1. STRATEGIC PURPOSE

1.1 This paper communicates recommendations from the Finance and Risk Committee to the Board for scaling up the GPE Multiplier. This would also extend periods during which countries can access GPE Multiplier, update the list of countries eligible to access the Multiplier during the 2018-2020 period, and integrate procedural changes and risk mitigation measures to improve its operation.
2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2.1 This paper presents the Finance and Risk Committee’s recommendation to scale-up the GPE Multiplier from US$ 100 million to US$ 300 million as envisaged by the Financing and Funding Framework and increase the number of eligible countries.

2.2 Subject to the Board’s review of three (3) further Expressions of Interest to access the Multiplier, the Secretariat forecasts US$ 12.5 million (of the initial US$ 100 million) will be available by June 2018.

2.3 The paper also proposes several process and transparency enhancements to facilitate access to Multiplier by Developing Country Partners. These draw from feedback from DCPs and a review of the Multiplier’s initial roll-out and a benchmarking exercise against comparable facilities.

3. RECOMMENDED DECISION / REQUESTED INPUT

3.1 The FRC recommends that the Board approve the following decision:

BOD/2018/06-XX- GPE MULTIPLIER: OPTIONS FOR SCALING UP, ELIGIBILITY, ALLOCATION MODEL, AND IMPROVING OPERATIONS: The Board of Directors in accordance with BOD/2018/06 DOC XX instructs the Secretariat to:

Summary of Finance and Risk Committee Deliberations

The Secretariat updated the Committee with options for scaling-up the GPE Multiplier and extending the period during which countries could access it to include the full 2018-2020 period.

- Committee members supported increasing the allocation for the multiplier to $300 million.
- The Committee requested that the Secretariat continue to monitor the co-financing used to access the Multiplier, with an emphasis on the additionality of this co-financing.
- It welcomed the Secretariat’s commitment to tracking long-term additionality through a long-term, on-going summative evaluation.
- FRC members welcomed the assessment done on the multiplier and noted that the improvements proposed will make the process more efficient.
- Committee members agreed with the Secretariat’s analysis that expanding eligibility to all 89 countries eligible for some form of support from GPE would not be feasible due to capacity limitations.
  - As such, committee members were supportive of Option 1 included in the paper.
- Committee members requested that the Secretariat implement all the process modifications noted in the paper and appreciated the analysis done to motivate the modifications.
1. Scale up the GPE Multiplier’s resources in accordance with Option 2 set out in Section 6 and enable countries to apply throughout the 2018-2020 period.

2. Adjust eligibility to access the GPE Multiplier to those countries included as per Option 1 set out in Section 8 and adjust Maximum Country Allocations from the GPE Multiplier to match those in Model B set out in Section 8.

3. Integrate the proposed process modifications into its operations as set out in Section 9 to improve efficiency and effectiveness, including delegating authority to the Grants and Performance Committee to approve Maximum Country Allocations for the Multiplier based on Board-approved eligibility criteria and allocation model.

4. Regularly update the FRC and Board regarding progress operationalizing the Multiplier and drawdown of its resources.

4. **BACKGROUND**

4.1 During its June 2017 meeting (BOD/2017/06), GPE’s Board approved the eligibility criteria, allocation methodology, and approach to operationalizing the GPE Multiplier1, as set out in BOD/2017/06 DOC 08. This decision delegated authority to the Finance and Risk Committee to approve minor modifications to the approach as they arose.

4.2 Since July 2017, the GPE Secretariat has operationalized the Multiplier, informing countries of their eligibility and potential allocations. The Secretariat prepared a process by which eligible Developing Country Partners can obtain a Maximum Country Allocation from the Multiplier (MCAMs) based on Expressions of Interest (EOIs). The process was designed in response to requests from DCPs and co-financing partners for greater certainty that Multiplier funds would be available.

4.3 The resulting roll-out generated eight (8) EOIs, seven (7) of which were endorsed following technical review by the Grants and Performance Committee and recommended to the Board for approval. During its meeting in Paris in December 2017, GPE’s Board approved the recommended EOIs, indicatively allocating US$ 67.5 million of the initial US$ 100 million.

4.4 In May 2018, the GPC is reviewed and recommended that the Board approve three (3) further EOIs (BOD/2018/06 Doc 02 Annex 3). If approved, these would absorb a further US$ 20 million, leaving US$ 12.5 million available for allocation by mid-2018.

---

1 Originally known as the Leverage Fund and subsequently rebranded to avoid confusion with GPE’s single constituent core fund.
In its December 2017 Board decision (BOD/2017/12-11), the Board requested the Secretariat to:

“...develop options for review by the Finance and Risk Committee and for their subsequent recommendation to the Board on the expansion of the Multiplier. The paper should include consideration of potential changes to eligibility, allocation, and modifications to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the process. It should take into consideration lessons learned on the process to date from the relevant Committees and Partners involved, the projections of available resources arising from the GPE Financing Conference, and the evaluation of the Multiplier.”

This paper responds to that request, presenting options for the financial scale-up of the Multiplier, extending it, providing options for new and updated eligibility and allocation models, and proposing several modifications to the process of accessing funding based on experience so far.

5. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

5.1 The fast allocation rate indicates robust country-level demand for the Multiplier. Additionally, when the multiplier fund was originally created, there was concern that only a limited range of partners would provide co-financing alongside the instrument. The seven (7) MCAMs approved by the Board indicate that this not the case. Funding from the Multiplier is supporting education delivery across diverse country contexts.

5.2 Following GPE’s Financing Conference in Dakar in February 2018, the Secretariat’s analysis of resource in-flows and pledges shows that there are adequate financial resources available to support scaling up the Multiplier from the initial US$100 million to US$300 million. (FRC-2, Financial Forecast).

5.3 Depending on the Board’s decision regarding options for eligibility and scale-up, the recommended allocation of an additional US$ 200 million to scale up the Multiplier would enable approximately 20 further countries to access the Multiplier based on a median MCAM of US$ 10 million.

5.4 Countries mobilize at least US$ 3 in new and additional funding for each US$ 1 unlocked from the Multiplier. Scaling up the instrument to US$ 300 million (comprised of the US$100 million already approved and the additional US$200 million to be decided upon) for 2018-2020 as envisaged in the Financing and Funding Framework would therefore mobilize at least US$ 900 million for education delivery in GPE countries. In practice, the initial seven EOIs approved by the Board assert a higher mobilization ratio of US$ 4.2 to US$ 1, so total co-financing mobilized for education may be larger.
6. **SCALE-UP OPTIONS FOR THE 2018-2020 PERIOD**

6.1 Based on resources forecast to be available following the GPE Financing Conference, the Board can choose to either maintain the Multiplier at its current level of resources or increase resources to enable further countries to access it.

**Option 1: “Maintain at current level”**. Maintain the Multiplier’s allocation at US$ 100 million, of which US$ 67.5 million has been allocated. **Pros**: this option would increase the share of resources available for other GPE grants or mechanisms such as ASA and KIX. **Cons**: based on the forecast level of demand, the initial US$ 100 million allocation will be fully allocated by mid-2018, preventing any further countries from accessing the facility and reducing the overall leverage effect of the instrument.

**Option 2: “Scale-up to level consistent with the Financing and Funding Framework.”** This would increase the Multiplier’s total allocation by a further US$ 200 million for the 2018-2020 period as envisaged in GPE’s Financing & Funding Framework. **Pros**: Based on a median allocation of US$ 10 million, this would enable approximately a further twenty (20) countries to access the Multiplier. With the co-financing requirement, this total level of resources would mobilize a further US$ 900 million for education delivery. **Cons**: The funds will be underutilized if demand for the Multiplier does not continue to be robust. However, in this case, the Finance and Risk Committee may recommend that the Board reallocate a share of these resources towards other GPE grants through the regular reviews of the financial forecast.

7. **ALLOCATION MODEL OPTIONS FOR THE 2018-2020 PERIOD**

7.1 In its decision in Ottawa in June 2017 (BOD/2017/06-15), the Board approved an allocation model for countries accessing the GPE Multiplier. The model uses information on a country’s school-age population to determine the level of Maximum Country Allocation from the Multiplier, ranging from US$ 1 million to US$ 25 million.

7.2 Based on experience gained during the Multiplier’s roll-out so far, a suggested modification to the allocation model is to reduce the large “jumps” in allocations across countries that may have relatively similar school-age populations. This can be done by splitting the current category for allocations of US$ 5 million, so that countries with 200,000 or fewer school-age children would be eligible for an MCAM of up to US$ 1 million; those with more would be eligible for up to US$ 5 million. The two models are set out below:

7.2.1 **Allocation Model A**: Maintain the current allocation model.
7.2.2 **Allocation Model B**: Allocate more resources for relatively more populous countries. The only change relative to Model A is to increase the cut-off for accessing US$ 5 million allocations from a school-age population of 100,000 to 200,000. In practice, the change to Model B from Model A affects three countries: Bhutan, Comoros, and the Solomon Islands are eligible for US$ 1 million, compared to US$ 5 million.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allocation ceiling US$</th>
<th>School-aged population¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 million</td>
<td>Over 10 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 million</td>
<td>Over 5 million up to and including 10 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 million</td>
<td>Over 1 million up to and including 5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 million</td>
<td>Over 100,000 up to and including 1 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 million</td>
<td>Up to 100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.3 The tables in Section 8 below set out lists of countries and their respective allocations under each Model.

---

¹ School-age population calculated as the sum of the data series 'population of the official age for lower secondary education, both sexes (number)' and 'population of the official age for primary education, both sexes (number)'. Adapted from: UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS).
8. ELIGIBILITY OPTIONS FOR THE 2018-2020 PERIOD

8.1 Subject to the decision to scaleup the Multiplier, the Secretariat recommends that the countries determined to be eligible in the Board’s decision in June 2017 in Ottawa continue to be eligible for the 2018 – 2020 period.

8.2 Subject to increasing the resources for the Multiplier, the eligibility criteria could also be modified to expand the pool of eligible countries. Eligibility3 is currently limited to countries that can apply in 2018 in the following categories:

- Countries that have Maximum Country Allocations for ESPIGS of less than US$ 10 million or that are capped at US$ 100 million
- Vulnerable Lower Middle-Income Countries
- Lower Middle-Income Countries eligible for other forms of support from GPE.

Option 1: “Full application cycle.” Eligibility would be expanded to include countries that are able to apply in 2019-2020 in the same categories:

- Countries that have Maximum Country Allocations for ESPIGS of less than US$ 10 million or that are capped at US$ 100 million
- Vulnerable Lower Middle-Income Countries
- Lower Middle-Income Countries eligible for other forms of support from GPE.

Option 2: “All countries.” All 89 countries eligible to receive some form of funding from GPE.

8.2.1 The table below summarizes these options:

---

3 Per BOD/2017/06-15 and minor modifications approved by the FRC and set out in BOD/2017/12 DOC 18.
### Option 1: “Full application cycle.”
- 47 / 22
- 69 total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries: ESPIG-eligible / non-ESPIG eligible</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Possible disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Ensures resources for countries with smaller ESPIGs and capped countries</td>
<td>• Excludes some countries that may have been able to mobilize co-financing and have large needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Option 2: “All countries.”
- 67 / 22
- 89 total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Possible disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Transparent and inclusive eligibility</td>
<td>• Significant call on Secretariat resources and time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Demand likely to severely outstrip supply, benefiting “first movers” and causing frustration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.3 **The Secretariat is not in favor of Option 2** to expand to all 89 countries at this stage as it is likely that demand for Multiplier funds would exceed supply, thereby creating tensions. Furthermore, the additional workload for Secretariat staff would be untenable, due to current limitations on Secretariat staffing linked to the ongoing discussions on institutional arrangements. Finally, expanding the eligibility to all may result in disruptions to the current ESPIG pipeline if countries seek to delay the application process to secure additional Multiplier allocations.

---

*This includes 30 countries deemed eligible by the Board in its decision at Ottawa in June 2017 (BOD/2017/06-15). These 30 countries include 22 other Lower Middle-Income Countries that are not ESPIG-eligible and eight (8) countries that are ESPIG-eligible.*
8.3.1 The Table below lists eligible countries based on allocations under **Allocation Model A**. The list of eligible countries would include all those in the second column (countries deemed eligible by the Board in June 2017 in Ottawa) and either the third (“Full cycle”) or fourth (“All countries”) columns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum Country Allocation from Multiplier (MCAM)</th>
<th>Countries eligible per BOD/2017/06-15</th>
<th>Option 1: “Full application cycle”</th>
<th>Option 2: “All countries”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US$ 25 mn</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US$ 15 mn</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| US$ 10 mn | Bolivia  
Congo Rep  
El Salvador  
Guatemala  
Honduras  
Sri Lanka  
Tajikistan  
Tunisia  
Ukraine  
Uzbekistan  
West Bank and Gaza  
Zambia | Cambodia  
Lao PDR  
Nicaragua  
Papua New Guinea  
Syria  
Zimbabwe | Benin  
Burkina Faso  
Burundi  
Cambodia  
Central African Republic  
Chad  
Eritrea  
Guinea  
Haiti  
Lao PDR  
Liberia  
Malawi  
Mali  
Nicaragua  
Papua New Guinea  
Rwanda  
Senegal  
Sierra Leone  
Somalia  
South Sudan  
Syria  
Togo  
Zimbabwe |
| US$ 5 mn | Armenia  
Djibouti  
Guyana  
Kyrgyz Republic  
Mauritania  
Moldova  
Mongolia  
Swaziland | Bhutan  
Comoros  
Gambia  
Guinea-Bissau  
Lesotho  
Solomon Islands  
Timor-Leste | Bhutan  
Comoros  
Gambia  
Guinea-Bissau  
Lesotho  
Solomon Islands  
Timor-Leste |
| US$ 1 mn | Cape Verde  
Dominica  
Grenada  
Kiribati  
Maldives  
Marshall Islands  
Micronesia  
Samoa  
Sao Tome and Principe  
St. Lucia  
St. Vincent and the Grenadines  
Tonga  
Tuvalu  
Vanuatu | Cape Verde  
Dominica  
Grenada  
Kiribati  
Maldives  
Marshall Islands  
Micronesia  
Samoa  
Sao Tome and Principe  
St. Lucia  
St. Vincent and the Grenadines  
Tonga  
Tuvalu  
Vanuatu |
8.3.2 The Table below lists eligible countries based on allocations under **Allocation Model B**. It is identical to the table above, but Bhutan, Comoros and the Solomon Islands would be eligible for US$ 1 million allocations, rather than US$ 5 million. The Finance and Risk Committee recommends the countries and allocations listed below under “Option 1” (highlighted). Countries deemed eligible in June 2017 in Ottawa would also continue to be eligible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum Country Allocation from Multiplier (MCAM)</th>
<th>Countries eligible per BOD/2017/06-15</th>
<th>Option 1: “Full application cycle”</th>
<th>Option 2: “All countries”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>US$ 25 mn</strong></td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Republic of Congo</td>
<td>Republic of Congo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>US$ 15 mn</strong></td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>Cameroon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>Cote d'Ivoire</td>
<td>Cote d'Ivoire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>Madagascar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>Myanmar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>Niger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yemen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| US$ 10 mn | Bolivia  
Congo Rep.  
El Salvador  
Guatemala  
Honduras  
Sri Lanka  
Tajikistan  
Tunisia  
Ukraine  
Uzbekistan  
West Bank and Gaza  
Zambia | Cambodia  
Lao PDR  
Nicaragua  
Papua New Guinea  
Syria  
Zimbabwe | Benin  
Burkina Faso  
Burundi  
Cambodia  
Central African Republic  
Chad  
Eritrea  
Guinea  
Haiti  
Lao PDR  
Liberia  
Malawi  
Mali  
Nicaragua  
Papua New Guinea  
Rwanda  
Senegal  
Sierra Leone  
Somalia  
South Sudan  
Syria  
Togo  
Zimbabwe |
| US$ 5 mn | Armenia  
Djibouti  
Guyana  
Kyrgyz Republic  
Mauritania  
Moldova  
Mongolia  
Swaziland | Gambia  
Guinea-Bissau  
Lesotho  
Timor-Leste | Gambia  
Guinea-Bissau  
Lesotho  
Timor-Leste |
| US$ 1 mn | Bhutan  
Cape Verde  
Comoros  
Dominica  
Grenada  
Kiribati  
Maldives  
Marshall Islands  
Micronesia  
Samoa  
Sao Tome and Principe  
Solomon Islands  
St. Lucia  
St. Vincent and the Grenadines  
Tonga  
Tuvalu  
Vanuatu | Bhutan  
Cape Verde  **Comoros**  
Dominica  
Grenada  
Kiribati  
Maldives  
Marshall Islands  
Micronesia  
Samoa  
Sao Tome and Principe  
**Solomon Islands**  
St. Lucia  
St. Vincent and the Grenadines  
Tonga  
Tuvalu  
Vanuatu |
9. **PROCESS MODIFICATIONS**

9.1 The Board instructed the Secretariat to account for evidence from an early-stage evaluation of the GPE Multiplier when proposing options for scaling it up (BOD/2017/12-11). Accordingly, the Secretariat commissioned a rapid-cycle review of the Multiplier’s roll-out by an external consultant.

9.2 The review includes evidence from structured interviews with Secretariat staff responsible for rolling out the Multiplier at country level, representatives of co-financing partners mobilizing funding alongside the Multiplier, and country-level stakeholders such as the relevant Ministry of Education or a representative of the Coordinating Agency.

9.3 It identified a set of potential risks to the Multiplier’s operation. To mitigate these risks and improve the functioning of the Multiplier, the Secretariat proposes the following process modifications:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk identified</th>
<th>Proposed modification</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| High transaction costs and long process to access allocations | Delegate authority to Grants and Performance Committee to approve MCAs from the Multiplier (MCAMs) | To apply for funding from the Multiplier, a country first needs to submit an Expression of Interest (EOI) for the GPC’s recommendation to the Board. If the Board approves the EOI, the country receives an MCAM. The country then needs to submit a successful application to access the funds.  
**Under the proposed modification, the Board would delegate authority to the GPC to approve the MCA from the Multiplier.** This would mitigate the risk of high transaction costs in accessing allocations.  
**Note that the Board would still review and approve grant applications prepared by countries seeking to use their MCAMs.** |
| Insufficient clarity about eligibility and allocations | Instruct the Secretariat to publish the list of eligible countries and total of funds available for the 2018-2020 period (following Board decision on the  | During the Multiplier’s initial roll-out, key stakeholders felt that the countries and potential MCAMs were not easily available.  
Similarly, following Board decisions regarding allocations from the Multiplier, stakeholders were not able to easily access updated information about the level of resources remaining. |

---

5 The issue of high transaction cost is examined in a more holistic way by the GPC with related recommendations to the Board in BOD/2018/06 DOC XX. These recommendations include delegations to the GPC for approving ESPIGs, including Multiplier grants. Specifically, the GPC could approve grants of US$10 million and below. The Board would approve grants over US$10 million. The grant amount considered in the delegation is based on the total value of a country’s application at one time. For example, if a country submits an application for a US$10 million ESPIG together with an application for a US$5 million Multiplier grant, Board approval is required as the total value exceeds US$10 million.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Insufficient clarity about application timelines and access to resources ringfenced through submission of the Expression of Interest (EOI).</th>
<th>Delegation of authority to the Grants and Performance Committee (GPC) to extend the application period available to countries.</th>
<th>Unlike resources from the GPE core fund, the total value of potential Multiplier allocations for which countries are eligible is larger than the level of resources available, including if the Board elects to scale up available resources to US$ 300 million for the 2018-2020 period.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Where a year has elapsed and no application using the funds earmarked for a country through an approved EOI has been received, those funds will be freed for access by other countries.</td>
<td>There is a risk that countries with an approved MCAM will not prepare full applications to access the MCAM, and so will not use ringfenced resources. To mitigate this risk, the Secretariat proposes to maintain the requirement that countries submit a full application based on their EOI within one (1) year of the MCAM being approved. <strong>To enable flexibility for countries that are on track to prepare Applications, the Secretariat recommends delegating responsibility to the GPC to approve extensions of up to one year to this application period.</strong> Where countries have not prepared full Applications and a year has elapsed and the GPC has not approved an extension of the application period, the MCAM is canceled and the funds become available to other countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-financing included as the basis of the Expression of Interest may not be mobilized or likely to be mobilized when the final Application is prepared or reviewed.</td>
<td>Instruct the Secretariat to amend the Guidance to the Grants and Performance Committee regarding how Expressions of Interest are evaluated going forward.</td>
<td>During the Multiplier’s initial roll-out, the Secretariat tested a broad definition of sources of co-financing that included funding in support of the Education Sector Plan that would not necessarily be provided through the same Grant Agent or pooled funding facility. This has the benefit of allowing a large range of partners to score increased funding as a source of support for the national ESP, and to enable a MCAM. However, it creates a risk that financing that is the basis for a Multiplier allocation may not be available or as likely to be mobilized at the time GPE’s Board reviews the final Multiplier application.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Note that access to GPE resources for countries that do not have a Secretariat Country Lead appointed to them will be contingent on increasing the size of the Secretariat’s Country Support Team. This is discussed further in the section on Risks and Resource Implications, below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Insufficient clarity about criteria to access the Multiplier</th>
<th>Publication of the Guidance to the Grants and Performance Committee.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To mitigate this risk, the Secretariat could amend the Guidance to the GPC for future evaluations of Expressions of Interest to include only a narrower range of financing alongside the Multiplier allocation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would define the clearest evidence of co-financing to be funding to be delivered through the same modality as GPE funding in a single program (typically with the same Grant Agent) or through a common funding mechanism in support of the education sector plan such as a pooled fund (in which case the Grant Agent may be different from the partner providing the co-financing).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The review of Multiplier operations highlighted the risk that insufficient clarity about criteria to access the Multiplier could be an impediment to scaling up the instrument.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To address the risk, the guidance developed by the Secretariat to support the Grants and Performance Committee in its evaluation of Expressions of Interest for the Multiplier could be made publicly available. Updates and adjustments to the Guidance would be subject to the GPC's review and approval.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient clarity on how financial “additionality” of co-financing should be demonstrated</td>
<td>Request co-financing partners to formally endorse the additional resource mobilization reported in Expressions of Interest, and ensure that these funds are available or highly likely to be available at implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for long-term evaluation to supplement the rapid-cycle analysis</td>
<td>Instruct the Secretariat to track countries that have Multiplier grants to test longer-term outcomes and resource mobilization.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Quality education for all children*
9.4 To ensure flexibility to operate in the range of country contexts and situations that may arise, the Board may also continue to delegate responsibility for minor modifications of the Multiplier’s operation, eligibility or allocations to the Finance and Risk Committee and / or the Grants and Performance Committee.

9 RISKS AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

9.1 Following GPE’s Financing Conference in Dakar in February 2018, the Secretariat’s analysis of resource in-flows and pledges shows that there are adequate financial resources available to support scaling up the Multiplier from the initial US$100 million to US$300 million. (BOD/2018/06 DOC 08).

9.2 The operationalization of the Multiplier creates capacity risks for the GPE Secretariat. The Guidelines for Multiplier ESPIG applications clarifies that countries eligible for both an ESPIG and a Multiplier allocation are expected to prepare a single application using both instruments, except where preparing separate applications is strongly justified.

9.3 The eligibility options set out in BOD/2018/06 DOC 08 include some countries that may seek to prepare these separate applications. Where this occurs, it will create additional capacity costs for the Secretariat related to, for example, the preparation and quality assurance of separate applications.

9.4 The eligibility scenarios also include countries that are not currently directly covered by a country-facing member of the Secretariat’s Country Support Team. Enabling these countries to access Multiplier resources would therefore require some increase in the Country Support Team’s headcount to enable the Secretariat to engage with further Developing Country Partners.

9.5 The Secretariat will factor this into the outreach to countries with respect to the Multiplier while at the same time seeking to explore solutions on the human resources side to be better able to meet demand from GPE eligible countries.

10. NEXT STEPS

10.1 During their meeting in Maputo in May 2018, GPE’s Developing Country Partner (DCPs) focal points expressed enthusiasm for the Multiplier and requested further support from the Secretariat to facilitate their access to Multiplier grants. Based on feedback from the Board, the Secretariat will continue to operationalize the GPE Multiplier, including through outreach and support to DCPs.
11. **PLEASE CONTACT** Theodore Talbot ([ttalbot@globalpartnership.org](mailto:ttalbot@globalpartnership.org)) for further information.

12. **ANNEXES/FURTHER INFORMATION AND GLOSSARY**

12.1 This paper includes the following annexes and further information:

**Annex 1:** *GPC Guidance: Evaluating EOIs for the GPE Multiplier*

**Annex 2:** *GPE Multiplier: Analysis of Initial Roll-Out & Benchmarking Exercise*

**Other documents:** *GPE Country-Level Evaluations: Final Inception Report.*