 11

Number of policy changes in partner countries are influenced by civil society organizations, teachers' organizations, youth groups, or the private sector.

Purpose: To measure the extent and reach of policy influence by organized non-state actors influence tangible changes in education policy and practice in partner countries. It highlights how civil society organizations (CSOs), teachers' organizations, youth groups, and private sector actors contribute to advancing the universal right to education through reforms in laws, plans, budgets, and implementation arrangements.

Definition: The indicator measures the number of partner countries (or subnational entities, where relevant) where significant education policy changes have been documented and where those changes were influenced by civil society organizations, teachers' organizations, youth groups, or the private sector. Policy or practice changes that non-government education partners contributed to are assessed across a set of dimensions in the GPE annual monitoring questionnaire (Question III.1.c) or partnership compact midterm review preparatory monitoring questionnaire, including but not limited to:

Changes are defined as changes reached with the influence of the national education coalitions, its individual members and other Education Out Loud grantees for increasing the universal right to education in national, regional, local laws and policies; education plans, curricula, methodologies; teachers´ skills; education public administration; up-take of students, and the like. Changes are counted in the following documents: new or improved laws, policy documents, public education budgets, public education sector reform documents, teachers' professional standards, working conditions, curricula, education programs, uptake log, other documents.

Influence of civil society and other actors: A change is considered to be influenced when there is documented evidence—reflected in a "Yes" response—that at least one of the following contributed to the policy process: civil society organizations (including national education coalitions), teachers' organizations or unions, youth groups or youth-led organizations, or private sector entities or foundations.

Unit of measurement: Number of policy changes (cumulative)

DRAFT

Official Use Only

Calculation method: *At the document level,* identify whether each education policy or practice document produced or updated during the reporting period contains a significant change and whether that change was influenced by civil society organizations, teachers' organizations, youth groups, or private sector actors. Influence must be supported by verifiable evidence such as participation records, consultation notes, meeting minutes, research inputs, advocacy materials, or other documentation.

At the country level, count the total number of documents recording significant policy changes that were influenced by these non-state actors.

At the aggregate level, sum the number of policy changes across all partner countries/subnational entities with data available. The final value is the total number of policy changes influenced by civil society and other non-state actors during the reporting year.

Formula:

Document level

$$Doc_{i,c} = \begin{cases} 1 & \textit{if document i records a change in education policy or practice in country c and the change is influenced by CSOs, teachers' organizations, youth groups, or the private sector} \\ 0 & \textit{Otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where:

$\text{Doc}_{d,c}$ Indicator that document i for country c contains a significant change in education policy or practice influenced by civil society organizations, teachers' organizations, youth groups, or private sector actors

i Document identifier

c Country or subnational entity

Country level

$$Change_c = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \sum_{i=1}^{I_c} \text{Doc}_{i,c} > 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Official Use Only

where:

$Change_c$	Country/subnational entity c has at least one significant documented Change i in education policies or practices influenced by civil society organizations, teachers' organizations, youth groups, or private sector actors
$\mathrm{Doc}_{i,c}$	Document i with change in education policies influenced by EOL grantees for country c
I_c	Total number of assessed documents on education policy or practice for country c in the reporting period

Aggregate level

$$Change = \sum_{c=1}^{n} Change_c$$

where:

$Change$	Total number of partner countries with significant documented change in education policies influenced by EOL grantees
n	Number of eligible partner countries with data available

Reporting timeframe: CY

Data required: List of countries; for each country: List of education policy and practice documents in the reporting period where changes are recorded (laws, policies, plans, budgets, curricula, administrative arrangements, etc.), assessment of whether each documented change was influenced by CSOs, teachers' organizations, youth groups, or private sector actors, supporting evidence of influence (e.g., advocacy campaign documentation, meeting minutes, policy consultation records, research reports, social accountability reports).

Data source: Education Out Loud data reporting, Question III.1c of GPE annual monitoring questionnaire submitted by country partners and reviewed by Secretariat.

Types of disaggregation: PCFC, and by countries hosting the highest number of refugees.

DRAFT

Official Use Only

Interpretation: A higher value indicates that partner countries are demonstrating stronger and more effective sector coordination, reflected through more aligned partner actions, improved collaboration across ministries and organizations, and more substantive contributions from non-government partners to education policies and practices. Progress may include partners harmonizing reporting requirements, coordinating technical support, or conducting joint sector processes, as well as partnership activities that strengthen mutual accountability, such as joint sector reviews or regular convening of technical groups. When more countries rate these aspects as satisfactory, it suggests that education stakeholders are working together in a more coherent, organized, and mutually reinforcing way to support national education goals.

Quality standards: Secretariat Country Engagement Leads (CELs) review information against minimum verification criteria, including completeness, timeliness, and soundness. Country submissions must provide clear, evidence-based descriptions of partner actions, policy contributions, and coordination activities, as well as major actions, significant changes, and partnership activities. GPE annual monitoring questionnaire submitted includes reviews from the country's LEG and is supported by evidence.

Limitations: The indicator counts countries with at least one change but it's not possible to capture details for consistency across partner countries, e.g., implementation quality, time lags between advocacy and adoption.

DRAFT

Official Use Only

INDICATOR RF 12

Percent of partner countries improving sector coordination.

Purpose: To track country-level progress in strengthening sector coordination, including the functioning of coordination bodies, cross-sector engagement, and collaboration among education stakeholders.

Definition: The indicator is based on government self-assessment of overall reform progress in sector coordination, with LEG review. Progress is assessed across a set of dimensions in the GPE annual monitoring questionnaire (Question II.1) [link to guidelines][20], including but not limited to:

- The effectiveness, functioning, and inclusiveness of local education groups or equivalent bodies;
- Coherence and collaboration among key education actors working on reform implementation;
- Alignment and harmonization of external aid; engagement with ministries of finance to support sustainable sector financing;
- Collaboration between humanitarian and development actors and/or with other sectors; fostering a culture of learning, innovation, and collective improvement;
- Coordination and leadership to prevent and respond to violence within and across the education system. Governments provide narrative descriptions and supporting evidence, which are reviewed by the Secretariat.

For each dimension, countries report one of three responses: *achieved, in progress, or not applicable*. "Achieved" reflects full implementation of the dimension, "In progress" reflects partial implementation, and "Not applicable" indicates that the dimension does not apply to the country context. Governments provide narrative descriptions and supporting evidence for each dimension, which are reviewed by the Secretariat. The combined assessment across all applicable dimensions is used to determine the progress rating on the enabling factor ("satisfactory," "somewhat satisfactory," or "unsatisfactory", or "somewhat unsatisfactory"), from which the indicator value is derived.

Unit of measurement: Percentage of partner countries/subnational entities.

Calculation method: *At the country/subnational level,*

[20] Questionnaire used during GPE Annual Monitoring exercise or partnership compact midterm review.

Official Use Only

identify whether countries' report indicates demonstrable progress in sector coordination. A country/subnational entity is classified as making progress when its monitoring rating indicates progress in sector coordination as "somewhat satisfactory" or "satisfactory.

At the aggregate level, calculate by dividing the number of partner countries/subnational entities making progress in sector coordination by the total number of partner countries/subnational entities with monitoring data and multiplying by 100.

Formula:

Country/subnational level

For each country or subnational entity, identify whether the progress in sector coordination is rated as "somewhat satisfactory" or "satisfactory".

$$Progress^{c} = \begin{cases} 1\ (On\ track), if\ rating\ is\ somewhat\ satisfactory\ or\ better \\ \quad in\ the\ enabling\ factor \\ 0\ (Off\ track), if\ rating\ is\ somewhat\ unsatisfactory\ or\ worse \\ \quad in\ the\ enabling\ factor \end{cases}$$

Aggregate level

Calculate the percentage of partner countries/subnational entities with monitoring data that are making progress:

$$Progress\ (\%) = \left(\frac{\sum_{c=1}^{n} Progres^{c}}{n}\right) \times 100$$

where:

$Progress^{c}$	The review by country/subnational entity *c* rated the overall progress in the enabling factor "somewhat satisfactory" or better
c	Country or subnational entity
$Progress\ (\%)$	Percentage of countries/subnational entities with the progress in the enabling factor rated "somewhat satisfactory" or better by country's review

Reporting timeframe: CY. Data reported annually is based on annual reform monitoring cycle.

Official Use Only

Data source: Question II.1 of GPE annual monitoring questionnaire submitted by country partners and reviewed by Secretariat, including any supporting evidence (policy documents, plans, JSRs, performance reports).

Data required: Countries' self-assessment and evidence demonstrating progress in sector coordination, with LEG review, supporting documents such as records of LEG meetings, cross-sectoral coordination mechanisms, joint reviews, and documentation of engagement with development and humanitarian partners.

Types of disaggregation: PCFC, and by countries hosting the highest number of refugees.

Interpretation: Higher values indicate that more partner countries are strengthening their sector coordination systems. This includes improved functioning of LEGs or equivalent bodies, stronger cross-sectoral collaboration, more coherent coordination between humanitarian and development actors, and more effective engagement with finance and planning authorities. Improvements in this indicator signal stronger governance structures that support more coherent education sector planning, policy dialogue, and monitoring.

Quality standards: Secretariat Country Engagement Leads (CELs) review reported progress against minimum verification criteria, including completeness, timeliness, and soundness, with support from Secretariat thematic teams, where needed. GPE annual monitoring questionnaire submitted includes reviews from the country's LEG and is supported by evidence.

Limitations Self-reported progress may introduce reporting bias. Annual monitoring may not fully capture longer-term changes in coordination practices, and differences in national coordination structures, documentation quality, and starting points may affect comparability. The indicator reflects progress in strengthening coordination systems, not the quality or impact of coordination outcomes, and indicator's binary reporting (on/ off track) may not capture gradual progress.

DRAFT

Official Use Only

REGULAR REPORTING INDICATORS

INDICATOR RR 1

Proportion of active system capacity grant where activities under three windows are on track:
(i) gender-responsive planning and monitoring,
(ii) mobilized coordinated action and finance,
(iii) adapt and learn for results at scale

Purpose: To track whether activities funded under the system capacity grant (SCG) are implemented as planned across the three SCG windows: (i) gender-responsive planning and monitoring, (ii) mobilized coordinated action and finance, (iii) adapt and learn for results at scale. This provides a unified view of implementation progress across windows, enabling portfolio-level performance tracking.

Definition: Please refer to the GPE operational guidelines for a description of the system capacity grant and its windows. A window is considered to have met its objectives if, in the system capacity grant completion report, its implementation rating is "substantial" or better. The Secretariat may adjust the rating if justified by evidence (e.g., mission reports, aide-mémoires, email exchanges).

Unit of measurement: Percentage of SCG grants completed since 1 January 2026.

Calculation method: *At the grant level*: for each system capacity grant, identify whether the implementation of activities under each active window: (i) the gender-responsive planning and monitoring window, (ii) the mobilized coordinated finance and action window, and (iii) the adapt and learn for results at scale window—was rated substantial or better. Each grant–window combination is treated as one observation. At the *aggregate/portfolio* level, the value is the number of active system capacity grant windows with implementation of activities rated substantial or better, divided by the total number of system capacity grant windows active, and multiplied by 100.

Formula:

Grant window level

For SCG $j$and window k:

$$W_{j,k} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } R_{j,k} \geq \textit{substantial} \\ 0 & \textit{Otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Official Use Only

where:

$W_{j,k}$ SCG *j* with activities under each window k met objectives

$R_{j,k}$ Secretariat's rating of implementation of activities under window k for SCG *j*

Aggregate level (across all windows)

Let S be the set of all grants with a completion report submitted in the calendar year.

$$W = \left(\frac{\sum_{(j,k)\in S} W_{j,k}}{n} \right) \times 100$$

Disaggregation by window:
For each window k, compute:

$$W_k = \left(\frac{\sum_{j\in S_k} W_{j,k}}{n_k} \right) \times 100$$

where:

W Percentage of SCG windows met objectives (portfolio-wide)

S_k set of active SCG–window k pairs and $n_k = |S_k|$

n Total number of SCGs windows[21] with a completion report in the CY

n_k number of SCG windows for window k in the CY

Reporting timeframe: CY (cumulatively).

Data source: System capacity grant completion monitoring reports to track achievement of objectives (rating) at SCG completion.

Data required: This includes list of system capacity grant's with a completion report in the calendar year with information on the three windows. Secretariat may change the rating if there is evidence supporting the change.

Types of disaggregation: PCFC, and by countries hosting the highest number of

[21] If a system capacity grant has 3 active windows, that counts as 3 observations. If another SCG has 1 active window, that counts as 1 observation.

Official Use Only

DRAFT

refugees, and by SCG window.

Interpretation: Higher values indicate better portfolio performance in implementing SCG activities across the three windows.

Quality standards: All grant implementation ratings are quality assured, per grant monitoring standards, by the Secretariat.

Limitations: Secretariat may not have enough evidence to validate GA's rating.

DRAFT

Official Use Only

INDICATOR RR 2

Proportion of implementation grants, system transformation grants, multiplier grants, girls' education accelerator:

a. **meeting objectives during implementation (methodology to account for disbursement/utilization volume and progress towards objectives), overall and by thematic areas,**
b. **met objectives at completion, overall and by thematic areas**

Purpose: RR 2.a tracks the implementation of system transformation grant (STG)/ Education Sector Program Implementation Grant/GPE Multiplier, and girls' education accelerator; hereafter, referred to as implementation grant (and system transformation grant in formula section). The indicator monitors overall grant progress and progress by thematic area. RR 2.b tracks whether the implementation grant met objectives at completion. The indicator monitors the completion status overall and by thematic areas.

The thematic areas considered for this indicator are indicative and may be modified based on programs' focus; they include access; teachers and teaching; learning; and system strengthening.

Definition: For a description of the implementation grants, see the GPE website.

For RR 2.a, the implementation grant's overall implementation progress is on track if (1) the overall grant implementation status is rated as "moderately satisfactory" or better using GPE's grant implementation monitoring standards, and (2) the fund utilization is rated as on track. For the utilization, it is rated on track if the proportion of grant period elapsed does not exceed the proportion of funds utilized by more than 25 percentage points at the end of the 4th quarter of that FY. Given different definitions of "utilization" applied among GAs, Secretariat may adjust utilization rating in the following scenario - when evidence suggests that the reported utilization amount is underestimated due to delay in disbursing expenses at the country level despite achievement of the results or overestimated as the GA only reports on transfers to government and/or implementing partner.

To assess whether an implementation grant is on track by different thematic areas, the for each grant Secretariat component rating is mapped to the thematic area that the component supports, and calculates the % of grants on-track for all grants that provide support to that thematic area. Each implementation grant component is

DRAFT

Official Use Only

tagged to a thematic area that it supports at the application stage. When grant agent submits a progress report, they provide a implementation rating for every component, using GPE's grant implementation monitoring standards. Grant agent's ratings are reviewed by Secretariat's country program officer who provides their own rating. The component rating applies to relevant thematic areas the component is mapped to, if there are multiple. In a thematic area, an implementation grant will be considered on track if more than 50% of the total grant amount across components are rated as "moderately satisfactory" (system transformation grant monitoring guidelines at implementation).

For RR 2.b, an implementation grant met its overall objectives at completion if achievement of objectives ('efficacy') is rated "substantial" or better using GPE's grant completion reporting standards. This part of the indicator is reported cumulatively since 1 January 2026.

To assess whether an implementation grant met its objectives at completion by different thematic areas (access, learning and system strengthening), the GPE Secretariat first manually maps each implementation grant component and splits amount to all relevant priority areas. Meanwhile, all components are rated on meeting objectives using GPE's grant completion reporting standards. The rating received by a component applies to all relevant thematic areas the component is mapped to. Therefore, under a thematic area, there could be multiple components with their mapped grant amount and ratings. In a thematic area, an implementation grant met its objectives if more than 50% of the total grant amount across components are rated as "substantial" or better (system transformation grant monitoring guidelines at completion).

Unit of measurement: Percentage. For part (a), active grants in the calendar year with a grant progress report. For part (b), cumulative reporting, closed grants with a grant completion report since 1 January 2026.

Calculation method: RR 2.a: For each implementation grant during implementation, identify:

- for overall, overall grant implementation status rating and the fund utilization rating.
- for each thematic area, Identify each grant component's implementation rating. Map each component to the relevant thematic categories using the updated GPE grant thematic coding (see Annex C forthcoming). Allocate each

Official Use Only

component's financing amount to all thematic categories to which it is mapped. Assign each component's implementation rating to all mapped thematic categories.

A grant is on track in a thematic area if more than 50% of the thematic-mapped grant amount is rated Moderately Satisfactory or better.

RR 2.b: For each implementation grant at completion:

- for overall, identify the overall grant completion status rating.
- for each thematic area, Identify each grant component's completion rating. Map each component to the relevant thematic categories using the updated GPE grant thematic coding. Allocate each component's financing amount to all thematic categories to which it is mapped. Assign each component's completion rating to all mapped thematic categories.

A grant met objectives in a thematic area if more than 50% of the thematic-mapped financing is rated Substantial or better.

Formula:

Grant level

RR 2.a

Overall

$$STG^{j}_{imp,overall} = \begin{cases} 1 \; if \; R^{j}_{imp} \geq \text{moderately satisfactory}; \;\; and \; U^{j} = \text{on track} \\ 0 \; otherwise \end{cases}$$

Component-level thematic areas

$$STG^{j,k}_{imp,a} = \begin{cases} 1 \; if \; R^{j,k}_{imp,a} \geq \text{moderately satisfactory} \\ 0 \; otherwise \end{cases}$$

Grant-level thematic areas

$$STG^{j}_{imp,a} = \begin{cases} 1 \; if \;\; \dfrac{\sum_{k=1}^{n}\left(G^{j,k}_{a} * STG^{j,k}_{imp,a}\right)}{\sum_{k=1}^{n} G^{j,k}_{a}} > 0.5 \\ 0 \; otherwise \end{cases}$$

where:

$STG^{j}_{imp,overall}$	STG *j* with the overall implementation progress on track
$\bar{R}^{j}_{imp}$	Rating of STG *j* on overall grant implementation

Official Use Only

U^j	Rating of STG *j* on fund utilization
$STG_{imp,a}^{j,k}$	In thematic area *a*, STG *j* component *k* has implementation progress
$R_{imp,a}^{j,k}$	In thematic area *a*, rating of STG *j* component *k* on implementation
$STG_{imp,a}^{j}$	STG *j* with the implementation progress on track in thematic area *a*
$G_a^{j,k}$	STG *j* component *k* grant amount mapped to thematic area *a*
n	Number of components under STG *j*

RR 2.b

Overall

$$STG_{cmpl,overall}^{j} = \begin{cases} 1 \; if \; R_{cmpl}^{j} \geq \text{substantial} \\ 0 \; otherwise \end{cases}$$

Component-level thematic areas

$$STG_{cmpl,a}^{j,k} = \begin{cases} 1 \; if \; R_{cmpl,a}^{j,k} \geq \text{substantial} \\ 0 \; otherwise \end{cases}$$

Grant-level thematic areas

$$STG_{cmpl,a}^{j} = \begin{cases} 1 \; if \; \dfrac{\sum_{k=1}^{n}\left(G_a^{j,k} * STG_{cmpl,a}^{j,k}\right)}{\sum_{k=1}^{n} G_a^{j,k}} > 0.5 \\ 0 \; otherwise \end{cases}$$

where:

$STG_{cmpl,overall}^{j}$	STG *j* met the overall objectives at completion
R_{cmpl}^{j}	Rating of STG *j* on achievement of objectives
$STG_{cmpl,a}^{j,k}$	In thematic area *a*, STG *j* component *k* met its objectives at
$R_{cmpl,a}^{j,k}$	In thematic area *a*, rating of STG *j* component *k* on achievement of objectives
$STG_{cmpl,a}^{j}$	STG *j* met the objectives at completion in thematic area *a*
$G_a^{j,k}$	STG *j* component *k* grant amount mapped to thematic area *a*
n	Number of components under STG *j*

Aggregate level

RR 2.a

Overall

DRAFT

Official Use Only

$$STG_{imp,overall} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{N_{active}} STG_{imp,overall}^{j}}{N_{active}}$$

Thematic area

$$STG_{imp,a} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{N_a} STG_{imp,a}^{j}}{N_{active,a}}$$

where:

$STG_{imp,overall}$	Proportion of STGs with the overall implementation progress on track
$STG_{imp,overall}^{j}$	STG *j* with the overall implementation progress on track
N_{active}	Total number of active STGs at the end of the calendar year
$STG_{imp,a}$	Proportion of STGs with the overall implementation progress on track in thematic area *a*
$STG_{imp,a}^{j}$	STG *j* with the implementation progress on track in thematic area *a*
$N_{active,a}$	Total number of active STGs at the end of the calendar year in thematic area *a*

RR 2.b

Overall

$$STG_{cmpl,overall} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{N_{closed}} STG_{cmpl,overall}^{j}}{N_{closed}}$$

Thematic area

$$STG_{cmpl,a} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{N_{closed}} STG_{cmpl,a}^{j}}{N_{closed,a}}$$

where:

$STG_{cmpl,overall}$	Proportion of STGs met the overall objectives at completion
$STG_{cmpl,overall}^{j}$	STG *j* met the overall objectives at completion
N_{closed}	Total number of STGs submitted completion report cumulatively by CY
$STG_{cmpl,a}$	Proportion of STGs met the overall objectives at completion in thematic area *a*
$STG_{cmpl,a}^{j}$	STG *j* met the objectives at completion in thematic area *a*
$N_{closed,a}$	Total number of STGs submitted completion report cumulatively by the CY in thematic area *a*

Reporting timeframe: CY

DRAFT

Official Use Only

Data required: (1) List of implementation grants active at the end of the calendar year with at least one progress report submitted to the Secretariat. (2) List of implementation grants that submitted completion reports since 1 January 2026. (3) Implementation/completion rating for overall grant and by component, based on GA's rating included in the progress/completion report. (4) Coding/costing data mapping implementation grant components to GPE 2030 thematic areas. (5) Utilization data for implementation grants active at the end of the fiscal year.

Data source: (1) GPE grant coding/costing database for thematic codes. (2) implementation grant implementation monitoring reports (grant performance rating section). (3) implementation grant completion reports (grant efficacy rating section). (4) implementation grants' utilization (amounts) database.

Types of disaggregation: PCFC, and countries hosting the highest number of refugees.

Interpretation: Higher values indicate better grant performance for indicator RR 2.a, with respect to progress towards objectives overall and in the priority areas, and overall utilization; and, for indicator RR 2.b, with respect to the achievement of objectives overall and in the thematic areas. Thematic allocation shares show where financing is concentrated.

Data by additional thematic areas will be considered for analysis, including grant coding markers, such as gender equality and inclusion and climate (see coding framework in Annex C forthcoming).

Outside the core RR 2, additional analyses will track:

- financing allocated to each thematic category,
- standard outputs: textbooks distributed, classrooms built/rehabilitated,

Quality standards: Secretariat may adjust GA's rating if there is evidence supporting the change (e.g., mission reports, Aide-Memoires, and exchanges of emails).

Limitations: Secretariat may not have enough evidence to validate GA's rating. Utilization data provided by GA is diverse and does not always report on actual expenditure. Implementation rating may be positively affected by extensions. The current utilization rating doesn't capture low utilization during the first year(s) of implementation. Utilization data is not available at component level, therefore, unlike overall progress and completion, progress and completion for different thematic

DRAFT

Official Use Only

areas will be assessed purely based on implementation ratings. Outputs and intermediate outcomes may be unequally defined across grants; targets may not be comparable.

DRAFT

Official Use Only

INDICATOR RR 3

Proportion of grants with a Girls' Education Accelerator component where the Girls' Education Accelerator-funded component a) meet its objectives during implementation; b) met its objective at completion.

Purpose: The indicator tracks whether system transformation grants (or Multiplier grants) with Girls' Education Accelerator funding are implemented effectively and meeting their objectives in girls' education during implementation (part a.) and at grant completion (part b.).

Definition: For the description of Girls' Education Accelerator-funding and list of eligible countries for this funding, see GPE website. For RR 3.a, the Girls' Education Accelerator-funding of a grant during implementation is on track if the corresponding component is rated as "moderately satisfactory" or better using GPE's grant implementation monitoring standards. For RR 3.b, the Girls' Education Accelerator-funding of a grant met its overall intended objectives at completion if the achievement of objectives ('efficacy') is rated "substantial" or better using GPE's grant completion reporting standards.

Unit of measurement: Percentage, cumulative since 1 January 2026.

Calculation method: For each system transformation (or Multiplier grants) during grant implementation and at completion, identify Girls' Education Accelerator-funding level of progress during implementation (part a.) or achievement rating at the time of grant closing (part b.). See definition section for details on indicator criteria.

Grant level

3.a.

$$GEA^i = \begin{cases} 1 \; if \; R^i \geq \text{moderately satisfactory} \\ 0 \; otherwise \end{cases}$$

3.b.

$$GEA^c = \begin{cases} 1 \; if \; c \geq \text{substantial} \\ 0 \; otherwise \end{cases}$$

where:

Official Use Only

GEA^i System transformation grant / Multiplier j with Girls' Education Accelerator -funding is on track to meet the intended objectives during grant implementation

R^i Rating of system transformation grant / Multiplier j Girls' Education Accelerator -funding on progress to achievement of objectives

GEA^c System transformation grant / Multiplier j with Girls' Education Accelerator -funding met the intended objectives at completion

R^c Rating of system transformation grant / Multiplier j Girls' Education Accelerator -funding on achievement of objectives

Aggregate level

RR 3.a.:

$$GEAI = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} GEA^i}{Ni}$$

RR 3.b.:

$$GEAC = \frac{\sum_{c=1}^{N} GEA^c}{Nc}$$

where:

GEAI Proportion of system transformation grant / Multiplier with Girls' Education Accelerator -funding on track to meet the intended objectives during implementation

GEA^i System transformation grant/ Multiplier j with Girls' Education Accelerator -funding on track to meet the intended objectives at during implementation

Ni Number of System transformation grant / Multiplier with Girls' Education Accelerator -funding submitted progress report during the calendar year

GEAC Proportion of system transformation grant / Multiplier with Girls' Education Accelerator -funding met the objectives at completion

GEA^c System transformation grant/ Multiplier j with Girls' Education Accelerator -funding met the objectives at completion

Nc Number of System transformation grant / Multiplier with Girls' Education Accelerator -funding submitted completion report during the calendar year

Reporting timeframe: CY

DRAFT

Official Use Only

Data required: List of system transformation grants (or Multiplier) with Girls' Education Accelerator financing that submitted a progress report (for part a.) and a completion report (for part b.) during the CY. Progress and completion rating for overall intended objectives for Girls' Education Accelerator -funding, based on GA's rating included in the progress and completion report, reviewed by GPE Secretariat.

Data source: GPE grant tracking database. System transformation grant (or Multiplier) progress (for part a.) and completion (for part b.) reports.

Types of disaggregation: PCFC, and by countries hosting the highest number of refugees.

Interpretation: Higher values indicate better grant performance during grant implementation (for part a.) and at grant completion (for part b.) with respect to the achievement of Girls' Education Accelerator-funded intended objectives.

Quality standards: Secretariat may adjust GA's rating if there is evidence supporting the change (e.g., mission reports, Aide Memoire, and exchanges of emails).

Limitations: Secretariat may not have enough evidence to validate GA's rating.

DRAFT

Official Use Only

INDICATOR RR 4

Percent of partner countries whose priority reform is making demonstrable progress in advancing gender equality and inclusion through their priority reform.

Purpose: To track country-level progress in advancing gender equality and inclusion through the implementation of priority education reforms.

Definition: This indicator is based on government self-assessment of progress in advancing gender equality and inclusion through the priority reform, with Local Education Group (LEG) review. Progress is reported in Question I.1b of GPE annual monitoring questionnaire [link to guidelines][22], supported by narrative, evidence.

Reported progress assesses whether reform implementation during the reporting timeframe contributed to measurable improvements in gender equality and inclusion, including for marginalized groups such as children with disabilities, refugee populations, and girls and boys living in rural areas or affected by conflict and climate-related crises.

Unit of measurement: Percentage of partner countries/ subnational entities.

Calculation method:

At the country/subnational level: Progress is assessed using the overall performance rating reported in Question I.1b of the annual monitoring questionnaire. A country or subnational entity is considered to be making demonstrable progress in advancing gender equality and inclusion when the reported rating is "satisfactory" or "somewhat satisfactory."

At the aggregate level: The percentage is calculated as the number of partner countries/subnational entities with progress rated "satisfactory" or "somewhat satisfactory", divided by the total number of partner countries/ subnational entities, multiplied by 100.

Formula:
Country/subnational level

[22] Questionnaire used during GPE Annual Monitoring exercise or partnership compact midterm review.

Official Use Only

For each country or subnational entity, identify whether the progress in advancing gender equality and inclusion is considered on track, rated as "satisfactory" or "somewhat satisfactory."

$$Progress^{c} = \begin{cases} 1 \; if rating \; is \; satisfactory \; or \; somewhat \; satisfactory \\ 0 \; if \; rating \; is \; somewhat \; unsatisfactory \; or \; unsatisfactory \end{cases}$$

Aggregate level

Compute the percentage of partner countries/subnational entities whose progress in advancing gender equality and inclusion is rated "satisfactory" or "somewhat satisfactory."

$$Progress\ (\%) = \left(\frac{\sum_{c=1}^{n} Progress^{c}}{n}\right) \times 100$$

$Progress\ (\%)$	Percentage of partner countries/subnational entities making demonstrable progress in advancing gender equality and inclusion
$Progress^{c}$	The review by country/subnational entity c rated the overall progress as "satisfactory" or "somewhat satisfactory."
c	Country or subnational entity
n	Total number of partner countries/subnational entities with a monitoring questionnaire and reported at least one priority action related to gender equality and inclusion

Reporting timeframe: CY. Data reported annually is based on reform monitoring cycle.

Data source: Question I.1b of GPE annual monitoring questionnaire submitted by country partners and reviewed by Secretariat, including any supporting evidence (policy documents, plans, JSRs, performance reports).

Data required: Performance rating for question I.1b; and narrative provided in the

DRAFT

Official Use Only

annual monitoring questionnaire.

Types of disaggregation: PCFC, and by countries hosting the highest number of refugees.

Interpretation: Higher values indicate that a larger share of GPE partner countries are demonstrating progress in integrating gender equality and inclusion into priority reform implementation and gender-responsive reforms are being integrated into system strengthening efforts.

Quality standards: Secretariat Country Engagement Leads (CELs) review reported progress against minimum verification criteria, including completeness, timeliness, and soundness, with support from Secretariat thematic teams and gender and inclusion specialists, where needed. GPE annual monitoring questionnaire submitted includes reviews from the country's LEG and is supported by evidence.

Limitations: Self-reported progress can introduce reporting bias. Progress measured annually for some system improvements may require longer timeframes to materialize, and indicator binary reporting (on/ off track) may not capture gradual changes of progress.

DRAFT

Official Use Only

INDICATOR RR 5

a. **Proportion of GPE grant funding aligned to national systems.**
b. **Proportion of GPE grant funding using harmonized funding modalities.**

Purpose: RR 5.a assesses the extent to which GPE funding is aligned with national systems. Alignment between external aid and country systems is widely recognized as a key factor for increasing the effectiveness of development interventions and for strengthening national capacity.

RR 5.b assesses the extent to which GPE funding is harmonized with other sources of external financing in GPE partner countries. It measures progress toward more coordinated and effective financing aligned with nationally owned education sector plans and country systems..

Definition: RR 5.a, measures the share of active implementation grant[23] funding aligned to national systems, expressed as a percentage of total active implementation grant funding. An implementation grant is considered aligned if it meets at least 7 of 10 alignment elements, covering 7 dimensions of national systems.

For RR 5.b measures the share of active implementation grants using a co-financing modality(project pooled or sector pooled mechanism), expressed as a percentage of the total active implementation grant funding. Co-financing modality can include:

- **Project pooled** funding that refers to funding coming from more than a single partner to support a common project.
- **Sector pooled** funding that refers to a diverse group of grant or credit modalities with varying instruments and mechanisms to support implementation of a national education sector plan. The specificity for sector pooled funds is that multiple contributing partners deliver funds in a coordinated fashion to support implementation of the national education plan, or specific parts thereof. Sector pooled funding is ring-fenced for the education sector. Therefore, by definition, sector pooled funding is aligned to national systems.
- Alternatively, grant funding can be **stand-alone**, which refers to unilateral, or in other words, funding not pooled with any other sources of financing. This is not considered a co-financing modality.

[23] Including STGs and Multipliers, excluding accelerating funding grants.

Official Use Only

Unit of measurement: Percentage.

Calculation method:
RR 5.a: At the grant-level, count the number of implementation grant elements out of a total of 10 elements across 7 dimensions that are aligned to country systems:

Dimension 1 - In relation to the ESP/TEP **1.1** (On Plan) Is the GPE-funded program aligned with the Education Sector Plan? **1.2** (On Plan) Are the projected expenditures of the program included in the multi-year forecast of the Ministry of Finance (medium-term expenditure framework)?	Dimension 4 – In relation to procurement **4.1** (On procurement) Are government procurement rules used? If yes, are they accompanied by exemptions/safeguard clauses?
Dimension 2 - In relation to the national budget and parliament **2.1** (On Budget) Is the project included (planned) in the national budget? **2.2** (On parliament) Does the national annual budget show specific appropriations for the different planned expenditures (economic and/or functional classification of expenditure)?	Dimension 5 – In relation to accounting **5.1** (On accounting) Is financial accounting integrated with the accounting systems used for the national budget? If not, are the accounting results subsequently incorporated into national accounting systems?
Dimension 3 – In relation to treasury **3.1** (On treasury) Is the majority of the financing disbursed into: (a) the main revenue account of government, (b) a specific account at treasury, or, (c) a specific account at a commercial bank? **3.2** (On treasury) Is the expenditure process (documents and signatures on commitment, payment orders, etc.) for the national budget used for the program expenditures? Do the national execution procedures include any exemptions or safeguard clauses for program expenditures (other documents and/or signatures)?	Dimension 6 – In relation to audit **6.1** (On auditing) Will the financial accounts be audited by the government's independent auditor?
	Dimension 7 – In relation to reporting **7.1** (On reporting) Is the information on program execution included in the education sector plan implementation report? Is the report prepared by the Ministry of Education?

DRAFT

Official Use Only

Based on the above scoring, at the grant-level classify each active implementation grant as aligned or not. The aggregate value is calculated by dividing the total volume of funding of aligned implementation grants by the total volume of funding of implementation grants, multiplied by 100.

RR 5.b: At grant-level, classify each active implementation grant funding modality as co-financed or stand-alone. The aggregate indicator value is calculated by dividing the total volume of co-financed (project pooled + sector pooled) implementation grants by the total volume of funding of implementation grants, multiplied by 100.

Formula:

Grant level

RR 5.a

$$E_i^j = \begin{cases} 1 \ \ if\ element\ i\ of\ implemenation\ grant\ j\ is\ aligned \\ 0 \ \ otherwise \end{cases}$$

$$A^j = \begin{cases} 1\ if \sum_{i=1}^{10} E_i^j \geq 7 \\ 0\ otherwise \end{cases}$$

where:

E_i^j Element *i* of implementation grant *j* is aligned to national system (if yes)

A^j ESPIG *j* with 7 or more elements of alignment

RR 5.b

$$CO^j = \begin{cases} 1\ if\ \text{implementation grant } j \text{ has cofinancing modality} \\ 0\ otherwise \end{cases}$$

where:

CO^j Implementation grant *j* is cofinanced

Aggregate level

RR 5.a

$$A = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{n}(A^j * V^j)}{\sum_{j=1}^{n} V^j} * 100$$

where:

A Percentage of Implementation grant funding aligned to the national system

A^j Implementation grant j meets 7 or more elements of alignment

DRAFT

Official Use Only

V^j Total volume of funding in Implementation grant *j*

n Total number of active implementation grants

RR 5.b

$$HF = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{n}(CO^j * V^j)}{\sum_{j=1}^{n} V^j}$$

where:

HF Percentage of Implementation grant funding that are project pooled or sector

PP^j Implementation grant *j* is cofinanced

CO^j Implementation grant *j* is cofinanced

V^j Volume of funding in ESPIG or STG *j*

n Total number of active ESPIGs/STGs

Reporting timeframe: CY

Data required: For RR 5.a, responses to questions on 10 elements of alignment listed under calculation method. For RR 5.b, grant modality is required.

Data source: Implementation grant application form.

Types of disaggregation: PCFC, and by countries hosting the highest number of refugees.

Interpretation: For RR 5.a, A high percentage of proportion of funds aligned indicates a high degree of alignment of the volume of grant funding, with DCPs basing support/funding modalities on the countries' own operational systems, frameworks and procedures. Monitoring of alignment of GPE supported programs with national systems complements monitoring of harmonization between donors (Indicator RR 5.b).

For RR 5.b, a high percentage of proportion of grant funding in co-financed modality indicates a high degree of harmonization of GPE funding with funding from other donors and/or international partners. While harmonization is typically recommended to create a space for dialogue and coordination, funding modalities should respond to different country needs, capacity and operating mechanisms of the entity supervising or managing the grant. Monitoring of *harmonization* between donors

Official Use Only

complements the monitoring of *alignment* of GPE supported programs with national systems (Indicator RR 5.a), two of the five fundamental principles outlined in the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness.[24]

Quality standards: For RR 5.a, all implementation grants active in a calendar year are included, regardless of closure status or funding model. Alignment assessments are reviewed during the quality assurance process. Grants are weighted by funding volume to reflect the proportion of aligned funding rather than the number of aligned grants.

For RR 5.b, grant modality in the application form should distinguish between cofinanced and stand-alone funding. Where modality is unclear, clarification from the Grant Agent (GA) is required.

Limitations: Changes that could happen during grant implementation are not captured. Indicator only measures harmonization with GPE funding and does not distinguish between sector pooled and project pooled. Results can be influenced by the composition of active grants in a given calendar year, specifically when grants vary in volume significantly.

DRAFT

[24] Five fundamental principles recognized in the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness are Ownership, Alignment, Harmonization, Results, and Mutual Accountability.

Official Use Only

VALUE FOR MONEY INDICATORS

The Value for Money (VfM) framework defines GPE's value for money proposition across three domains: the Partnership, the GPE Fund, and the GPE Secretariat — and five dimensions: economy, efficiency, effectiveness, equity, and sustainability.
Value for money propositions

The Partnership (P): Harnesses the expertise, capacities, and resources of all partners to deliver nationally owned education reforms.

The GPE Fund (F): Maximizes the impact of every dollar by leveraging domestic and international resources and incentivizing system-wide reforms.

The GPE Secretariat (S): Facilitates collaboration across the partnership through lean, fit-for-purpose administrative and operational support.

Value for money dimensions

The framework builds on existing value for money frameworks that typically have four dimensions: efficiency, effectiveness, and equity, and adds a fifth dimension, sustainability:

1. **Economy (ECO)** refers to obtaining an appropriate quality of inputs at a reasonable cost.

INDICATOR VFM ECO-P1

Percent of partner countries where education sector partners are taking actions to align their capacities and resources to priority reforms.

Refer to Indicator RF 9

INDICATOR VFM ECO-F1

Total co-financing mobilized through GPE grants.

Refer to Indicator RF 6

DRAFT

Official Use Only

INDICATOR VFM ECO-F2

Grant agent fees and direct grant agent costs as a percentage of the active grant portfolio.

Purpose: To track whether the cost of delivering GPE grants through grant agents remains economical relative to the value of the grant portfolio.

Definition: This indicator measures grant agent implementation fees and direct costs as a proportion of the total value of the active grant portfolio. Lower percentages represent economy by minimizing administrative and oversight costs relative to the value of education investments being managed.

Unit of measurement: Percentage

Calculation method:

At the grant level, for each active grant, identify the annual value of grant agent fees and direct grant agent costs recorded in the Secretariat's financial system. Each individual grant's costs are treated as one observation.

At the aggregate/portfolio level, the value is the total sum of grant agent fees and direct costs across all active grants, divided by the total value of the active grant portfolio, multiplied by 100.

Formula:

Grant level

For each active grant, add the grant agent's fee and any direct grant-specific costs to calculate the total delivery cost for each individual grant.

$$C_g = Fees_g^{GA} + Costs_g^{GA}$$

where:

$Fees_g^{GA}$	the fee charged by the grant agent for managing grant g.
$Costs_g^{GA}$	operational or technical costs incurred directly by the grant agent to support or supervise the implementation of grant g.
C_g	total grant agent delivery cost for grant g.

DRAFT

Official Use Only

Aggregate level

Aggregate across grant-level delivery costs across the portfolio and divide by the total value of the active grant portfolio to determine what percentage of overall grant value is spent on grant agent costs.

$$C\ (\%) = \frac{\sum_{g=1}^{n} C_g}{Total\ Value\ of\ Active\ Grant\ Portfolio} \times 100$$

where:

C	percentage of the total active GPE grant portfolio is spent on grant agent costs
$\sum_{g=1}^{n} C_g$	sum of all grant-level grant agent costs (fees + direct costs) across every grant
n	number of active grants in the portfolio

Reporting timeframe: CY.

Data source: Secretariat financial reports, Board-approved budgets.

Data required: Audited expenditure totals, approved budget ceilings, direct cost statements.

Disaggregation: By grant agent type, grants in partner countries affected by fragility and conflict.

Interpretation: Higher values may signal increased delivery costs, addressing fiduciary risks, or supporting more complex grant designs that require additional grant agent involvement. Lower values reflect more economical delivery of GPE grants, with a smaller proportion of funds used for administrative or support costs, and more is directed to implementation.

Quality standards: Fee and cost data must be consistent with grant agreements. Cost records must align with Secretariat financial reporting standards.

Limitations: Some grant agent support costs may be bundled differently across agencies. Variations in grant size influence cost ratios and may require contextual analysis.

Official Use Only

INDICATOR VFM ECO-S1

Secretariat operational expenditure within Board approved parameters.

Purpose: To track whether the Secretariat delivers its administrative and operational functions economically and within the cost envelope approved by the GPE Board.

Definition: This indicator measures the proportion of actual Secretariat operational expenditure relative to the total budgetary ceiling approved by the Board for the reporting period. Secretariat operational expenditures include all administrative and operational costs necessary to support the functioning of the partnership, such as staffing, travel, technical support, corporate services, and governance. The indicator provides insight into the Secretariat's ability to remain within its mandated resource envelope while delivering on its responsibilities.

Unit of measurement: Percentage

Calculation method:

At the Secretariat level, actual expenditure for the reporting period is identified from validated financial records. This expenditure is then compared against the Board-approved budget ceiling for that same period.

At the aggregate level, the ratio of actual expenditure to the approved ceiling is multiplied by 100 to express the result as a percentage. This percentage indicates whether the Secretariat's operational spending is within, below, or above authorized limits.

Formula:

Secretariat level

At the Secretariat level, compare actual Secretariat spending to the approved budget ceiling.

$$OE_s = \frac{Expenditure_{act}}{Expenditure_{cap}} 100$$

Aggregate level

Aggregate across Secretariat-level expenditure data and express the result as the percentage of the approved Secretariat budget that was used.

Official Use Only

$$ECO\text{-}S1(\%) = OE_s \times 100$$

where:

$Expenditure_{act}$	Actual Secretariat operational expenditure during the fiscal year
$Expenditure_{cap}$	Total Board-approved operational expenditure ceiling for the same fiscal year
OE_s	Ratio of actual expenditure to the approved ceiling
$ECO\text{-}S1(\%)$	Percentage of the approved Secretariat budget that was utilized

Reporting timeframe: CY.

Data source: Secretariat administrative and financial reports including expenditure reports and Board-approved budget documentation.

Data required: Actual expenditure totals for the reporting period, board-approved budget ceiling, financial statements.

Disaggregation: By grant type, by cost category (personnel, travel, procurement).

Interpretation: Higher values or a percentage close to 100% reflects efficient and economical use of allocated funds within approved limits. Lower values or a percentage below 100% may indicate delays in procurement, or operational efficiencies that reduce costs. Values above 100% suggest overspending and raise potential concerns about budget discipline and operational planning. Interpretation must consider the timing of expenditures, multi-year commitments, and operational contingencies.

Quality standards: All financial data must be validated through the Secretariat's financial reporting procedures and aligned with GPE's accounting policies. Expenditure and budget data must reflect audited or formally reviewed financial statements and approved budget decisions.

Limitations: Variations in the timing of procurement, recruitment, and activity implementation may influence expenditure patterns and create temporary under- or over-spending. Multi-year budget commitments may not align evenly within a single fiscal year. Interpretation should consider operational context and annual work planning cycles.

Official Use Only

2. **Efficiency** refers to converting inputs into desired outputs.

INDICATOR VFM EFF-P1

Percentage of partner countries improving sector coordination.

Refer to Indicator RF 12

INDICATOR VFM EFF-F1

Cumulative percentage of grant funds approved under GPE 2030 versus targets.

Purpose: To assess the efficiency of GPE in progressing along its planned funding allocation schedule under GPE 2030. It evaluates whether grant approval volumes match planned targets and whether allocation processes operate as efficiently as intended.

Definition: The indicator measures the cumulative share of grant funds approved relative to the cumulative share of funds expected to be approved according to predefined targets. These targets are established during strategic planning and represent expected pacing of approvals across cohorts and funding windows. The indicator provides insight into how effectively GPE manages the timing and flow of financial commitments.

Unit of measurement: Percentage of grant funds

Calculation method:

At the grant level, the approved value of each grant is identified, which captures the exact allocation amount endorsed for a particular grant during the reporting period.

At the aggregate level, all approved values are summed and divided by the cumulative target amount for that period. This ratio is then expressed as a percentage, multiplied by 100.

Formula:

Grant level
For each grant, identify the approved value endorsed during the reporting period.

$$A_g = ApprovedValue_g$$

Official Use Only

Aggregate level

Aggregate across all approved grant values and compare the total to the cumulative approval target to determine progress toward planned approvals.

$$EFF\text{-}F1(\%) = \left(\frac{\sum_{g=1}^{n} A_g}{Cumulative\ Approval\ Target} \right) \times 100$$

where:

A_g	The *approved value* of grant g
$\sum_{g=1}^{n} A_g$	Total approved value across all grants from 1 to n within the reporting cycle. It consolidates all grant-level approvals into a single portfolio-level figure
$EFF - F1(\%)$	Percentage of cumulative grant approval progress achieved relative to the planned target
n	Number of active grants in the portfolio

Reporting timeframe: CY.

Data source: Administrative data from the Secretariat's internal data system (GPE Connect).

Data required: Approved funding amounts for each grant, Dates of approval for all grants, Cumulative approval targets for the reporting period.

Disaggregation: By grant type, grants in partner countries affected by fragility and conflict.

Interpretation: Higher values or a value of 100% indicate that the GPE has approved exactly the amount of funding originally planned for that point in time, suggesting efficient and timely progress. Values above 100% indicate acceleration, Lower values or a value below 100% reflect delays or slower-than-expected approval processes. Lower percentages may signal bottlenecks in country readiness, quality assurance, or internal approval workflows.

Quality standards: Grant approval data must match official Secretariat records and

Official Use Only

adhere to documented approval dates and values. Targets should be based on formally endorsed planning assumptions.

Limitations: Approval targets may shift due to changes in country readiness, external crises, political developments, or adjustments in the GPE 2030 workplan. As such, interpretation must consider contextual dynamics beyond procedural efficiency.

DRAFT

Official Use Only

INDICATOR EFF-F2

Percentage of active implementation grants that are on track to meet their objectives.

Refer to Indicator RR 2.a

INDICATOR VFM EFF-S1

Ratio of GPE Secretariat staff to number of partner countries.

Purpose: To assess whether the Secretariat maintains sufficient staffing to support its country's engagement and operational responsibilities.

Definition: This indicator measures the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) Secretariat staff relative to the number of partner countries that GPE supports. It provides an assessment of Secretariat capacity in relation to its country-facing workload. A balanced ratio reflects an efficient distribution of staff effort and ensures the Secretariat can meet its operational and technical responsibilities.

Unit of measurement: Ratio

Calculation method:

At the Secretariat level, total staff expressed as FTEs is identified using HR administrative data.

At the aggregate level, the total number of Secretariat staff FTEs is divided by the total number of GPE partner countries. The result is expressed as a ratio of staff-to-country coverage.

Formula:

Secretariat level

At the Secretariat level, identify the total number of staff expressed in full-time equivalents and the total number of partner countries.

$$S = \textit{Total Secretariat FTE staff}$$

$$PC = \textit{Total number of partner countries}$$

Official Use Only

Aggregate level

Aggregate across Secretariat-level staffing and country counts to calculate the ratio of staff to partner countries.

$$EFF\text{-}S1 = \frac{S}{n}$$

where:

S	Total number of Secretariat staff measured in full-time equivalents
$EFF\text{-}S1$	Percentage of grants on track to meet their objectives
n	Total number of partner countries/subnational entities.

Reporting timeframe: CY.

Data source: Secretariat HR and administrative data.

Data required: Total Secretariat FTE staff counts, Total number of GPE partner countries, Staffing records and organizational structure data.

Disaggregation: PCFC, by department or functional area.

Interpretation: Higher ratios may reflect adequate support capacity but could also indicate over-resourcing if not matched to workload. Lower ratios may indicate that staff workloads are high relative to the number of countries supported, potentially affecting responsiveness, technical quality, and overall effectiveness of Secretariat operations. Interpretation requires consideration of workload distribution and the complexity of country engagements.

Quality standards: FTE values must be calculated using consistent HR methodologies. Country lists must reflect official GPE partner classifications.

Limitations: The ratio does not reflect staff workload intensity or the complexity of engagement in different countries. FTE calculations may vary due to temporary assignments or secondments.

DRAFT

Official Use Only

3. **Effectiveness (EFFEC)** refers to converting the outputs of an intervention into the desired results.

INDICATOR VFM EFFEC-P1

Percentage of partner countries where the partnership is demonstrating mutual accountability for effective partnership.
Refer to Indicator RF 9

INDICATOR VFM EFFEC-F1

Number and percentage of children [who benefited from GPE grants or cofinancing from partners] with improved learning outcomes.

Refer to Indicator H4

INDICATOR VFM EFFEC-F2

Percentage of implementation grants that meet their objectives at completion.
Refer to Indicator RR 2.b

INDICATOR VFM EFFEC-S1

Percentage of Secretariat key performance indicators (KPIs) met in each reporting period.

Purpose: To track the overall effectiveness of the GPE Secretariat in delivering on its internal performance commitments. By measuring the proportion of Secretariat KPIs met in a given reporting period, the indicator provides an overarching view of Secretariat performance management, operational execution, and alignment with organizational priorities.

Definition: This indicator measures the percentage of Secretariat performance indicators that meet or exceed their targets within a defined reporting period. KPI categories may include operational processes, service delivery standards, governance support, technical assistance quality, and internal management metrics. A KPI is classified as "met" when actual performance meets or surpasses the target set for the period.

Unit of measurement: Percentage of KPIs.

Official Use Only

Calculation method:
At the KPI level: each Secretariat KPI is assessed as either met (1) or not met (0) during the reporting period.

At the aggregate level, the number of KPIs met is divided by the total number of KPIs tracked for that period, multiplied by 100.

Formula:
KPI level

At the KPI level, classify each KPI as met (1) or not met (0).

$$K_i = \begin{cases} 1 & if\ KPI\ i\ is\ met \\ 0 & Otherwise \end{cases}$$

Aggregate level
Aggregate across KPI level results to calculate the percentage of KPIs met during thE reporting period.

$$EFF\text{-}S1(\%) = \left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m} K_i}{m}\right) \times 100$$

where:

A_g	a binary indicator that indicates whether KPI i as met (1) or not (0)
$\sum_{i=1}^{m} K_i$	total KPIs met within the reporting period
$EFF\text{-}S1(\%)$	percentage of Secretariat KPIs successfully met
m	total number of KPIs included in Secretariat performance monitoring

Reporting timeframe: CY.

Data source: Secretariat internal performance reports submitted to the Board Executive Committee.

Data required: KPI framework and targets for the reporting period, Actual performance results for each KPI, Verification documentation for KPI achievement.

Disaggregation: By KPI category.

DRAFT

Official Use Only

Interpretation: A high proportion of KPIs met indicate strong Secretariat performance and effective internal management. Low values may reflect operational challenges, capacity constraints, delays in strategic initiatives, or misalignment of planned targets to resource availability.

Quality standards: KPI definitions, calculations, and assessments must follow Secretariat performance management guidelines. Data must be validated during internal review.

Limitations: KPI targets may vary in ambition from one reporting period to another. Internal systems and data quality affect accuracy.

DRAFT

Official Use Only

4. **Equity** (EQY) refers to considering the opportunities and constraints that people, particularly the most marginalized, face in spending and programming decisions.

INDICATOR VFM EQY-P1

Percentage of partner countries with inclusive local education groups.
Refer to Indicator RF 10

INDICATOR VFM EQY-F1

Percentage of GPE grant financing that is allocated to (i) low-income countries (ii) countries affected by fragility and conflict.

Purpose: To track the extent to which GPE financing is directed toward countries with the greatest need, specifically low-income countries (LICs) and countries affected by fragility and conflict (PCFC).

Definition: This indicator measures the proportion of total GPE grant financing that is directed to low-income countries (LICs) and countries affected by fragility and conflict (PCFCs). It reflects how much of the active GPE grant portfolio supports education systems facing the greatest financial and systemic challenges. By quantifying the share of resources allocated to LICs and PCFC contexts.

Unit of measurement: Percentage of grant funds.

Calculation method:

At the grant level: each active grant is assigned a classification depending on whether it belongs to a LIC, PCFC, or neither. The grant amounts for each grant g is recorded.

At the aggregate level: the total grants amounts for grants classified as LIC or PCFC are summed separately and divided by the total value of the active GPE grant portfolio. Each resulting ratio is then multiplied by 100 to produce two separate percentages: percentage of financing for LIC percentage of financing for PCFC, multiplied by 100.

Formula:
Grant level

At the grant level, record the grant amount (in US$) value associated with each active grant.

Official Use Only

$$F_g = Grant\ amount\ value_g$$

Aggregate level (LIC)

Aggregate across grants' amounts for all LIC grants to calculate the percentage of total portfolio financing allocated to LICs.

$$EQT\text{-}F1_{LIC}(\%) = \left(\frac{\sum_{g \in LIC} F_g}{Total\ Value\ of\ Active\ Grant\ Portfolio} \right) \times 100$$

Aggregate level (PCFC)

Aggregate across grants' amounts for all PCFC grants to calculate the percentage of total portfolio financing allocated to PCFCs.

$$EQT\text{-}F1_{PCFC}(\%) = \left(\frac{\sum_{g \in PCFC} F_g}{Total\ Value\ of\ Active\ Grant\ Portfolio} \right) \times 100$$

where:

F_g	grant amount value of grant *g*, representing the full value of the grant included in the active portfolio.
$\sum_{g \in LIC} F_g$	total grants amounts allocated to all grants in LICs
$\sum_{g \in PCFC} F_g$	total grants amounts allocated to all grants in countries affected by fragility and conflict
$Total\ Value\ of\ Active\ Grant\ Portfolio$	total grants amounts across all active GPE grants
$EQT\text{-}F1_{LIC}(\%)$	percentage of total financing allocated to LICs
$EQT\text{-}F1_{PCFC}(\%)$	percentage of total financing allocated respectively to PCFCs

Reporting timeframe: CY.

Data source: Secretariat administrative data.

DRAFT

Official Use Only

Data required: LIC and PCFC country classification, Grant's financing value, Total portfolio financing value.

Disaggregation: By grant type, LIC, PCFC.

Interpretation: Higher values reflect a stronger equity orientation in GPE's financing model, indicating emphasis on countries with the greatest need.

Quality standards: Country classifications must align with recognized GPE criteria for LIC and PCFC designation. Grant financing values must reflect official portfolio totals.

Limitations: Changes in LIC/PCFC classifications during a grant cycle may affect comparability. Portfolio shifts over time may influence percentages independent of equity intent. Lower values may indicate shifts in portfolio composition due to demand patterns, eligibility changes, or grant cycles rather than reduced equity commitment.

INDICATOR VFM EQY-F2

Number and percentage of children with disabilities supported with better education [through GPE grants or co-financing from partners].

Refer to Indicator H1

INDICATOR VFM EQY-F3

Number and percentage of children and youth that benefit from interventions that promote gender equality [financed through GPE grants and cofinancing from partners].

Refer to Indicator H2

INDICATOR VFM EQY-F4

Number and percentage of out-of-school children and youth provided education and/or training [through GPE grants and cofinancing from partners].

Refer to Indicator H3

INDICATOR VFM EQY-F5

Proportion of grant financing allocated to interventions to improve (i) gender equality (ii) disability inclusion (gender and disability marker data).

Official Use Only

Purpose: To monitor GPE-financed grants that allocate funding to interventions that promote gender equality and disability inclusion, using gender and disability marker data to track alignment with GPE's equity-focused priorities.

Definition: This indicator measures the proportion of total implementation grant financing allocated to activities that advance gender equality and disability inclusion, as identified through GPE's gender marker and disability inclusion marker (see grant coding framework in Annex C forthcoming). These markers classify grant-funded interventions according to their intended objectives around gender equality and disability inclusion.

Funding tagged under these markers includes activities around support to gender-transformative change, address gender-based barriers, strengthen equitable access and learning for girls, support learners with disabilities, or reinforce inclusive education systems.

Unit of measurement: Percentage of grant funds.

Calculation method:

At the grant level, for each implementation grant, the total amount of financing tagged for gender equality and the total amount of financing tagged for disability inclusion are identified using the gender marker and disability inclusion marker. Each tagged financing amount for a particular grant is recorded as a separate observation, alongside the total value of the grant.

At the aggregate level, all financing amounts tagged for gender equality across the portfolio are summed and divided by the total value of all implementation grants with available marker data. The same calculation is performed separately for financing tagged for disability inclusion. Each resulting ratio is then multiplied by 100 to produce two separate percentages.

Formula:

Grant level

At the grant level, identify three financing values for each implementation grant g:

$$G_g = \textit{Financing allocated to gender equality for grant } g$$

$$D_g = \textit{Financing allocated to disability inclusion for grant } g$$

Official Use Only

$$T_g = \textit{Total implementation grant amount for grant } g$$

Aggregate level (Gender)

Aggregate across all implementation grants to calculate the proportion of total grant financing allocated to gender equality and disability inclusion.

Aggregate level (Disability Inclusion)

Aggregate across all implementation grants to calculate the proportion of total grant financing allocated to gender equality and disability inclusion.

$$EQY\text{-}F4_{Gender}(\%) = \left(\frac{\sum_{g=1}^{n} G_g}{\sum_{g=1}^{n} T_g}\right) \times 100$$

$$EQY\text{-}F4_{Disability\ inclusion}(\%) = \left(\frac{\sum_{g=1}^{n} D_g}{\sum_{g=1}^{n} T_g}\right) \times 100$$

where:

G_g	Grant amounts allocated to gender equality interventions for grant g.
D_g	Grant amounts allocated to disability inclusion interventions for grant g
T_g	Total implementation grant amount for grant g
n	Total number of implementation grants in the portfolio

Reporting timeframe: CY.

Data source: Gender marker and disability inclusion markers database validated by Secretariat, using program documentation.

Data required: Gender equality marker classifications and associated grant amounts per grant, disability inclusion marker classifications and associated grant amounts per grant, total approved grant amounts, and program documentation.

DRAFT

Official Use Only

Disaggregation: By grant type, PCFC,

Interpretation: Higher values indicate a greater allocation of GPE grant financing toward gender equality and disability inclusion. This suggests stronger alignment with GPE's commitments to equity, inclusion, and addressing system-level barriers affecting girls and learners with disabilities.

Quality standards: Marker assignments must be based on documented evidence in grant design packages and validated through Secretariat QA processes. Financing amounts linked to markers must match approved grant budgets and be consistently coded across grants.

Limitations: Marker-based financial allocations capture the intended focus of grant activities but do not measure whether interventions produce actual gender or disability inclusion outcomes. Differences in marker interpretation across countries or grant agents may introduce inconsistencies, requiring strong Secretariat validation. Additionally, system-level reforms may contribute to equity outcomes even if they are not explicitly tagged, potentially underrepresenting their impact. Lower proportions of the indicator may signal the need to strengthen integration of gender-responsive and disability-inclusive approaches during program design and implementation.

INDICATOR VFM EQY-S1

Secretariat equity indicator

Under development.

DRAFT

Official Use Only

5. **Sustainability (SUS)** refers to the extent to which the positive impacts of GPE funding and support to partner countries continue (or are likely to continue) after the initial funding or support ends.

INDICATOR VFM SUS-P1

Percentage of partner countries whose priority reform is improving key education system components.
Refer to Indicator RF 1

INDICATOR VFM SUS-P2

Number of policy changes in partner countries influenced by civil society organizations, teachers' organizations, youth groups, or private providers of education.

Refer to Indicator RF 11

INDICATOR VFM SUS-F1

Percentage of GPE implementation grant-funded programs that contribute to the sustainability of priority reforms.
Refer to Indicator RF 8

INDICATOR VFM SUS-F2

Percentage of partner countries achieving top-up triggers related to the volume, equity, and efficiency of domestic finance.

Refer to Indicator RF 5.b

INDICATOR VFM SUS-F3

Percentage of partner countries achieving top-up triggers related to reporting on SDG 4.1.1a.

Refer to Indicator RF 3.b

DRAFT

Official Use Only

ANNEX A
METHODOLOGY CRITERIA FOR THE CLASSIFICATION OF GPE PARTNER COUNTRIES (Fragility and Conflict, and Refugee Hosting)

GPE Partner Countries Affected by Fragility and Conflict (PCFC)

A country is categorized as a GPE Partner Country Affected by Fragility and Conflict (PCFC) if it is included in either the World Bank Group Classification of Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations and/or the UNESCO Global Education Monitoring Report (GEMR) Conflict Affected Countries list[25]. Inclusion in one or both sources qualifies a country to be classified as GPE PCFC.

The PCFC list is updated annually by the end of August, following the publication of updated classifications by the World Bank and UNESCO.

GPE Partner Countries considered with high refugee hosting

A country is categorized as a GPE Partner Country with High Refugee Hosting if it meets the refugee-hosting threshold based on data from the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), using refugee counts only[26] (excluding internally displaced persons) and World Bank population data. A country is classified as high refuge hosting if it hosts either (i) 100,000 or more refugees, or (ii) a refugee population equivalent to at least 0.5 percent of its total population.

The high refugee hosting classification list is prepared annually, using the most recent two years of available data to minimize data gaps.

[25] To be part of the list a country must either cumulate more than 1,000 deaths over the past 10 years, or more than 200 deaths in one year in the past 3 years.
[26] https://ourworldindata.org/grapher/refugee-population-by-country-or-territory-of-asylum#explore-the-data

Official Use Only