Effective Partnership Review
Improved Accountability and Reduced Transaction Costs

Meeting of the Board of Directors – December 6-7, 2018 – Dublin, Ireland
Background

• Board decisions December 2016, 2017
• Oxford Policy Management review
• Board decision June 2018
• GPC action plan (adopted by Board in July 2018)
• IOD PARC
  — Consultations with country level partners
  — Review of Options by GPC in October
  — Review of DCP consultation group in October
  — Presentation of Options at Board retreat
• Board resolution November 2018
• Collaborative efforts by IOD PARC and Secretariat to finalize
Evolution of GPE model

- Previous funding model: 2012-2013
- 2014 – New Funding Model
- GPE 2020
- 2015 – Operational Model Reforms
- Funding and Financing Framework
- 2017
- Effective Partnerships Review
- 2018
Summary of Board request
November 2018

- Outline the extent to which accountability, authorities, and risks are clearly assigned in the current model in relation to each of the different GPE grants and elements of the planning and program lifecycle
- Identify any areas of inefficiency, duplication, misalignment or gaps in accountability in the model
- Identify options, implications, and recommendations for addressing issues raised in the analysis and a revised work plan for the Effective Partnerships Review workstream
Summary of conclusions

• Inconsistencies in country-level model application = deficiencies in effectiveness and efficiency
• Responsibilities, accountabilities and decision-making authorities of actors are unclear, unspecified or duplicative
• GPE grant processes distort ESP processes and government ownership
• Heavy processes and transaction costs

Recommendation
The Board is requested to choose a decentralized approach to increase mutual accountability and transparency at country-level, while also seeking to reduce processes and transaction costs
Possible Increased Accountability Models

Decentralized mutual accountability with increased accountabilities and authority for country actors

Centralized ‘command and control’ compliance model with more Secretariat oversight
Aims of the recommendations

- Increase **decentralized** mutual accountability
- **Rebalance** the country-level model
- Drive national government **ownership** and strengthen its capacity
- **Reduce** GPE processes and transaction costs
Delivering GPE2020

OBJECTIVE 1
Strengthen education sector planning and policy implementation

OBJECTIVE 2
Support mutual accountability through effective and inclusive sector policy dialogue and monitoring

OBJECTIVE 3
GPE financing efficiently and effectively supports the implementation of sector plans focussed on improved equity, efficiency and learning
Identified areas for improvement

1. Strengthening the country level partnerships and policy dialogue
2. Strengthening the education sector planning process
3. Streamlining the Education Sector Program Implementation Grant application/quality assurance process
4. Strengthening transparency and accountability of the Grant Agent
1. Strengthening the country level partnership and policy dialogue

GPE 2020 Objective:
Support mutual accountability through effective and inclusive sector policy dialogue and monitoring

Challenges:
Ambiguity over roles, responsibilities, and accountabilities of country-level actors; emphasis on ESPIG rather than sector planning
1. Strengthening the country level partnership and policy dialogue

Recommendations:
Country level COMPACT (partnership framework) and 360; GPE-funded post in the MOE; re-focus CA role on support to policy dialogue; ensure annual JSR to measure ESP progress

Impact on Efficiency
Initial investment in developing framework / Funding National Staff Position
Significant benefit in reducing inefficiencies due to lack of clarity/duplication of roles and responsibilities
Significant benefit of re-focused CA role on policy dialogue
Significant benefit strengthening DCP role
Significant benefit of refocusing LEG on ESP
2. Strengthening the education sector planning process

GPE 2020 Objective:

• Strengthen education sector planning and policy implementation.
• GPE financing efficiently and effectively supports the implementation of sector plans focused on improved equity, efficiency and learning.

Challenges:

ESP should be the bedrock of GPE with full engagement of DCPs, GAs, LEG and partners. GA’s role vis-à-vis ESP is inconsistent and ESPIG can divert partners’ and GA’s focus from ESP. Need to reduce processes and transactions.
2. Strengthening the education sector planning process

Recommendations:
TORs for ESPDG GA; separate GA from ESPIG; Independent ESP appraisal for all ESPDG financed plans

Impact on Efficiency
Clarity on role and accountability of ESPDG Grant Agent
Reduced Grant Agent Reporting
3. Streamlining the Education Sector Program Implementation Grant application process

GPE 2020 Objective:
GPE financing efficiently and effectively supports the implementation of sector plans focused on improved equity, efficiency and learning

Challenges:
ESPIG is not always designed to address ESP strategic priorities; GA-focused or ‘Christmas tree’ ESPIGs, Burdensome and sometimes duplicative Secretariat Quality Assurance
3. Streamlining the Education Sector Program Implementation
Grant application process

Recommendations:
Scoping note basis for GA selection; GA’s concept note assessed by Independent Technical Panel; GA develops program with less ‘interference’; Secretariat QA adapted to GA’s QA processes

Impact on Efficiency
Development of Scoping Note / Establish and operate an Independent Technical Panel
Streamline & remove duplications in Quality Assurance Review Process (QAR 1 and QAR 2)
Improve efficiency of proposal development by clarifying roles and responsibilities between LEG and GA through upfront agreement on scope of proposal
Strengthening link between ESPIG funding and Sector Plan needs and priorities
4. Strengthening transparency and accountability of the grant agent

GPE 2020 Objective:
GPE financing efficiently and effectively supports the implementation of sector plans focused on improved equity, efficiency and learning

Challenges:
Varied effectiveness of GA support to grant implementation and varied GA engagement in ESP/policy dialogue reduces quality, impact and link to ESP; Limited GA accountability and improvement mechanisms; Accountability to Partnership not always clear; GPE not visible
4. Strengthening transparency and accountability of the grant agent

Recommendations:
Government & GA to report to LEG on key ESPIG issues semi-annually; GA support government and CA in annual Joint Sector Reviews (JSRs); LEG selected KPIs for GA; GA Agency Fees transferred in proportion to grant disbursement

Impact on Efficiency
Development and reporting of KPIs and ESPIG progress to LEG
Strengthen sector dialogue through better shared understanding of implementation challenges
Clear mechanism for LEG and GA to engage on key programmatic issues and progress without interference in program management
Next steps

1. Way forward
   • Agreed recommendations developed further and stress tested
   • Proposed changes aligned with changes arising from other workstreams including the Quality Assurance pilot and review; the LEG principles; Joint Sector Review guidance and the development of KIX and ASA
   • Any changes which affect financial relationships negotiated with relevant partners
   • Resourcing implications considered in the FY20 budget
Next steps

2. Oversight of follow up

- GPC will oversee follow up to these recommendations; significant changes will come back to Board in June
- Secretariat will update GPC on progress, and chair of GPC will inform Coordinating Committee Chair
- Board decision specifies that the GPC will revert to the Board if any of the options is deemed ineffective or likely to lead to unintended negative consequences or transaction costs
Aims of the recommendations

Increase decentralized mutual accountability

Drive national government ownership and strengthen its capacity

Rebalance the country-level model

Reduce GPE processes and transaction costs
Thank you.