**GPE Funding Model Requirements Matrix –** Enter Country Name

The table below is based on the Board paper, Operational Framework for Requirements and Incentives in the Funding Model of the Global Partnership (BOD/2014/05-DOC 03). It aims at helping countries analyze their readiness vis-à-vis the fulfillment of the requirements of the GPE funding model, and identify actions to be taken by the country to further comply with these (both in view of the application submission and medium/longer term actions). This matrix is jointly prepared by country level partners and the Secretariat Country Leads.

This matrix will also form the basis of the discussion during Quality Assurance Review (QAR) Phase 1 and will be subject to changes by the Secretariat according to the findings of QAR phase 1. The matrix will be presented for information to and feedback from the Grants and Performance Committee (GPC) with regard to country readiness and recommended action(s) prior to the submission of the grant application. GPC feedback will be reported to the countries.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Requirements for the fixed component of the Program Implementation Grant (70% of the allocation)** | **Technical specifications and sources of verification** | **Country situation** | **Actions identified (specify timing; what needs to be done before application VS. medium/longer term)** |
| **Requirement 1: Credible, endorsed Education Sector Plan (ESP)**  |
| **1.1 Credible Education Sector Plan or equivalent, including a costed multi-year implementation plan** |
| * 1. Education Sector Plan has to be “credible”
 | a ‘credible’ Education Sector Plan (ESP) will include evidence-based strategies for access to quality basic education for all, cover all sub-sectors and both formal and non-formal education, have an appropriate balance between sub-sectors, and focus on the learner as the central beneficiary. To be feasible, an ESP must pay attention to financial, technical and political constraints and stakeholder ownership, and be context-sensitive with regard to vulnerabilities such as conflicts, natural disasters and economic crisis.)For more detailed information, please refer to the [Plan Preparation Guidelines](http://www.globalpartnership.org/useful-resources-for-gpe-grants) developed by GPE and UNESCO/IIEP | Click here to enter text. | Click here to enter text. |
| * 1. Endorsed no later than 3 months before submission of the Program Implementation Grant application
 | This criterion is exclusively on the endorsement process and does not discuss the quality, credibility and feasibility of the ESP (see above cell)  | Click here to enter text. | Click here to enter text. |
| * 1. Costed multi-year implementation plan covering at least the first 2 years of grant cycle
 | For more detailed information, please refer to the Plan Preparation Guidelines developed by GPE and UNESCO/IIEP | Click here to enter text. | Click here to enter text. |
| 1.2 In fragile and conflict-affected states, a costed Transitional Education Sector Plan (TESP) may fulfil the requirement | For more detailed information, please refer to the Plan Preparation Guidelines developed by GPE and UNESCO/IIEP  | Click here to enter text. | Click here to enter text. |
| **Requirement 2: Evidence of commitment to the ESP/TESP and its financing** |
| * 1. **Government commitment**
 |
| 1. Commitment to finance ESP
 | Budget law should include provisions to finance national contribution during first year, and, if available, MTEF should forecast enough resources to finance second and third year. In any situation, the ESP financing framework should make clear the domestic resources devoted to education over the planned period.  | Click here to enter text. | Click here to enter text. |
| 1. Current government commitment to education: lower/higher than 20% of national budget?
 | The economic prospects for reaching or maintaining the 20% of national budget target should be stated in the ESP and should be relevant with the macro-economic assumptions and framework | Click here to enter text. | Click here to enter text. |
| 1. If the country has not reached Universal Primary Education, an extra commitment to allocate at least 45% of the education budget to primary education is requested.
 |  | Click here to enter text. | Click here to enter text. |
| * 1. **Development partners commitment**
 |
| 1. DP’s intended financial support to the ESP/TESP reflected in the plan’s financial framework
 |  | Click here to enter text. | Click here to enter text. |
| **Requirement 3: Availability of Data (or a strategy to obtain Data)** |
| **3.1 Education Sector Analysis** |
| 1. Education Sector Analysis conducted no more than three years prior to the grant application submission?[[1]](#footnote-1)
 |  | Click here to enter text. | Click here to enter text. |
| 1. In fragile contexts, a time-bound plan to carry out an ESA.
 |  | Click here to enter text. | Click here to enter text. |
| 1. ESA includes context analysis (including demographic analysis), analysis of existing policies, costs and financing, system performance and system capacity.
 | For more detailed information, please refer to the Plan Preparation Guidelines developed by GPE and UNESCO/IIEP | Click here to enter text. | Click here to enter text. |
| 1. ESA addresses vulnerability and equity (marginalized groups, girls, children with disabilities)
 | For more detailed information, please refer to the Plan Preparation Guidelines developed by GPE and UNESCO/IIEP | Click here to enter text. | Click here to enter text. |
| **3.2 Basic financial and education data to monitor sector** |
| 1. Availability of basic financial and education data disaggregated by gender and socio-economic status[[2]](#footnote-2)
	* EMIS
	* Household surveys
 | * EMIS: timing of school data collection, Timing of EMIS/statistics publication, Funding source, Levels of education covered, Response rate, Estimation of missing values e.g. for community or Koranic schools, Issues regarding EMIS, Assessment of EMIS and main recommendations/perspectives to improve EMIS
* Household surveys: years of last household surveys such as DHS, MICS, CWIQ, LFS etc., If the data was analyzed to highlight equity issues related to gender, urban/rural, regions, income quintile, disability etc.
 | Click here to enter text. | Click here to enter text. |
| OR1. A time-bound plan to develop or strengthen the national EMIS
 |  | Click here to enter text. | Click here to enter text. |
| **3.3 System or mechanism to monitor learning outcomes** |
| 1. System or mechanism to monitor learning outcomes[[3]](#footnote-3)

OR1. A time-bound plan to develop mechanisms to monitor learning outcomes
 | Types of learning assessments done and years carried out- national and international, Education level targeted, Subjects covered, Availability of databases, Sources of funding, Implementer of the assessment, Plans for future assessments and frequency, intended uses | Click here to enter text. | Click here to enter text. |
| * 1. **Reporting of critical data to UNESCO Institute of Statistics for global monitoring of education progress**
 |
| 1. The type of data that was last reported (specify the year) + challenges identified in the reporting + strategies in place for improving reporting to UIS
 |  | Click here to enter text. | Click here to enter text. |

1. When an endorsed ESP is already being implemented, the requirement is to conduct an ESA prior to the development of the next phase of the ESP. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Socio-economic status can be taken from household survey data [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. National exams are not considered as an effective monitoring mechanism if their data are not directly used to monitor learning outcomes at school level. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)