GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP for EDUCATION

August 2018

Terms of Reference

Clarifying roles, responsibilities, authorities, accountabilities, resourcing and risk at the country level as part of GPE's Efficient Partnership Review Action Plan

1. BACKGROUND

Established in 2002, the Global Partnership for Education (GPE), formerly the Education for All Fast-Track Initiative, is a multi-stakeholder partnership focused on supporting and financing education in low and lower middle-income countries, contributing to the achievement of Sustainable Development Goal on Education (SDG 4). GPE's strategic goals and objectives are to achieve improvements in learning outcomes, equity and efficiency across the 89 developing countries eligible to join the partnership (67 are currently developing country partners, or DCPs). The Partnership's strategic plan, GPE 2020, outlines its approach to achieving both global and country level impacts, the latter through its support for strengthened educational systems, including support to education sector planning, inclusive policy dialogue and mutual accountability, and financing for the implementation of sector plans.

GPE offers an operational model to support developing country partners' efforts in building effective education systems and in engaging in policy dialogue with its partners around planning, implementation and monitoring of their education sector plans. At the country level, the model is made up of core actors, with the Developing Country Partner (DCP) at the center, the Local Education Group (LEG) as a multi-partner body, the Coordinating Agency (CA), and the Grant Agent (GA). In addition to these actors, the Secretariat has a supporting role throughout the national education sector policy cycle and, as such, is considered part of the operational model.

During the December 2016 Board of Directors meeting, in the context of discussing Secretariat capacity and efficiency, the Board decided to expand the discussion and look beyond just Secretariat capacity. The Board requested the Secretariat, with the help of an external firm, to examine how other key actors of the partnership such as grant agents, coordinating agencies, and local education groups can operate as efficiently and effectively as possible to deliver GPE 2020.

Accordingly, the Secretariat retained Oxford Policy Management (OPM) in Partnership with Dalberg to conduct a review of the Partnership effectiveness and efficiency at country level.

Overseen by the Grant and Performance Committee (GPC), OPM completed the review with submission of the final report to the Board of Directors in June 2018.

As a result of these discussions, the Board requested GPC to develop a costed action plan to address key areas where the GPE operational model needs strengthening, notably to address roles, responsibilities, authorities, accountabilities, resourcing and risk-ownership of key actors; to improve communication on the operational model to ensure all stakeholders are well informed of the overall goals, objectives, theory of change, operating modalities and associated roles, etc.; and following the Board's discussions of Institutional Arrangements in November and December, to address any further areas that need improvement. It is expected that this could include follow-up to the Efficient Partnership Review report's conclusions on capacity building and strengthening mutual accountability.

2. CONTEXT OF THE ASSIGNMENT

The OPM report - ***Efficient Partnership Review: an examination of key actors' roles in GPE's country-level operational model*** (included in reference materials) - presented analysis and findings regarding the efficiency and effectiveness of key actors in GPE's country-level operational model, from the perspective of the key actors themselves. The study was based largely on primary data collected through interviews, written responses and webinars with developing country partners (DCPs), development partners (DPs, multilateral and bilateral), and civil society organizations (CSOs). The findings were presented in chapters reflecting five main subjects of focus: local education groups (LEGs), grant agents (GAs), coordinating agencies (CAs), GPE's Secretariat, and capacity development.

The OPM report was presented to GPE's Board at its June 12-14, 2018 meeting. Based on the recommendations in this report, and following Board discussions, the Board requested the GPC to develop a costed action plan to address key areas where the GPE operational model needs further clarification and strengthening. The GPC has now developed a draft Effective Partnership Review Action Plan, that identifies the following three workstreams:

- **Workstream I:** Clarifying roles, responsibilities, authorities, accountabilities, resourcing and risk at country level to ensure GPE makes optimal use of its resources to deliver on GPE 2020. The first output of this workstream will be Board decisions on an identified

sub-set of roles, responsibilities etc. that are of critical importance to rendering the GPE operational model effective, notably regarding grant development and management but also for functions related to the broader partnership agenda of leveraging effective collaboration, policies and strategies to deliver results on equity and learning outcome goals. Following Board decision, the Secretariat will review and update terms of reference (TORs) for the key actors in accordance with the decision. These TORs and other resulting guidance will then be incorporated into the Partnership Engagement Strategy (Workstream II). A clearer definition of the roles and responsibilities of the various actors in the partnership will lead to a stronger understanding of each actor's expectations under the concept of mutual accountability, leading to a clearer and tighter ability to respond to the findings in GPE's annual Results Report.

- **Workstream II:** Developing a Partnership Engagement Strategy to ensure GPE's goals, objectives, operational model and associated roles, responsibilities and accountabilities are well understood by all partners, particularly at country level, and that stakeholders are effectively engaged to contribute to achieving impact through mutual accountability.
- **Workstream III:** Addressing further work by the GPC, other committees and the Board, including potential revisions to the Charter; reviewing the resources necessary to implement new accountabilities and roles, and to ensure capacity building to strengthen systems building through GPE's grants and processes; and possibly revising grant policies and guidelines, country-level operational guidance and decision making and reporting of results through portfolio review and results framework.

The GPE Secretariat is hereby seeking an external firm to assist in the execution of the tasks outlined in Workstream I.

3. SCOPE OF WORK AND METHODOLOGY

The external firm will be tasked with providing propositions for making clear choices in the delineation of roles, responsibilities, authorities, accountabilities, resourcing and risk-ownership of key actors, with a specific focus on grant agents but also including coordinating agencies, the Secretariat country leads, and these in relation to the role of government partners and capacity

for policy dialogue at country level. A key element will be to clarify who is accountable for what to whom, and how these accountabilities should work in practice[1].

The specific activities and timeline associated with Workstream I are detailed below:

Activity	Description	Timeline
1. Framing of Options	Using the mapping prepared by OPM, the external firm selected will consolidate findings into options for potential solutions, including associated risks and opportunities.	By mid-September, 2018
2. Benchmark GPE roles against comparators	Desk review/interviews with GAVI, Global Fund, Green Climate Fund and the Global Environment Facility (GEF)to assess how similar authorities, risks and accountabilities are addressed, and how the potential options outlined in Activity 1 compare.	By mid-September, 2018
3. Analysis of options	Define a consultation process to stress test options. Using the mapping and set of options: Consult grant agent (GA) representatives regarding their institutional parameters (using a set of key questions on accountabilities, authorities, responsibilities, fees, etc.), to determine potential scenarios for GA roles, authorities, accountabilities, etc. Analyze coordinating agency (CA) and Secretariat country lead (CL) roles and corresponding resource needs in relation to one another and to GA.	By end September, 2018

[1] Roles and accountabilities of key actors who are not covered by Terms of Reference also need reinforcement. These are set out in the GPE Charter, including for Government, Civil Society Organizations, Teacher Organizations, Private Sector and Foundations, and development partners who are members of the Local Education Group (LEG) but who do not hold the role as CA or GA. Clarification on these roles and accountabilities is partly being addressed in the related LEG workstream under the oversight of the Strategy and Impact Committee.

	Clarify the role of government with some initial categorization by level of capacity and fragility[2] & propose how this may impact adaptation of GA, CA and CL roles. Use face-to-face consultations, Webex/Skype, webinar, surveys and other methodologies to compile and synthesize feedback on options from stakeholders. Give all constituency groups opportunities to engage with potential options through webinars.	
4. Preparation of draft options	Prepare draft decision options in the form of a PowerPoint presentation for review and discussion by the GPC at its October meeting, with background documents as needed on GA institutional limitations; advantages and constraints related to each option; etc.	By October 7, 2018
5. First review of options	Presentation and discussion at the October 10-12, 2018 face-to-face GPC meeting, to be held in Washington D.C.	October 10-12, 2018
6. Preparation of Options Paper	Based on direction from GPC, prepare options paper for discussion by the Board, finalizing annexes on institutional limitations, advantages and constraints, institutional implications of options, etc.	October 30, 2018
7. Board retreat discussion	Presentation of options at the November 5-7, 2018 face-to-face Board retreat, to be held in Washington D.C., as a basis for finalizing decision paper.	November 5-7, 2018
8. Finalization of Options Paper	Based on direction from Board, prepare final options paper for decision by the Board	November 15, 2018
9. Board meeting discussion	Presentation of final options paper at the December 6-7, 2018 face-to-face Board meeting, to be held in Dublin, Ireland	December 6-7, 2018

[2] The consultants will draw on relevant categorization mechanisms from other organizations (UNDP, World Bank, etc.) compiled and synthesized by the Secretariat.

The external firm will draw on OPM's final mapping that highlights where clarity is needed to frame the key issues that need to be addressed in the development of options for roles, responsibilities, authorities, accountabilities, resourcing and risk-ownership (activity 1) and benchmarking how roles etc. are assigned against other partnerships/funds (activity 2). This will lead to defining and testing concrete options for decisions on key functions and corresponding roles, responsibilities, authorities, accountabilities, resourcing and risk ownership (activity 3). Given time constraints, aspects of activity 1, 2, and 3 will run concurrently, though sequentially the framing under activity 1 will start first, followed by initial benchmarking (activity 2). Each activity will iteratively inform the other.

Under activity 1, the consultants will conduct initial discussions of wider strategic contextual thinking with a cross-section of Board members and GPE senior staff. Under activity 3 they will engage in dialogue with representatives of key roles (GA, CA and CLs) to clarify legal and policy parameters, capacity, resource needs, and any other parameters to consider in developing options.

Key background resources for this work will include the OPM review and synthesis of findings, but also the findings and recommendations of GPE's External Review of Risk Management as well as emerging evaluation outcomes from the GPE evaluation strategy and MOPAN[3].

To ensure the outcomes of the organizational design work in activity 1-3 meet Board expectations, the oversight arrangement for the consultancy will include a small Secretariat steering group at management level, which will provide regular updates to the GPC Chair and through the GPC Chair, check in with and update the Coordinating Committee. A senior officer is assigned to lead on project management of this work.

The consultants will present draft options to the GPC at their meeting on October 10-12, 2018 and on that basis, will finalize a proposal for the Board at its retreat in November so that these options can contribute to inform the Board's discussions.

[3] Multilateral Organizations Performance Assessment Network, currently assessing GPE.

Based on discussions at the Board retreat, the consultants will produce a final options paper for Board decision at its meeting on December 6-7, 2018.

4. DELIVERABLES AND TIMELINE

Key deliverables and Timeline

The assignment will commence in late August/early September and finalize in December 2018. The external firm is expected to work closely with the Secretariat steering group and GPC on its submission of the following deliverables:

Deliverables	Timeline
Develop Inception Presentation on Key Issues/Outputs (Prepare a short presentation, of no more than 10 slides, to highlight and agree on the key issues, proposed methodology and expected outputs.)	Within 2 days of the initial meeting with the Secretariat steering group
Develop Options Paper (Based on inputs from Efficient Partnership Review and other sources, includes consolidating findings into options for potential solutions, including associated risks and opportunities.)	By September 14, 2018
Conduct desk reviews/interviews (Interviews with GAVI, Global Fund, Green Climate Fund and the Global Environment Facility (GEF) to assess how similar authorities, risks and accountabilities are addressed and how the potential options outlined above in Activity 1 compare)	By September 14, 2018
Undertake Consultation Process to Determine Viability of Options (Define and undertake a consultation process to determine the precise viability of options in practice and compile and synthesize feedback received.)	By September 30, 2018 (potential to continue some consultation between September 30-October 10)
Prepare Draft Decision Options	By October 7, 2018

(Prepare draft decision options paper and accompanying PowerPoint presentation for review and discussion by the GPC at its October 2018 meeting in Washington D.C.)	
Present Draft Decision Options (Present PowerPoint and discuss draft decision options at the October 10-12, 2018 GPC meeting.)	October 10-12, 2018
Revise Presentation of Draft Decision Options (Revise decision options as needed based on GPC deliberation and submit revised options paper to Board.)	October 17, 2018
Present Revised Options (Present PowerPoint on revised options at November 2018 Board retreat in Washington D.C. as a basis for discussion).	November 5-7, 2018
Revise Presentation of Final Options (Revise final options as needed based on Board deliberation and submit final options paper to Board.)	November 14, 2018
Present Final Options (Present PowerPoint on final options at December 2018 Board meeting in Dublin, Ireland as a basis for decision.	December 6-7, 2018

The timeline for completion of these tasks is very tight. Given the importance of delivering clear decisions to the Board, all deadlines for the deliverables set out in this Terms of Reference should be strictly adhered to and efforts should be taken to ensure that all deliverables are submitted according to the agreed deadlines above, and as they are being developed. The external firm contracted needs to commit to being able to deliver as per the deadlines noted above in order to be selected. The external firm will be expected to mobilize staffing resources as needed and minimize any risks that may hinder progress against all agreed deliverables.

Participation in Meetings

The external firm will be required to participate in the following:

- 2 face-to-face consultations to stress-test the viability of options in practice (By mid-October, 2018, Paris, France + European city TBD)
- 1 face-to-face meeting of the Grants and Performance Committee (October 10-12, 2018, Washington, D.C.)
- GPE Board of Directors face-to-face retreat (November 5-7, Washington DC)
- GPE Board of Directors face-to-face meeting (December 6-7, Dublin, Ireland)
- The firm may be required to provide updates via audio calls and consult with external consultants and a working group of the Board examining GPE's institutional arrangements with the World Bank on emerging issues and options that may be of relevance given this topic will also be considered at the face-to-face retreat

As noted above, the external firm should budget for a face-to-face meeting in October 2018 (Washington), another face-to-face meeting to present the options to the GPE Board in November 2018 (Washington) and a final face-to-face meeting to present the final results to the GPE Board in December 2018 (Ireland). All other meetings will be facilitated using audioconference and online technologies.

Acceptance Criteria for Inception Presentation

The inception presentation should define the specific activities to accomplish the overall goals of the assignment. The presentation should be no longer than 10 pages and should include tasks, staffing and level of effort, methods for gathering information, proposed methodology, and outputs. The inception presentation can be delivered in .pptx format.

Acceptance Criteria for Final Options Report

The final report will comprise the following sections: (i) executive summary; (ii) main text; (iii) annexes; and (iv) references. The report will be delivered in .docx format in letter (8.5 x 11) layout. The final report will be presented in digital versions in English.

The report must meet the following criteria:

- It should be written clearly, to be understood by an audience consisting of GPE Board members and other GPE partners. The tone of the report should be impartial and constructive.
- It should be written in American business English. Each draft should be professionally edited before being presented to the GPE Secretariat and GPC.
- There should be creative use of tables and high-quality graphics.
- The report should draw upon evidence already gathered and using the consultants' expertise to determine ways in which the ambiguities in the various roles and differences in opinion should be addressed using concrete options for resolving them.
- The report should outline clear options on the roles, responsibilities, authorities, accountabilities, resourcing and risk-ownership of the Grant Agent, Coordinating Agency and Secretariat Country Lead roles. For each option there should be an assessment of benefits and risks/challenges.
- Options should be clearly linked to findings from the various sources, benchmarking and consultations.

5. PAYMENT SCHEDULE FOR CONTRACT AMOUNT:

Payment will be made as follows:

- 10% on contract signature
- 30% on acceptance of Draft Options Report
- 60% on acceptance of Final Options Report

Funds will be disbursed upon satisfactory finalization of deliverables, based on GPE approval. The costs associated with editing reports and presentations described in above will be borne by the external firm (however translation costs will be borne by the Secretariat). The costs associated with the use of (as well as the management of) sub-contractors hired by the external firm will be borne by the external firm. Any other applicable costs will fall to the selected external consulting firm.

6. REFERENCE MATERIALS

Various reference materials related to GPE's operational model are available in the table below. In addition, the Secretariat will make all relevant data and documents available to the selected external firm; will facilitate access to staff, partners, Board members, and constituent representatives for interviews.

Primary Reference Materials:

- Efficient Partnership Review
- MOPAN evaluation preliminary conclusions
- GPE country level evaluations
- Grant Agent TOR
- ToR for Coordinating Agencies
- Country Lead job description
- GPE Charter
- GPE Country-level Process Guide
- Institutional Arrangement papers (December 2017 and June 2018)
- Standard Selection Process for Grant Agents - ESPIG
- Conflict Resolution Procedures
- GPE Fund Governance
- Evans Hosting Review from 2012
- Evans Staffing Review from 2014

Secondary Reference Materials:

- ESPDG Guidelines
- PDG Guidelines
- ESPIG Guidelines
- ESPIG Policy
- Policy and Communications Protocol on Misuse of GPE Trust Funds