

METHODOLOGY SHEET FOR GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP FOR EDUCATION (GPE) INDICATORS

Indicator title	Indicator (29) Proportion of GPE grants aligned to national systems
Result measured (from GPE Results Framework):	GLOBAL-LEVEL OBJECTIVE - Strategic Objective (4) Mobilize more and better financing (b) Advocate for improved alignment and harmonization of funding from GPE and its international partners around nationally owned education sector plans and country systems

JUSTIFICATION FOR INDICATOR

Background/context for indicator:	<p>The importance of alignment of external aid with national systems and policy objectives was emphasized through its inclusion as a key principle in the 2005 Paris Declaration, which sought to increase aid effectiveness. In addition to alignment, this included four other principles: (country) ownership; harmonization (of donor intervention); (managing for) results; and mutual accountability. While the Third High-level Forum on Aid Effectiveness¹ reaffirmed the principles of the Paris Declaration, the Busan Declaration² defined the following four principles for effective development cooperation: ownership, focus on results, inclusiveness and transparency / accountability. However, the principle of alignment remains important to GPE, which mentions this in its Strategic Plan GPE 2020³ and in its Charter⁴, and is directly linked to the ownership principle. Alignment is essential for GPE system building focus as the use of national systems is critical in strengthening national capacity.</p> <p>For the 2014 Portfolio Review, the Secretariat conducted a desk review of 59 grants, which provided an overview of the extent to which GPE support is aligned to national systems. The assessment methodology considered several dimensions of the use of national systems (on plan, on budget, on treasury, on procurement, on accounting, on audit and on report). This methodology was derived from international best practice and the classification of dimensions of aid on budget proposed by the Busan Task Force on Public Financial Management. The 2014 desk review established that program documents do not always clearly indicate the use of country systems, nor always explain why certain dimensions of country systems are not used. Data gathered through this 2014 desk review were updated the subsequent year for the 2015 Portfolio Review.</p> <p>Through the Quality Assurance Review process, the Secretariat will continue to recommend the use of country systems where possible.</p>
-----------------------------------	--

¹ The ACCRA Third High Level Forum On Aid Effectiveness, *A CCIC Participant Assessment of the Outcomes* (2008), retrieved March 2017 from http://cso-effectiveness.org/IMG/pdf/brian_assessment_of_accra_EN.pdf

² Fourth High-level Forum on Aid Effectiveness, *Busan High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness: Proceedings* (2011), retrieved March 2017 from <https://www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness/HLF4%20proceedings%20entire%20doc%20for%20web.pdf>

³ Global Partnership for Education, *GPE 2020. Improving learning and equity through stronger education systems* (Washington, DC: World Bank Group, 2016), retrieved May 25, 2016 from <http://www.globalpartnership.org/content/gpe-2020-strategic-plan>

⁴ Global Partnership for Education, *Charter of the Global Partnership for Education* (Washington, DC: GPE, 2013), retrieved May 25, 2016, from <http://www.globalpartnership.org/content/charter-global-partnership-education>

	<p>Emphasis will be on dimensions that are both low-risk and highly related to education sector management. In line with the mandate set out in the GPE Charter, the Secretariat will encourage, where this is feasible, a qualitative inclusion of the program’s budget in the government budget law and integration of financial results in government accounts, reinforcing GPE’s commitment to development cooperation effectiveness and better alignment on national systems. It is hoped that the strengthened process for selection of Grant Agents proposed by the Operational Platform Reference Group⁵ will also have a positive impact on greater use of national systems. In addition, a section on use of country systems was added to the ESPIG application form in 2015.</p>
<p>Rationale for indicator selection:</p>	<p>This indicator is included in GPE’s Results Framework as strengthening national education systems is fundamental to GPE’s Operational Model and Strategic Plan. GPE’s Strategic Plan for 2016-2020³ postulates as one of its eight principles: “Improving development effectiveness through harmonization and aligning aid to country systems.” Further, GPE 2020 details that “[GPE] will advocate for improved alignment and harmonization of funding from GPE and its international partners around nationally owned education sector plans and country systems” as an output aiming to fulfil Strategic Objective #4, which is: ‘Mobilize more and better financing’. This contributes to the outcome-level GPE Strategic Goal #3: Effective and efficient education systems.</p>

DEFINITION

<p>Indicator definition:</p>	<p>This indicator examines whether GPE program grants are aligned to and use their developing country partners’ national systems. It uses a threshold of meeting at least 7 out of 10 criteria of alignment, as defined in the GPE methodology developed for this indicator.</p> <p>In the context of this indicator:</p> <p>“Alignment” is defined as basing support / funding modalities on developing country partners’ (DCPs) own operational systems, frameworks and procedures⁶</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Country systems” are understood to relate to a set of seven dimensions covering strategic, administrative, and financial systems of GPE DCPs, for which the concept of alignment is examined, as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Plan ○ Budget ○ Treasury ○ Procurement ○ Accounting ○ Audit ○ Report <p>For the purpose of this indicator, each of these seven dimensions contains 1 to 2 sub-points, formulated as questions, intended to cover the concept of alignment to national systems for the specific dimension.</p>
------------------------------	--

⁵ The CGPC Committee approved the process in February 2015 in the following decision: CGPC/2016/02-02 – Standard Selection Process for Grant Agents (for ESPIGs): “The Country Grants and Performance Committee, in its delegated authority from the Board of Directors in BOD/2015/10-02, approves the proposals as set out in CGPC/2016/01 DOC 07 Rev. 1.”

⁶ Adapted from OECD, Glossary of Aid Effectiveness Terms <http://www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness/aideffectivenessglossary.htm>

	<p>This methodology was derived from international best practice and the classification of dimensions of aid on budget a proposed by the Busan Task Force on Public Financial Management. In the revised Quality Assurance Review process, adapted to the New Funding Model, the Secretariat introduced a requirement to provide information on use of country systems through an analysis of the previous grant at the start of the development of a new program. In addition, a section on the use or non-use of country systems was added to ESPIG application form (provided below in Annex 1). This provides a framework to analyze the use of country systems in all applications under the 2015-2018 Funding Model and compared to the applications that did not use this Model.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “GPE grants” are defined as GPE Education Sector Program Implementation Grants (ESPIGs) active during a given fiscal year and included in the ESPIG sample. These ESPIGs comprise all grants active in the FY regardless of whether: (a) they closed or not during the FY and (b) whether they fall or not under the new GPE funding model. 	
Unit of measurement:	<p>Percentage expressing a proportion “n out of N”, where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - n represents the number of ESPIGs active in a given fiscal year included in the ESPIG sample that meet at least 7 elements of alignment to country systems out of a possible total of 10 - N represents the total number of ESPIGs active in a given fiscal year and included in the ESPIG sample 	
Disaggregation:	<p>For the purpose of the GPE Results Framework, data will be disaggregated by FCAC / non-FCAC.</p> <p>For the purpose of the GPE Portfolio Review, data will also be disaggregated by country and region.</p> <p>[Please note: Although this is not a part of the corporate GPE results framework reporting requirements, additional possible disaggregation categories include disaggregation by the seven dimensions of alignment: on budget, on treasury, on procurement, on accounting, on audit, and on report.]</p>	
Year for data reported (select only one and mark an “x”)	<p><input type="checkbox"/>_X_ fiscal year</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/>__ calendar year</p>	
Frequency of data collection:	<p>For ESPIGs that became active in or after FY15: Once for each ESPIG application as part of the application process.</p> <p>Then, data will be reported annually for the corporate-level indicator of the GPE Results Framework.</p>	
DATA TREATMENT		
Source of information for collecting data:	Source document, template, etc.:	ESPIG application from the country (for ESPIGs starting in or after FY15)
	Source agency:	For ESPIGs starting in or after FY15: Following endorsement by the Local Education Group, the Coordinating Agency submits the ESPIG application package on behalf of the Government and LEG (based on instructions from the ESPIG application form)
Formula:	<p>(1) For each ESPIG, a “yes” or “no” rating is assigned to each 10 questions across seven dimensions of alignment addressed in the questionnaire.</p> <p>(2) Scores are applied to each of those “yes” and “no” ratings (and accompanying narratives). For each ESPIG j, each question i is scored</p>	

as either 1 or 0:

- A question i with a rating of “yes” – or a narrative interpreted as a “yes” in the absence of a “yes” rating – is given a score of 1
- A question i with a rating of “no” – or a narrative interpreted as a “no” in the absence of a “no” rating – is given a score of 0

$$Score_{j,espig,i} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if question } i \text{ from ESPIG } espig \text{ in country } j = \text{yes} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Notes:

- (a) Question 7.2 (see Annex 1) is for information only and is not scored.
- (b) For question 3.1, a score of 1 is given for either response a or b, and a score of 0 is given for response c.
- (c) For questions 3.2, question 4 and question 5.1, scoring only relates to the first points in the question. The latter part of the question is excluded from scoring (please note that this refers only to the original questionnaire in annex 1, as these questions have been removed from the current questionnaire).

- (3) Each ESPIGs’ degree of alignment is expressed as a score on a scale of 0 to 10, by aggregating all 0/1 scores assigned to each of the 10 questions for that ESPIG. To be considered *aligned*, a threshold of a total score of at least 5 out of 10 is required for each ESPIG j .

$$Score_{j,espig} = \sum_{i=1}^{10} Score_{j,espig,i}$$

$$Aligned_j = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \sum_{i=1}^{10} Score_{j,espig,i} \geq 7 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Where:

$Aligned_j$ = ESPIG meeting the “alignment” threshold of a score of at least 7 out of 10

$Score_{j,esp}$ = ESPIG’s total score, with a value from 0 to 10

- (1) The total alignment score (on a scale of 0 to 10) is tabulated for each ESPIG j included in that year’s ESPIG sample.
- (2) The total number of ESPIGs scoring at least 5 out of 10 is compiled and provides the numerator for calculating the corporate-level indicator, with the denominator being the total number of ESPIGs included in that year’s ESPIG sample.

Aggregation formula:

$$Prop_j(Aligned_j = 1) = \left[\frac{\sum_{j=1}^N Aligned_j}{N_j} \right] * 100$$

Where:

$Prop_j(Aligned_j = 1)$ = proportion of ESPIGs aligned in country j

N = total number of ESPIGs included in sample in country j

Data limitations (if any known / anticipated):

As new ESPIG applications are prepared by the countries, the alignment to and use of national systems for current ESPIG grant applications is reported

	as part of the application (starting in FY15 with the launch of the new ESPIG application form). The alignment is also analyzed and discuss in the QAR process which allows a consistency check. However, changes that could happen during the implementation cannot be taken into account.
Interpretation	A high percentage indicates a high degree of alignment, 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 (see Indicator #30). The holistic approach to monitoring harmonization and alignment allows for better execution, planning and monitoring efforts both at the project and sector levels through ESPIGs as the main implementation mechanism.

REFERENCES

- Fourth High-level Forum on Aid Effectiveness. *Busan High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness: Proceedings*. 2011. Retrieved March 2017 from <https://www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness/HLF4%20proceedings%20entire%20doc%20for%20web.pdf>
- Global Partnership for Education. *Charter of the Global Partnership for Education*. Washington, DC: GPE, 2013. Retrieved May 25, 2016, from <http://www.globalpartnership.org/content/charter-global-partnership-education>
- Global Partnership for Education. *GPE 2020. Improving learning and equity through stronger education systems*. Washington, DC: World Bank Group, 2016. Retrieved May 25, 2016 from <http://www.globalpartnership.org/content/gpe-2020-strategic-plan>
- OECD, Glossary of Aid Effectiveness Terms <http://www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness/aideffectivenessglossary.htm>
- The ACCRA Third High Level Forum On Aid Effectiveness. *A CCIC Participant Assessment of the Outcomes .2008*. Retrieved March 2017 from http://cso-effectiveness.org/IMG/pdf/brian_assessment_of_accra_EN.pdf

ANNEXES

Annex 1- Data Collection tool

Data collection tool utilized for collecting the data, if any:	<p>(a) For ESPIGs starting in or after FY15: ESPIG application from the country (the section on alignment to national systems, see Annex 1).</p> <p>(b) For ESPIGs that were active in FY15 but started before FY15: Same questions as in the application form were used but answered based on program documents and grant agent direct feedback.</p>
--	---

Annex 2- Standard Operating Procedure

Process Name: Data Collection, Quality Assurance & Storage for Indicator # 29 of the GPE Results Framework	Owner: R&P Team	Updated:
Function: Measuring GPE Impact	Version #: 1	Review:
Material changes from prior version of SOP		
None; this is the first version.		
Summary		
This SOP describes the process for data collection, quality assurance, and storage for indicator # 29 (Proportion of GPE grants aligned to national systems) of the GPE results framework.		
Results / Outputs		
This process should result in the results framework being updated with quality assured data on indicator# 29.		

<p>Interim outputs of the Secretariat:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Completed data collection template</p> <p>Final Output:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Updated results framework database</p>			
<p>Scope</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Begins: The process begins with Senior M & E Specialist (MU) preparing/obtaining the list of ESPIGs that are active (this is carried out on a routine basis) • Ends: The process ends with updated data being integrated into the results framework database by the Monitoring and Evaluation Data Manager. • Includes: All procedural aspects • Excludes: Methodological aspects of calculating the indicator value. These can be found in the methodology sheet. • Note: For ESPIGs that became active in or after FY15: Data will be collected once for each ESPIG application process. Then data will be reported annually for the corporate-level indicator of the GPE Results Framework. 			
<p>Standards (Policies, Approvals, Deadlines, etc.):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies: GPE 2020, Monitoring Sheet for GPE Results Framework Indicators # 29 • Deadlines: M & E Data Manager updates results framework database with the Indicators # 29 data by 15th November • Approval: The completed data template is prepared by the Senior M & E Specialist (MU) and includes quality checks by the M & E Data Manager and final approval by the Head of M&E 			
<p>Issues /Risks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant data related to this indicator might not be available on time. 			
<p>Overview:</p> <pre> graph LR A[Compile Data] --> B[Aggregating Data] B --> C[Update results framework database] style A fill:#2e75b6,color:#fff style B fill:#2e75b6,color:#fff style C fill:#2e75b6,color:#fff </pre>			
Steps in the Process	Roles / Responsibilities	Outputs / Deliverables	Tools / Templates
<p>1. Prepare list of Active ESPIG Typically by 30thSeptember</p>			
Prepare/obtain list of ESPIGs that are active (this is carried out on a routine basis)	Senior M & E Specialist (MU)	List of active ESPIGs	Filled in ESPIG application form from the country
Request Grant Agents to complete the questionnaires on grant alignment (annexed), based on the procedure described in the methodology sheet, for each active ESPIG (this is carried out on a routine basis)	Senior M & E Specialist (MU)		Questionnaire on Grant Alignment
Complete the questionnaires on grant alignment	Grant Agent	Completed Questionnaire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Methodology Sheet • Questionnaire

Assign a rating (yes/no) to each criterion on grant alignment as specified in the methodology sheet	Senior M&E Specialist with TCT Planning and Finance		
2. Compile Data Typically by 30th September			
Compile the completed questionnaires and assigned ratings for each of the active ESPIGs	Senior M & E Specialist (MU)	Dataset containing completed questionnaires and assigned ratings for each active ESPIG	
2. Aggregate Data Typically by 30th October			
Enter data into the template provided by the M&E Data Manager	Senior M & E Specialist (MU)		
Compute indicator values using the completed data collection template, based on the latest available classification of Countries Affected by Fragility and Conflict and forward to M & E data Manager.	Senior M & E Specialist (MU)	Completed data collection template and indicator values	List of Countries Affected by Fragility and Conflict from the GPE Intranet
Review completed data collection template and send comments/queries to the Senior M & E Specialist (MU)	M & E Data Manager		
Respond to the comments/queries, updates data collection template as necessary and forward to M & E data Manager	Senior M & E Specialist (MU)	Updated data collection template	
3. Update Results Framework Database Typically by November 15th			
Forward data collection template to the head of M & E for review and approval	M & E Data Manager		
Review and approve completed data collection template	Head of M & E	Approved data collection template	

Update results framework database using completed template submitted by the Senior M & E Specialist (MU)	M & E Data Manager	Updated results framework database	N/A
Notify the secretariat on the availability of data in the results framework database through the intranet	M & E Data Manager	Notification on GPE intranet	

Annex 4 - Section of the ESPIG Application Form (launched in FY15) displaying the original questionnaire on alignment on national systems

Summary of Proposed Program Funding Modality Alignment on National Systems		
Dimensions	Previous GPE Grant (where applicable)	Current application
On PLAN		
1.1 Is the GPE funded program aligned with the Education Sector Plan?		
1.2. Are the projected expenditures of the program included in the multi-year forecast of the Minister of Finance (medium term expenditure framework)?		
On BUDGET/PARLIAMENT		
2.1 Is the project included in the national budget?		
2.2 Does the national annual budget show specific appropriations for the different planned expenditures (economic and/or functional classification)?		
On TREASURY		
3.1 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 Is the expenditure process (documents and signatures on commitment, payment orders, etc.) for the national budget used for the program expenditures? Are there any specific derogations or safeguards on the national execution procedures for the program expenditures (other documents and/or signatures)?		
On PROCUREMENT		
4.1 Are government procurement rules used? If so, are there any derogations/safeguards on the use of these rules introduced?		
On ACCOUNTING		
5.1 Is the financial accounting directly on government's accounting systems used for the national budget? If not, are or the accounting results afterwards be integrated in government's accounting systems?		

On AUDIT		
6.1 Will the financial accounts be audited by the government's external auditor?		
On REPORT		
7.1 Will the information on project execution be included in the Education Sector Plan Annual Implementation Report prepared by the Ministry of Education?		