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Introduction and objectives

Global Goal: SDG 4
Strategy: GPE 2020
Question: Is the country-level model working?
Mandate
Governance
Study Questions

1. Is there clarity of understanding of the roles and responsibilities of key actors?

2. What are the core enabling factors and bottlenecks to fulfilling their roles and responsibilities effectively?

3. What changes would further support key actors in fulfilling their roles effectively?

4. How do key actors approach the responsibility for capacity development, and how could capacity development be delivered more effectively?
Who and what are we talking about?

- Planning [ESPDG]
- Implementation [PDG]
- Monitoring and Evaluation [ESPIG]

- Inclusive dialogue and collaboration
- Technical support and capacity development
- Quality assurance
- Fiduciary oversight
- (Mutual) Accountabilities
- Aid effectiveness approaches
Methodology: sources

**Primary Data**
- Telephone interviews
- 11 DCPs (3 of which written)
- 12 DPs (GA/CA HQs)
- 2 INGOs (GA HQs)

**Webinars**
- 6 CSOs
- 1 DP + 3 written responses

**Secretariat responsibilities**
- Mapping by secretariat
- 4 written responses from GPC

**Secondary Data**
- Mapping of GA/CA/LEG roles
- DCP consultation
- LEG survey
- LEG desk review
- Background documents
Methodology: approach

Perceptions and expectations

Inductive

Breadth versus depth

Open consultation
DCP meeting, May 2018
Mozambique
Findings
Overarching findings

Model is fine

Roles and responsibilities: clear on paper, ambiguity in practice

DCP leadership and ownership is key
Local education groups (LEGs)

Confusion about role and mandate

Lack of meaningful representation and participation

Want a role in monitoring and accountability
Coordinating agencies (CAs)

Nominated lead in the CA

Lack of resources

DPs’ resource contribution?
Grant agents (GAs)

GPE is not ‘visible’

(Lack of) diversification

Remote GAs, weaker relationships

Accountable to who?
Interaction: CAs and GAs

Interpretation by individuals

Clarification and context

The variable part
Secretariat

No TORs: boundaries
Facilitation, or direction?
Technical skills and expertise
Time consuming processes
Interaction: Secretariat, CAs and GAs

CAs do not want to be the Secretariat’s messenger
- Secretariat as enabler
- Duplication in QAR process
- Limited Secretariat availability
- Monitor GAs and CAs
Capacity development

What does GPE mean by capacity development in the country model?

Government is key: ownership, systems, TA with (not instead)

Cross-country learning
Recommendations
Recommendation 1

Guidance and detail in ToR

Modalities of guidance
Publicly available ToR for CLs
Guidance on LEG effectiveness
Recommendation 2

Strengthen mutual accountability

Operationalising mutual accountability

Transparency around GAs

The DCP needs to be at the heart of the partnership
Recommendation 3

Differentiated support from the Secretariat

Develop a mechanism to scale CL support
Recognise (differing) CAs’ resource needs
Continue streamlining processes
Recommendation 4

Create a strategy for capacity development

- Define capacity development
- Specific objectives (and funding?)
- Continue cross-country exchange
Conclusions

No major change to model
Guidance and detail in TORs
Operationalise mutual accountability
Differentiated Secretariat support
Capacity development strategy
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