Purpose: Information & Discussion

- Demonstrate Global Partnership’s leadership in taking aid effectiveness principles further

- Show that a strong partnership approach is the core foundation for 21st century development cooperation
2011 Monitoring Exercise on Aid Effectiveness in the Education Sector

Context, Scope, and Methodology
Context: Monitoring Exercise

International Aid Effectiveness Framework
• Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (2005)
• Accra Agenda of Action (2008)
• 4th High-Level Forum (Busan, November 29 – December 1, 2011)

Monitoring Aid Effectiveness
• OECD surveys: 2006 (32 countries), 2008 (55), 2011 (78)
• OECD does not collect sector-specific data

Global Partnership for Education
• 2008 Pilot Survey in 10 GPE partner developing countries
• 2011 Monitoring Exercise in 40 developing countries
Why an Education Monitoring Exercise?

Better Understand How

Local Education Groups work
We can improve our support
To strengthen GPE’s and sector’s modeling of aid effectiveness

Strengthen dialogue among partners on aid effectiveness at country level

Data Collection
Generate baseline data for Results Framework
Complement OECD Survey with sector-specific data
Provide evidence for the ‘Busan discussion’
### Scope: Monitoring Exercise

#### 33 GPE developing country partners

- **21 in Africa**
  - Benin
  - Burkina Faso
  - Cameroun
  - Ethiopia
  - Gambia, The
  - Ghana
  - Guinea
  - Guinea-Bissau
  - Kenya
  - Lesotho
  - Liberia
  - Madagascar
  - Malawi
  - Mali
  - Mozambique
  - Niger
  - Rwanda
  - Senegal
  - Sierra Leone
  - Togo
  - Zambia

- **9 in Asia**
  - Afghanistan
  - Cambodia
  - Kyrgyzstan
  - Lao PDR
  - Mongolia
  - Nepal
  - Papua New Guinea
  - Tajikistan
  - Vietnam

- **2 in Central Europe**
  - Georgia
  - Moldova

- **1 in Central America**
  - Honduras

#### 7 non-GPE developing countries

- **5 in Africa**
  - Burundi
  - Chad
  - Congo DRC
  - Somalia
  - Zimbabwe

- **2 in Asia**
  - Bangladesh
  - Sri Lanka

Countries marked blue = Fragile States
Representative Source of Evidence

- Relating to over **US$ 2.3 billion** of development aid to **education** to 33 countries in 2010

- 73% average response rate from donor partners in Local Education Group

- Considerable variation in the participation, completeness and consistency of data across countries
Methodology: Monitoring Exercise

Data Collection
- Managed at country level through Local Education Group
- Aligned with OECD methodology and Paris Declaration Indicators
- Facilitated by Secretariat

Tools
- Ministry of Education Questionnaire
- Donor Questionnaire
- Explanatory Note discussing qualitative information

Products
- Contribution to OECD’s Flagship Report ‘Aid effectiveness: 2005-10’
- Individual Country Profiles to support country-level dialogue
- Overall Monitoring Exercise Report
Ownership
Alignment
Harmonization
Managing for **Education Results**
Mutual Accountability
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paris Indicators</th>
<th>Paris Targets 2010</th>
<th>OECD Survey results 33 GPE countries</th>
<th>33 GPE countries</th>
<th>7 non-GPE countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1 Education Plan in place</td>
<td>75% rated B or above</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3 Aid on budget</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4 Coordinated Technical Cooperation</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5a Use country financial management system</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5b Use of country procurement system</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6 Avoid parallel project implementation units</td>
<td>2/3 reduction</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7 Aid is predictable</td>
<td>50% reduction of gap</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9 Using Program-based approaches</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10a Joint donor missions</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10b Joint analytic works</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#11 Performance Assessment Framework in place</td>
<td>1/3 reduction of gap</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#12 Joint Sector Review takes place</td>
<td>In place in all countries</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Green:** achieved/ exceeded 2010 Paris Target; **Light Green:** Close to achieve 2010 Paris Target
**Red:** Serious gap to achieve 2010 Paris Target; **Light Orange:** Scope for Improvement
Indicator 9: % of Aid delivered in context of program-based approaches in 2010

2010 OECD Result: 37%
2010 GPE Result: 40%
2010 Paris Target: 66%

GPE countries
Fragile States
Indicator 10b: % of coordinated analytic works in education in 2010

2010 OECD Result: 42%
2010 Paris Target: 66%
2010 GPE Result: 80%

GPE countries
Fragile States
Summary of Results for GPE countries
“Strong Areas of Cooperation”

NATIONAL EDUCATION PLAN
- Performance Assessment Framework
- Consultative with activity-based implementation plan + budget

LOCAL EDUCATION GROUP
- Joint Sector Reviews
- Coordinated Technical Cooperation
- Joint Missions and Analytic Works
Summary of Results

‘Scope for Improvement’ and ‘Urgent Attention’

Alignment to and use of country systems

- Public financial management and procurement systems not used at large scale.
- Parallel implementation structures are still used with great variation across countries.

Harmonization of Donor Aid

- Program-based approaches need to be developed and strengthened.

Transparency and Predictability

- Managing aid more transparently, with higher predictability and improved reporting.
Reported Challenges

Challenges for ...

• **Greater use of country systems**: weak capacity, donor accountability and regulations, and fiduciary risk.

• **Joint arrangements**: time consuming and demanding, requiring the establishment of structures and governance acceptable to all participating donors.

• **Effective monitoring**: data quality and reliability, low capacity to collect and analyze data at all levels.

• **Regular and effective joint sector reviews**: findings not impacting strategic planning, delays in preparation, in some countries it’s a new initiative.
Addressing Challenges

‘Country Support Team: Focus on the year’

Presentation by Sandra Barton

10 November 2011
## Improving aid effectiveness beyond ‘Paris’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Better Access to Information</th>
<th>M&amp;E Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive Partnership and Decision-Making</td>
<td>Global Partnership for Education Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extending Partnerships to private sector and non-DAC donors</td>
<td>Supporting national Civil Society</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A vehicle for development effectiveness

- **Aid effectiveness is not the goal** but vehicle to achieve results and improve partnerships

- **Monitoring aid effectiveness** is included in the Results Framework specifically at output level 3 ‘managing and delivering education aid effectively’ but is also reflected at other levels

- **Linking results with aid effectiveness performance** through Results Framework and Mutual Accountability Matrix
Have we achieved what we wanted?

**YES, because ...**

- Local Education Groups actively discuss aid effectiveness because of the exercise and address problems.
- **Our results are featured in the OECD Report:** ‘Aid Effectiveness 2005-10: Progress in implementing the Paris Declaration’.
- **Strengthen our own motivation** to include aid effectiveness in Global Partnership’s Results Framework and Mutual Accountability.
- Two Education Side Events in Busan, including a Statement of Principles

... We know that the Global Partnership model works!
Invitation

Please join the **aid effectiveness session** immediately after this session at **6:15 to 8:00PM** in the **Plenary Room**.

We will discuss the **Statement of Principles on aid effectiveness in the education sector** for the Busan High-Level Forum.