

**EFFECTIVE PARTNERSHIP REVIEW: GRANTS AND PERFORMANCE COMMITTEE ACTION PLAN**

**For Decision**

---

*Please note: Board papers are deliberative in nature and, in accordance with the GPE Transparency Policy, are not public documents until the Board has considered them at the Board meeting. It is understood that constituencies will circulate Board documents among their members prior to the Board meeting for consultation purposes.*

**1. STRATEGIC PURPOSE**

1.1 The purpose of this paper is to request the Board to approve the action plan proposed by the Grants and Performance Committee (GPC) in response to Board decision BOD/2018/06-09 on the Effective Partnership Review (EPR) conducted by Oxford Policy Management (OPM). Specifically, the Board at its June 12-14, 2018 meeting requested the GPC to develop a costed action plan for Board approval by July 31, 2018 with clear actions and a time table:

**BOD/2018/06-09–Effective Partnership Review:** The Board of Directors:

4. Requests the GPC to develop a costed action plan by end July 2018 with clear actions and a timetable for Board approval, including:
  - a. In order to strengthen mutual accountability, a proposal to review and clarify roles, responsibilities, authorities, accountabilities, resourcing and risks at country level, resulting in revised terms of reference for key actors including Developing Country Partners, Grant Agents, Coordinating Agencies and the Secretariat Country Leads.
  - b. A communication strategy to ensure GPE's goals, objectives, operating model and associated roles, responsibilities and accountabilities are well understood by all partners.
  - c. Actions that need to be taken forward following the institutional arrangements decision in December 2018.
5. Requests that the costed action plan clearly reflect how members of the Board, relevant committees, and their constituencies will be responsible for its implementation.

## 2. RECOMMENDED DECISION

2.1 The GPC recommends that the Board approve the following decision:

**BOD/2018/07-XX–Effective Partnership Review Action Plan:** The Board of Directors, in reference to BOD/2018/06-09:

1. Approves the Effective Partnership Review Action Plan proposed by the Grants and Performance Committee and set out in Annex 1 to BOD/2018/07 DOC 01 for implementation by the Secretariat under the oversight of the GPC.
2. Requests options under the Action Plan's Workstream 1 to be presented at its retreat in November 2018 for discussion and to identify potential decisions for its December 2018 meeting.

## 3. BACKGROUND

3.1 During the December 2016 Board 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 (BOD/2016/12-09).

3.2 The Board at its March 2017 meeting further requested the work to incorporate clarifying responsibility and optimizing approaches for capacity building and technical assistance, including in fragile and conflict-affected countries (BOD/2017/03-06 7.b.iii).

3.3 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. The inception phase was overseen by the GPC, which was assigned oversight of the work stream by the Coordinating Committee. Following consultation with the Board in December 2017 on the overall approach to the study and through their GPC representatives, the inception report was finalized mid-March and shared with the Board.<sup>1</sup>

3.4 Next, OPM set out to interview all agencies with an active role as grant agents and coordinating agencies, and consult with a range of developing country partners (DCPs), civil society organizations (CSO), donor agencies, and the Secretariat to inform the analysis and recommendations set out in the report. This was followed by consultation with 51 DCP representatives at the DCP meeting in Maputo on May 9-11 on the draft report (Efficient Partnership Review report), as well as with a group of CSO representatives present at the meeting.

---

<sup>1</sup> Inception report: <https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/examination-key-actors-roles-gpes-country-level-operational-model-inception-report-volume-1>

3.5 The Board discussed the implications of the final report at its meeting on June 12-14, 2018. As a result of these discussions, the Board requested the 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.

3.6 At the draft stage of this Board paper, the Secretariat has consulted and received valuable feedback from MOPAN<sup>2</sup>, which has been taken into the proposal. Their inputs concern strategic content including some of the substance of what should go into workstream 3, oversight and engagement of key actors, benchmarking, and timescale/sequencing. The Secretariat also received useful feedback from several constituencies that were incorporated into the final draft prepared for GPC.

#### **4. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION**

4.1 The GPC reviewed the Board's decision at its meeting on June 26-28, 2018. The GPC reemphasized that further analysis is not needed and that priority be given to spelling out and addressing specific ambiguities and differences of perspective among partners on roles of key actors.

4.2 Accordingly, the main proposed workstream (Workstream 1) would provide 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 (GA) but also including coordinating agencies (CA), the Secretariat country leads (CL), and all of these in relation to the role of government partners and capacity for policy dialogue at country level. A key element would be to clarify who is accountable for what to whom, and how these accountabilities should work in practice<sup>3</sup>.

4.3 The effectiveness of the GPE partnership model relies on mutual accountability, which in turn requires a shared and common understanding of the goals, approach and accountabilities of the

---

<sup>2</sup> Multilateral Organizations Performance Assessment Network, which is currently assessing GPE.

<sup>3</sup> 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. If further clarification is needed, it can be rolled into workstream 3.

various partners and functional roles. The Partnership Engagement workstream (Workstream 2) would be sequenced to translate the first workstream into strategic engagement with stakeholders across the partnership to fully understand GPE's goals, objectives, theory of change, operating modalities and the associated roles, responsibilities and accountabilities; and how to implement these. It will include specific, targeted strategies for leveraging partners' specific roles and accountabilities within the Partnership. As such, it is an essential building block for mutual accountability.

4.4 The third workstream would be defined in more detail following the Board's decision on the first. This workstream is currently a place-holder for further work required to adjust to decisions made in December. It will need to build out from Workstream 1 and provide robust longer-term solutions to strategic and operational issues and risks, including capacity building, GPE's model of sustainability and country ownership, along with differentiation for fragile and conflict-affected states. Some of these issues and risks are already identified in the OPM study. Preparation for Workstream 3 will be drawn from Workstream 1 as specific roles and accountabilities are identified. The institutional arrangements outcomes may lead to additional issues that must be addressed. Adjustments to fragile states will also need to build on coming adjustments in the *Operational Framework for Responding Effectively in Fragile and Conflict-Affected States*, which is overseen by the GPC and expected for Board update or decision by the end of 2018.

4.5 Oversight arrangements for all three workstreams will be coordinated to ensure an aligned and sequenced approach. A process map and overall timeframe for all three workstreams illustrates how they are sequenced.

## **5. IMPLICATIONS FOR SECRETARIAT RESOURCES**

5.1 To allow the Secretariat to focus on ongoing work around grant development and monitoring, support to GPE processes at country level, partner engagement and other priorities, the key activities will be outsourced. This is also a way to ensure an arms-length approach and neutral facilitation to defining options around roles. The Secretariat budget includes a US\$250,000 set-aside for follow-up to the Effective Partnership Review in the FY19 budget. Any resources required in addition would require a Board decision.

## **6. RISKS**

The timeline is very tight so there is a risk that progress is not achieved in a timely manner, or that the outcomes are not of the required quality. The Secretariat will manage these risks by assigning an experienced senior officer as project manager, keeping close oversight over progress at senior management level, and through engagement with the GPC Chair and Coordination Committee to assess whether the process is on track and what adjustments might be needed, if any.

## **7. NEXT STEPS**

7.1 If adopted, the Action Plan will begin implementation on August 1<sup>st</sup>, 2018 with options for consideration at the Board's retreat in November and for decision at its December meeting.

**8. PLEASE CONTACT** Michelle Mesen ([mmesen@globalpartnership.org](mailto:mmesen@globalpartnership.org)) for further information.

## **9. REFERENCES**

[BOD/2018/06-DOC 07A](#) – Volume I - Effective Partnership Review: Examination Of Key Actors' Roles in GPE's Country-Level Operational Model Towards GPE 2020 Delivery

Reference: Volume II – Annexes to Volume I is posted on the [Board meeting registration site](#).

## **10. ANNEXES**

Annex 1 - Effective Partnership Review Costed Action Plan

## **ANNEX 1 - EFFECTIVE PARTNERSHIP REVIEW COSTED ACTION PLAN**

### **WORKSTREAM 1: CLARIFYING ROLES, RESPONSIBILITIES, AUTHORITIES, ACCOUNTABILITIES, RESOURCING AND RISK AT COUNTRY LEVEL**

**Goal:** To ensure GPE makes optimal use of its resources to deliver on GPE 2020.

**Objective:** To review and clarify roles, responsibilities, authorities, accountabilities, resourcing and risks at country level, resulting in revised terms of reference for key actors including grant agents (GA), coordinating agencies (CA) and the Secretariat, with specific attention to the role played by the Secretariat's country leads (CL).

**Outputs:** The first output of this workstream would 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 would review and update terms of reference (TORs) for the key actors in accordance with the decision. These TORs and other resulting guidance would then be incorporated into the partnership engagement strategy (see workstream 2).

**Summary of Process:** This workstream will draw on final activities by Oxford Policy Management (OPM) (activity 1 and 2) to synthesize the findings of the Efficient Partnership Review (EPR) into a map that highlights areas where clarity is needed.

Once this is done, consultants with expertise in organizational design will take over to work on framing of key issues that need to be addressed in the development of options for roles, responsibilities, authorities, accountabilities, resourcing and risk-ownership (activity 3) and benchmarking how roles etc. are assigned against other partnerships/funds (activity 4). This will lead to defining and stress-testing concrete options for decisions on key functions and corresponding roles, responsibilities, authorities, accountabilities, resourcing and risk ownership (activity 5). Given time constraints, aspects of activity 3, 4 and 5 will run concurrently, though sequentially the framing under activity 3 will start first, followed by initial benchmarking. Each activity will iteratively inform the other.

Under activity 3, the consultants will conduct initial discussions of wider strategic contextual thinking with a cross-section of Board members and GPE senior staff. Under activity 5 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.

They will also discuss with key partners to stress-test how different options for roles and responsibilities will impact the Partnership’s ability to strengthen sector planning and implementation, deliver efficient and effective financing, and leverage mutual accountability for delivering sector results

Key background resources for this work will include the OPM review and synthesis of findings, but also the findings and recommendations of the External Review of Risk Management as well as emerging evaluation outcomes from the GPE evaluation strategy and MOPAN<sup>4</sup>.

To ensure the outcomes of the organizational design work in activity 3-5 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 being 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 presentation for the Board at its retreat in November so that these options can contribute to inform discussions on the Institutional Arrangements.

**Workplan:**

| <b>Activity</b>                                      | <b>Description</b>   | <b>Responsible</b>         | <b>Timeline</b>          |
|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>1.<br/>Map decision areas</b>                     | Based on EPR analysis, prepare a map of areas where there is lack of clarity, disagreement or divergent understandings by type of respondent, including on accountabilities. This will include ‘an issue map (key points of tension) and sociograms to chart the relationships across the GPE actors (who agrees/disagrees; key alliances) | OPM                        | By mid/late August, 2018 |
| <b>2.<br/>Map solutions proposed by stakeholders</b> | Based on responses already provided by stakeholders (during OPM’s interviews) on potential solutions to perceived problems, map out the options proposed by these stakeholders.  | OPM                        | By mid-August, 2018      |
| <b>3.<br/>Framing of Options</b>                     | Using the mapping prepared by OPM and other evidence as listed in the summary above, a team of Organizational Design experts will consolidate findings into options for potential solutions, including associated risks and opportunities.   | Organizational Design team | By end August, 2018      |

<sup>4</sup> Multilateral Organizations Performance Assessment Network, currently assessing GPE.

|  |   |   |                               |
|--|---|---|-------------------------------|
| <p><b>4.</b></p> <p><b>Benchmark GPE roles against comparators</b></p> | <p>Desk review/interviews with GAVI, Global Fund and other funds and partnerships to assess how similar authorities, risks and accountabilities are addressed, and how the potential options outlined in activity 3 compare.</p>  | <p>Organizational Design team</p>       | <p>By end August, 2018</p>    |
| <p><b>5.</b></p> <p><b>Analysis of options</b></p>                     | <p>Define a consultation process to stress test options. Using the mapping and set of options:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Analyze coordinating agency (CA) and Secretariat country lead (CL) roles and corresponding resource needs in relation to one another and to GA.</p> <p>Clarify the role of government with some initial categorization by level of capacity and fragility<sup>5</sup> &amp; propose how this may impact adaptation of GA, CA and CL roles.</p> <p>Use 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.</p> | <p>Organizational design team</p>       | <p>By end September, 2018</p> |
| <p><b>6.</b></p> <p><b>Preparation of draft options</b></p>            | <p>Prepare draft decision options for review and discussion by the GPC at its October meeting.</p>  | <p>Organizational design team</p>       | <p>By September 24, 2018</p>  |
| <p><b>7.</b></p> <p><b>First review of options</b></p>                 | <p>Presentation and discussion at the October 10-12, 2018 GPC meeting</p>   | <p>Organizational design team / GPC</p> | <p>October 10-12, 2018</p>    |
| <p><b>8.</b></p> <p><b>Board discussion</b></p>                        | <p>Presentation of options at November 6-7 Board retreat as a basis for finalizing decision paper.</p>  | <p>Organizational design team / GPC</p> | <p>November 6-7, 2018</p>     |

<sup>5</sup> The consultants will draw on relevant categorization mechanisms from other organizations (UNDP, World Bank, etc.) compiled and synthesized by the Secretariat

## **WORKSTREAM 2: PARTNERSHIP ENGAGEMENT STRATEGY**

**Goal:** 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.

**Objective:** To develop a basic communications toolkit directed at country-level partners, including government officials and other members of the local education group (LEG), together with a distribution program that ensures materials are used to effectively engage partners in processes and the delivery on GPE strategic goals and objectives.

**Outputs:** The Secretariat will aim to have initial communication materials on GPE goals, objectives and theory of change in place by December. Remaining materials, including to incorporate decisions on roles, responsibilities, authorities, accountabilities and risks, will be available by mid-2019. The materials will be accompanied by an outreach and engagement strategy aimed at effectively mobilizing partners around GPE's goals, objectives and theory of change.

**Summary:** The effectiveness of the GPE partnership model relies on mutual accountability, which in turn requires a shared and common understanding of the goals, approach and accountabilities of the various partners and functional roles. Initially, the focus will be to ensure that GPE's goals, objectives and approach (operational model) are better understood by all parties. As more precision on roles and accountabilities of country-level partners emerges from Workstream 1, these elements will be included. A communication toolkit will include published and on-line materials designed to provide an overview—and progressively more detailed explanations—of GPE, its goals and objectives and operational model and the roles and accountabilities of the various actors, including governments, the local education group, coordinating agency, grant agent and Secretariat country leads. Materials would serve to ensure that individuals and organizations at the country level are informed. They could also be included in induction programs for new staff of ministries, GPE Secretariat, partner organizations and new members of LEGs. To maximize effectiveness, materials would be rolled out in individual GPE partner countries as well as at the regional and global headquarters of GPE partners.

**Workplan:** It is anticipated that communications firms based in developing country partner regions would be best placed to develop the materials and accompanying distribution strategy. An initial investment of US\$50,000 over 12 months is expected. Terms of reference for the work will be developed in July 2018 on the basis that the Board decision requesting a communications strategy has already been made. The Secretariat will undertake the procurement process for the communications firms and oversee their work.

### **WORKSTREAM 3: ACTIONS TO BE CARRIED OUT FOLLOWING THE WORKSTREAM 1 DECISIONS**

Outcomes from the Board's decisions under Workstream 1 could potentially affect Financial Procedures Agreements and could have governance, resource and other implications. Consequently, there may be follow-up work assigned to the Finance and Risk Committee, Governance and Ethics Committee, and Strategy and Impact Committee in addition to the Grants and Performance Committee.

A more strategic approach to capacity building would also need to be defined, including resource implications of roles and responsibilities assigned to GA, CA and CL to strengthen governments' capacity to deliver on GPE's goals and objectives.

Specifically, the third workstream would address:

1. Further work by GPC, other committees and the Board, including potential revisions of the Charter
2. Review of resources necessary to implement new accountabilities and roles, and to ensure capacity building to strengthen systems building through GPE's grants and processes
3. Possible revision of grant policies and guidelines, country-level operational guidance and decision making and reporting of results through portfolio review and results framework

A more detailed proposal of this workstream would follow the December Board meeting.

### **BUDGET**

A budget envelope of US\$ 250,000 has been set aside from the Secretariat's operational budget for FY19. The estimated distribution of funds across the three workstreams is as follows:

|                                   |             |              |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|--------------|
| <b>Workstream 1:</b>              |             |              |
| OPM remaining work                | US\$ 31,000 |              |
| Organizational design consultancy | US\$119,000 | US\$ 150,000 |
| <b>Workstream 2:</b>              |             | US\$ 50,000  |
| <b>Workstream 3:</b>              |             | US\$ 50,000  |
| <b>Total:</b>                     |             | US\$ 250,000 |

**PROCESS MAP**

| Workstreams  | Activities  | Jul-18 |         | Aug-18 |         | Sep-18 |         | Oct-18 |         | Nov-18 |         | Dec-18 |         | Jan-19 and beyond |
|--|---|--------|---------|--------|---------|--------|---------|--------|---------|--------|---------|--------|---------|-------------------|
|  |   | 1 - 15 | 16 - 31 | 1 - 15 | 16 - 31 | 1 - 15 | 16 - 30 | 1 - 15 | 16 - 31 | 1 - 15 | 16 - 30 | 1 - 15 | 16 - 31 |                   |
| <b>Workstream 1</b><br>(Clarifying Roles, Responsibilities, Authorities, Accountabilities, Resourcing and Risk at Country Level) | Activity 1. Map decision areas  |        |         |        |         |        |         |        |         |        |         |        |         |                   |
|  | Activity 2. Map solutions proposed by stakeholders  |        |         |        |         |        |         |        |         |        |         |        |         |                   |
|  | Development of TORs for Organizational Design Team  |        |         |        |         |        |         |        |         |        |         |        |         |                   |
|  | Identification and procurement of Organizational Design Team  |        |         |        |         |        |         |        |         |        |         |        |         |                   |
|  | Activity 3. Framing of options  |        |         |        |         |        |         |        |         |        |         |        |         |                   |
|  | Activity 4. Benchmark GPE roles against comparators   |        |         |        |         |        |         |        |         |        |         |        |         |                   |
|  | Activity 5. Analysis of options   |        |         |        |         |        |         |        |         |        |         |        |         |                   |
|  | Activity 6. Preparation of draft options (Sep 24)   |        |         |        |         |        |         |        |         |        |         |        |         |                   |
|  | Activity 7. First review of options at GPC Meeting (Oct 10 - 12), Second review of options adjusted based on GPC deliberation (Oct 15), and Draft options to Board (Oct 17) |        |         |        |         |        |         |        |         |        |         |        |         |                   |
|  | Activity 8. Board discussion (Board Retreat, Nov 6-7) and consultation with DCPs (DCP Constituency Meeting, Nov 28 - 30)  |        |         |        |         |        |         |        |         |        |         |        |         |                   |
|  | Board decision: on identified sub-set of roles, responsibilities, etc. at Board meeting, Dec 6 - 7  |        |         |        |         |        |         |        |         |        |         |        |         |                   |
| Next step: Review and update TORs and incorporate into Partnership engagement strategy   |   |        |         |        |         |        |         |        |         |        |         |        |         |                   |

|  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| <b>Workstream 2</b><br>(Partnership engagement strategy)   | Development of TORs for communications firm   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Identification and procurement of communications firm   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Development of toolkit that includes partnership engagement strategy and communication materials on GPE goals, objectives and Theory of change  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Next step: Incorporate decisions on roles, responsibilities, authorities, accountabilities and risks (available mid 2019)   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>Workstream 3</b><br>(Actions to be carried out following the institutional arrangements decision) | Next step: Potential revisions of the Charter, review of resources necessary to implement new accountabilities and roles, and to ensure implications and capacity building, and possible revision of policies and guidelines, and country level operational guidance and decision making and reporting of results |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |