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Annex 1.3.1: Terms of Reference
Independent Summative Evaluation (ISE) of the Global Partnership for Education (GPE) 2020

Terms of Reference – Updated August 8, 2019
### Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DCPs</td>
<td>Developing country partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFA-FTI</td>
<td>Education for All – Fast Track Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPE</td>
<td>Global Partnership for Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEC</td>
<td>Independent Evaluation Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISE</td>
<td>Independent Summative Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD/DAC</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development / Development Assistance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;P</td>
<td>Results and Performance (R&amp;P) team of the GPE Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP</td>
<td>Request for Proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG</td>
<td>Sustainable Development Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIC</td>
<td>Strategy and Impact Committee or Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STC</td>
<td>Short-term consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToR</td>
<td>Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTL</td>
<td>Task team leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBG</td>
<td>World Bank Group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Introduction and Background

About the Global Partnership for Education

1.1 Established in 2002, and formerly called the Education for All – Fast Track Initiative (EFA-FTI), the GPE is a multi-stakeholder partnership focused on supporting and financing education in low and lower middle-income countries and contributing to the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goal on Education (SDG 4).

1.2 The GPE has undergone a series of reforms since its founding. Following a mid-term evaluation of the FTI in 2010, the GPE introduced reforms to strengthen its governance and establish more specific funding arrangements. Three replenishment events led to a growth in GPE’s financial resources. The GPE adopted a new country-level funding model in 2014, revising its country-level eligibility criteria, its allocation formula, and requirements for credible Education Sector Plans, domestic financing levels, and data to access funding. The new funding model also introduced a performance-based financing component, which aimed to incentivize outcomes in the areas of learning, equity, and efficiency. The Independent Interim Evaluation of the GPE in 2015 laid the groundwork for organizational improvements, including its M&E systems and the consolidation of its core functions.

1.3 The GPE Board of Directors adopted a new strategic plan, GPE 2020, in December 2015, which set out the goals and objectives for the partnership between 2016 and 2020 along with a theory of change. GPE also adopted a Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Strategy in 2016, which included a results framework that has been used to monitor progress across the three goals and five strategic objectives in the partnership’s theory of change. In addition, the M&E strategy comprises an evaluation framework encompassing global indicators and a portfolio of country-level, programmatic and thematic evaluation studies. These previous evaluation studies have explored how well GPE inputs and activities have contributed to outcomes and impacts in different areas of the GPE’s engagement and programs at the country and global levels.

About the Independent Summative Evaluation

1.4 The GPE’s M&E strategy for 2016–2020 envisaged that an independent evaluation of the GPE’s contribution to development results would be conducted towards the end of the current GPE 2020 strategic plan. This would use a theory-based methodology; assess achievements along the entire results chain in the GPE’s theory of change, following the OECD/DAC criteria for development evaluation; draw on data collected from completed and forthcoming country, program, and thematic evaluations; and complement these with a review of GPE’s organizational effectiveness.

1.5 The present ISE is expected to serve as an important input into the shaping of the next GPE strategic planning exercise following the conclusion of the 2020 strategic plan. Hence, it will inform members of the Global Partnership, and the GPE Board and management about the progress that the GPE has so far made towards achieving its strategic goals and objectives, including verifying progress on the work plan derived from the 2015 interim evaluation. While the evaluation and planning processes are taking place concurrently, the evaluation will feed
into the strategic planning process at key points during the process as well as offering the summative report.

1.6 The ISE will evaluate the overall relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, contribution to impact, and likely sustainability of the GPE at both the country and global levels, and the extent to which the GPE has achieved the specific goals and objectives articulated in the GPE 2020 strategic plan. It will evaluate how well GPE 2020 strategic plan as a whole has unfolded; the validity of GPE’s theory of change according to the evidence so far available; the roles of the GPE Secretariat, developing country partners, and other stakeholders in delivering GPE 2020; and the extent to which the GPE has achieved the three main purposes and four main streams of work identified in the 2017 M&E strategy.

1.7 The ISE will also assess the extent to which the new GPE funding model and the associated planning, data, and domestic financing requirements have contributed to improving education systems in partner countries, and to observed improvements in terms of learning outcomes, equity, and gender equality. Because student-level outcomes take time to achieve and data are available only with a time lag, the ISE will also examine the extent to which the GPE is focusing on processes and substantive issues that are likely to yield results in the future, and that facilitate longer-term improvements in outcomes. The evaluation will also identify promising practices and lessons learned and formulate recommendations for improvement, taking into account possible bottlenecks and barriers.

Governance, Management and Independence of the ISE

1.8 The Strategy and Impact Committee (SIC) of the GPE is responsible for ensuring the budget and direction for the overall management and delivery of the ISE. The SIC will accomplish this with support from the GPE Secretariat and by working through an Independent Evaluation Committee (IEC) that has been appointed by the SIC.

1.9 The ISE will be conducted by a firm selected competitively according to standard World Bank procurement procedures. The present ToR represents the terms of reference for the firm to conduct the evaluation.

1.10 The IEC will oversee the conduct of the ISE by the firm to ensure that the evaluation is conducted independently of the partnership itself, including of the GPE Board and Committees. The IEC will guide the evaluation and will review the evaluation products prepared by the firm to ensure their quality, integrity, and timeliness, while preserving the independence of the evaluation. The GPE Board, the SIC, and the Secretariat will not interfere with the content and direction of the evaluation (i.e., the findings from the evaluation). Once selected, the evaluation firm will report directly to the IEC in relation to the evaluation findings, with required reviews and oversight provided by the GPE Secretariat Task Team Leader.

1.11 While the IEC has been endorsed by and will report to the SIC, the IEC will maintain an independent role (e.g., in determining the final evaluation questions and overseeing the quality of the evaluation). While the ISE will therefore be carried out independently of the GPE by the selected firm, the IEC will work closely with the SIC to coordinate the work, with
the Secretariat’s Results and Performance team providing administrative support to both the IEC and SIC.

2. Evaluation Purpose and Scope

Purpose

2.1 The ISE will be instrumental in helping shape GPE’s post-2020 strategy, through its reflections on the current GPE strategic plan, related operations, and governance at the global and country levels. The ISE implementation will run parallel to the new GPE strategy planning process organized separately by GPE, which formally begins in June 2019, so as to feed in a timely manner into the post-2020 strategy development. The ISE will serve as an update of the findings from the last independent evaluation of GPE that was conducted in 2015, and an assessment of the extent to which the GPE has implemented the recommended changes identified in that evaluation.

2.2 More specifically, the overarching aims of the ISE are as follows:

- **Learning** — To understand which aspects of the GPE 2020 strategy are working and which need improvement in the next GPE strategy period going forward.
- **Accountability** — To determine progress towards results and whether GPE partners are fulfilling their expected roles and responsibilities effectively.
- **Transparency** — To communicate findings and achievements broadly and confidently to all stakeholders in an effective way, including citizens and civil society.
- **Effectiveness** — To determine the extent to which the GPE operational model is fit for purpose.

Scope of Work for the Consultancy Assignment

2.3 The firm will conduct an Independent Summative Evaluation (ISE) of the Global Partnership for Education that meets the following expectations, as described here and in sections 3 and 4.

2.4 The ISE will cover the time period since the last independent evaluation in 2015.

2.5 The firm will examine both the development effectiveness and the organizational effectiveness of the GPE at both the global and country levels.

2.6 “Development effectiveness” is understood in the broad sense to comprise the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, contribution to impact, and likely sustainability, appropriately interpreted for global partnership programs like the GPE.

2.7 “Organizational effectiveness” refers to the proficiency of the programs’ governance and management structures, functions, and processes in facilitating the GPE’s purposes and objectives in an efficient and transparent manner. Thus, this evaluation, like other evaluations of global partnership programs, goes beyond the OECD/DAC principles to include an assessment of the governance and management of the partnership at both the global and
country levels. This includes an assessment of how well the GPE country model is working, and of the alignment among governments and development partners at the country level — including bilateral and multilateral donors, grant agents, international and national CSOs, teacher organizations, philanthropic foundations, and the private sector.

2.8 The firm will examine all aspects of the GPE’s work at the global and country levels, and how GPE supports partner countries to develop stronger education systems (through support to sector planning and implementation, raising and diversifying funds, mutual accountability, building and sustaining political will and commitment to education, etc.) with the aims of improving learning outcomes, equity, gender equality, and inclusion.

2.9 The firm will address the following set of evaluation issues in relation to the development effectiveness and the organizational effectiveness of the GPE, each issue being explored at the applicable level (global and/or country). Annex A provides a detailed set of evaluation questions in relation to each of the eight evaluation issues. Annex B provides a set of existing and forthcoming — but not exhaustive — data sources that will be useful in answering some of the questions around these eight issues.

A. Development Effectiveness

(1) Relevance
(2) Effectiveness and Contributions to Impact
(3) Efficiency, Additionality and Leverage
(4) Likely Sustainability

B. Organizational Effectiveness

(5) Governance and Management
(6) Administrative Efficiency
(7) Country-Level Arrangements and Processes
(8) Monitoring and Evaluation

2.10 The firm will assess the contributions of the GPE to achieving the GPE’s objectives as laid out in the GPE 2020 Strategic Plan and Theory of Change, the GPE Results Framework, the New Funding Model, “How GPE Works in Partner Countries,” and the 2016 Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy. It should also identify unintended outcomes, whether positive or negative, that emerge from the evaluation. Where possible, the firm will explore contributions to impact within the limits of available evidence. The evaluation is not expected to conclusively demonstrate attribution or causality between GPE inputs and intended or unintended development outcomes.

2.11 The firm will analyze the evaluation issues comparatively to understand how development effectiveness and organizational effectiveness differ operationally across different contextual conditions. Specific conditions such as the effects of conflict or challenges to the reach of central governments are likely to shape both national needs and the experience of the partnership and its funding modalities. It is important for the evaluation to
understand these differences as well as to assess the overall achievements of the GPE in order to increase the responsiveness of the GPE.

2.12 The firm will examine the extent to which the GPE has accepted and implemented the recommendations of the 2015 evaluation, and the results of implementing these recommendations.

2.13 The firm will conduct a portfolio review of what the GPE has actually funded since 2015 in terms of the type, size and country distribution of the funded activities and programs. The assessment of efficiency should describe where, what, and how GPE resources have been spent on; trends over the 2015–2020 strategic plan period; and how the preparation and disbursement speeds have affected implementation and results.

2.14 The firm will assess the extent to which the GPE Results Framework has been an effective tool. It should examine the coherence and alignment around indicators across the different partners. For example, if different partners focus on different measures for learning, etc., this could affect how well the partnership functions. If possible, it would be useful for the firm to consider whether there is need for some sort of data infrastructure at the outcome level and what shape or agreed framework this might take among GPE partners, with the GPE indicators potentially focused on GPE dimensions of partnerships, systems, and use of GPE resources.

2.15 The GPE has produced a large corpus of information and data since the 2015 evaluation as part of its M&E Strategy, including annual results reports, annual portfolio reviews, grants tracking data, country-level evaluations, programmatic evaluations, and other assessments of the GPE. (See list in Annex B.) Hence, the relatively short completion date of June 2020 for the ISE is based on the expectation that the evaluation will not require the firm to conduct extensive primary data collection. The firm is expected to take full advantage of the available evidence to inform its findings and recommendations, as noted in the GPE’s M&E Strategy, and in line with good practice.

Expectations on the Conduct of an Evidence-based and Methodologically Sound Evaluation

2.16 The evaluation will be evidence-based. All findings and conclusions should be based on evidence which is presented in the evaluation report (including the annexes) so that these can be critically assessed, and on the triangulation of different sources of evidence to verify and substantiate assessments. Such evidence may take the form of qualitative analysis, tabulation of data, compilation of survey results, analysis such as correlation or regression analysis, objective observations of measurable data, etc. In cases where the source of information is interviews, the method of selecting those to be interviewed should be presented in the evaluation report and the findings noted as the views of particular stakeholder groups. In the case of surveys, the questionnaire, information on the population or samples, and the response rates should be presented in the report.

2.17 Further data and report preparation details to be followed are below.
• The evaluation firm should ensure that all data are collected according to ethical standards and that collected data are organized, secured and preserved for potential re-analysis in the summative GPE evaluation.

• All data and findings will remain the property of GPE at the conclusion of the evaluation contract.

• The evaluation reports should be written clearly and be impartial and constructive in tone. Each draft should be professionally edited. There should be creative use of tables and high-quality graphics.

• The evaluation firm should follow the GPE guidelines and standards for publications in terms of style and language.

• The evaluation firm will be expected to participate in the dissemination of findings from the evaluation.

• Treatment of documents that are not publicly disclosed will be done in a confidential manner.

• Firm will agree not to publish evaluation results or outputs without permission from the Board or Secretariat.

3 Evaluation Approach and Activities

3.1 The evaluation will be conducted in two stages. The first stage, from August to December 2019, will begin with an August kick-off meeting and consist of a document review of the existing evaluative and other GPE partnership materials (e.g., grant guidelines and including, but not only, those listed in Annex B) and selected interviews, concluding with an Interim Report of preliminary findings presented to the Independent Evaluation Committee (IEC) by 15 October 2019, to the Strategy and Impact Committee at its meeting on 30–31 October 2019, and to the GPE Board meeting on 10–12 December 2019.

3.2 The first stage will begin with a kick-off meeting in Washington and include the preparation of an Inception Report (prepared by the end of November 2019) consisting of an analysis of the gaps in the existing evaluative material to answer the evaluation questions, and a proposed evaluation methodology to address these gaps during the second stage. Members of the firm, IEC, SIC Working Group, and the GPE Secretariat will meet on/about November 1 (in Paris), immediately after the SIC meeting, to discuss and agree on the major outlines of the next stage of the evaluation.

3.3 The second stage, which will have its methodology elaborated in an Inception Report (draft due end-November 2019 and final due mid-December 2019), will consist of additional mixed methods to address the identified gaps, concluding with a draft Final Evaluation Report submitted to the IEC by the end of March 2020 and submitted to the Strategy and Impact Committee meeting in April 2020. Then the firm will submit the Final Evaluation Report, based on comments received from the IEC, SIC and the GPE Secretariat, and present its findings to the GPE Board meeting on 2–4 June 2020.
3.4 It is expected that **interviews** (a combination of virtual and face-to-face) during the first stage will be limited to the GPE Board and Committees, the GPE Secretariat, and the authors of the evaluative material reviewed, as deemed helpful. The **range of interviews, surveys, and other evaluation methods during the second stage** may expand to additional GPE stakeholders, including at the country level and representing a balance of all constituencies. However, it is not expected that the firm will conduct additional country visits on top of those that have already taken place during the preparation of the existing and forthcoming country-level evaluations. (See **summative and prospective case studies** and **first-year synthesis report**.)

3.5 Any **stakeholder surveys** should be administered in coordination with similar surveys conducted by the GPE Secretariat as part the strategy planning exercise running parallel to the ISE in 2019–20. Surveys should be administered in multiple languages — English, French, Spanish, Portuguese, and Arabic.

3.6 The firm will be responsible for delivering all reports in English. The final Interim Report and the final Evaluation Report must also be translated into French and submitted to the GPE Board at least two weeks prior to the meetings in December 2019 and June 2020. The Executive Summaries of the final Interim Report and the final Evaluation Report should also be translated into Spanish. The evaluation firm will be responsible for editing, designing, translating and printing (in English – approximately 100 copies of the final report, 70 of the interim report; in French – approximately 10) and sending of hard copies to individual recipients (of the 70, about 25 will be sent to GPE’s offices in Washington and the rest to Board members, SIC members, their staff, etc. at global postal addresses).

3.7 The firm will also prepare two progress reports to the IEC in mid-September 2019 for the first stage and at the end of January 2020 for the second stage. Both reports may be PowerPoint presentations. Both may also be presented to members of the GPE Secretariat strategic planning group. The mid-September report may also be an opportunity for initial preparations for a single coordinated survey for both the ISE and the strategic planning exercise.

3.8 The final Interim Report should be no more than 50 pages and the final Evaluation Report should be no more than 75 pages, both excluding the Executive Summary and Annexes.

3.9 Deliverables will only be accepted as final upon satisfactory finalization of each evaluation deliverable, based on IEC recommendation and GPE Secretariat TTL administrative approval.

3.10 The firm should arrange for all travel necessary for the accomplishment of the activities and deliverables of this TOR.

3.11 The evaluation firm should include five (5) regular face-to-face meetings with the IEC and GPE Secretariat during the course of the contract and one presentation to the GPE Board of Directors.
4   Deliverables and Timeline

4.1 The firm will provide four main deliverables:

- A draft and final Interim Report (August to December 2019)
- A draft and final Inception Report for the second stage (End-November to mid-December 2019)

4.2 The table below provides a more detailed set of work items to be conducted in support of completing the above deliverables, as well as timeline of events for each stage of the evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Supports/Inputs</th>
<th>By When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultancy company (vendor/contractor) begins work and participates in an in-person kick-off meeting with the IEC and Secretariat (Washington, August date to be determined)</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>IEC/ Secretariat</td>
<td>13 August 2019 (estimated)-mid September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor prepares draft Interim Report, preliminary findings, gap analysis, and proposed evaluation methodology for final report, based on document review of existing evaluative material and interviews with GPE Board and Secretariat</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>IEC/ Secretariat</td>
<td>13 August to 15 October 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor submits and presents progress report (PowerPoint format) to IEC. IEC updates SIC Working Group on progress.</td>
<td>Contractor/ IEC</td>
<td>SIC/ Secretariat</td>
<td>13 September 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor submits draft Interim Report to IEC.</td>
<td>Contractor/ IEC</td>
<td>SIC/ Secretariat</td>
<td>15 October 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEC submits draft Interim Report, two-page summary, and IEC comments one week in advance of the upcoming SIC meeting (Paris).</td>
<td>IEC</td>
<td>SIC/ Secretariat</td>
<td>21 October 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor and IEC present draft Interim Report to SIC meeting in Paris, attended by all IEC members</td>
<td>Contractor/ IEC</td>
<td>SIC/ Secretariat</td>
<td>29–31 October 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor, IEC and SIC Working Group agree on detailed design of second stage of ISE evaluation</td>
<td>Contractor/ IEC/ SIC</td>
<td>Secretariat</td>
<td>1 November 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor attends ‘country level evaluation’ synthesis workshop in Washington, led by Universalia (and may also use the visit for data collection/meetings)</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>Secretariat</td>
<td>Est November 2019 (Date TBD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor submits English and French versions of final Interim Report to IEC, SIC, and Secretariat for transmission to the Board</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>IEC/ SIC/ Secretariat</td>
<td>25 November 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Task | Responsible | Supports/Inputs | By When
--- | --- | --- | ---
Contractor submits draft Inception Report to IEC, including detailed methodology for final report. | Contractor | IEC/ Secretariat | End-November 2019
Contract submits final Inception Report | Contractor | | 20 December 2019
Contractor presents final Interim Report to Board meeting (Nairobi). | Contractor/ IEC | SIC/ Secretariat | 10–12 December 2019


Contractor prepares draft Final Evaluation Report for review and comment by IEC | Contractor | IEC/ Secretariat | 1 November 2019 to 31 March 2019
Contractor submits and presents progress report (PowerPoint format) to IEC. IEC updates SIC Working Group on progress. | Contractor | IEC | 31 January 2020
Contractor submits draft Final Evaluation Report to IEC, including findings and recommendations. | Contractor | IEC | End-March 2020
IEC submits the draft Final Evaluation Report to the SIC at least two weeks before the SIC regular meeting, and submits comments on the report at least one week before the meeting, | IEC | Contractor/ Secretariat | Early April 2020
Contractor, IEC, and SIC discuss findings, recommendations and implications of draft Final Evaluation Report at the SIC regular meeting *(Meeting might be virtual or in a location to be determined.)* | Contractor/ IEC/ SIC | Secretariat | Mid to late April 2020
Contractor finalizes the report, and submits English and French versions of Final Report to IEC, SIC, and Secretariat for transmission to the Board | Contractor | IEC/ SIC/ Secretariat | 11 May 2020
IEC clears the report and provides its observations on quality of the evaluation report to the SIC for transmission to the Board | IEC | SIC/ Secretariat | 18 May 2020
Contractor and IEC present Final Evaluation Report findings to the Board at Board meeting *(Location not determined, but likely to be in a donor or development country partner city.)* | Contractor/ IEC | SIC/ Secretariat | 2–4 June 2020
GPE Board responds to ISE findings | Board | SIC/ Secretariat | End June 2020

### 5 Technical Requirements for the Proposal

5.1 Each offeror’s proposal should indicate concisely but specifically the abilities and experience of the firm and proposed team along the following four dimensions below.

5.2 Technical and Managerial Capabilities of the Firm (Consultants’ Organization and Experience).
• **Firm’s technical and managerial capabilities** (i.e., operational and financial management systems, staffing and other arrangements in place to manage similar assignments in a tight time-frame, etc.). A focus area of the firm’s work should involve the design and implementation of evaluations and the firm should have expertise in different evaluation methodologies.

• **Experience in assembling and managing high-level technical staff to deliver on similar assignments.** The proposed firm should have a successful track record of evaluating education sector planning and implementation programs.

• **Firm’s ability and commitment to meet the initial time demands of the evaluation** (this includes an initial surge of work August-October 2019 in the first stage (Interim Report) of the work).

5.3 **Expertise in Conducting Independent Summative Evaluations.**

• **Firm’s track-record of undertaking similar independent summative evaluation assignments, specifically in designing, managing and leading evaluations in a speedy and efficient manner, with evaluation designs fit for purpose** (e.g., in managing and delivering robust multi-component evaluations of education sector progress in developing country contexts; partnership evaluations; meta-evaluations; independent summative evaluations synthesizing data from multiple sources, etc.).

• **Experience in addressing issues around the two main evaluation issues – development effectiveness and organizational effectiveness.** On development effectiveness, the firm should understand and have used the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria. On organizational effectiveness, the firm should have experience in organizations and systems related to: governance and management; administrative efficiency; country level arrangements and processes; M&E. Experience with complexity and systems thinking is desired.

• **Project examples.** Brief descriptions of similar work in independent summative evaluations or evaluations that provide inputs into strategy development. If available, links to executive summaries (or full reports) should be provided.

5.4 **Technical Approach, Methodology and Work Plan.**

• **A summary of the overall methodological and analytical approach proposed,** focusing on the first stage of the evaluation, with an indicative approach for the second stage.

• **A comprehensive, actionable and realistic work plan** is provided for activities and deliverables, also including a contingency component and delineating roles/responsibilities.

• **A proposed evaluation matrix** that addresses the evaluation questions stipulated in Annex A.
5.5 Qualifications and Competence of the Key Staff related to the Assignment.

The following key profiles are expected for the as part of the core team in the technical proposal, in addition to support functions. The key staff should have masters to PhD level backgrounds.

- **Evaluation director** who is seasoned (e.g., 20+ years of experience) conducting and managing evaluations, leading a diverse team, responding to client needs, and so on.

- **Technical evaluators/researchers with a mix of expertise** — most would have 15+ years of experience — in the following areas.
  
  o **Evaluation design and implementation.** Expertise in education systems monitoring and evaluation in developing countries and expertise in education policy evaluation, including quantitative and qualitative approaches to such evaluation.

  o **Education sector expertise in developing country contexts,** with knowledge of such topics as education quality, education outcomes, education systems, education policy, etc. For this topic area, a PhD level expert with an education specialization, ideally with career experience working in a research capacity, is desired.

  o **On-the-ground experience of developing countries’ education systems.** This would include experience in advising national or state governments on education system needs, development or implementation of education sector plans, and so on.

  o **Strategy and organizational effectiveness development and reviews.** Experience working with a management consulting firm or in-house corporate position with a strategic focus is desired. Expertise is sought on developing or shaping strategies.

  o **Expertise in analysis of public finance and aid financing.** Experience working on policy, program or project financing in/with donor agencies or government agencies would be important.

  o **French language capabilities** among some members of the team is necessary. (Other GPE languages are a plus, but French is strongly desired.)

Oral Presentation – During Technical Evaluation

5.6 Offerors *may be* required to make an oral presentation of the technical proposals submitted. Information from the oral presentation will also be used as part of the technical evaluation process. The WBG reserves the right to incorporate elements from oral presentations in the final Contract. The oral presentation will not encompass price proposals.

Oral Presentation Ground Rules

5.7 The selected Offerors as specified above must make an oral presentation to the WBG’s evaluation panel and participate in a question and answer session. The purpose of the oral presentation and question and answer session is to validate the information provided by the Offeror in their proposal and to test the Offeror’s understanding of the work that will be performed per the TOR under the prospective contract, which will be a factor in the overall technical evaluation of the proposals.
5.8 Presentation will begin approximately 2 weeks after receipt of proposals. The WBG will determine the date and time for each Offerors’ oral presentation. The Procurement Specialist will notify Offerors of the scheduled date and time, as well as the agenda for their presentation within 1 week of the receipt of proposals. At its sole discretion, the WBG reserves the right to reschedule any Offeror’s presentation. Offerors must confirm their availability on that date should they be invited.

5.9 The presentation must be made by one or more of the personnel whom the Offeror will employ to manage or supervise contract performance.

5.10 The Offeror should be prepared to answer detailed technical questions from the WBG.

5.11 During the presentation, interaction between the evaluation team and the Offeror will be limited. The WBG’s Procurement Specialist will chair the meeting and ensure compliance with the ground rules. The WBG will not inform Offerors of their strengths, deficiencies or weaknesses during the presentation, and the WBG will not engage in bargaining during the presentations. The presentation does not constitute discussions with Offerors.

Avoidance of Conflicts of Interest

5.12 Evaluators must be able to undertake objective, unbiased evaluation. Therefore, each offeror must fully divulge in the Technical Proposal any activities or connections that might lead to potential or perceived conflicts of interest, and the firm should propose how it plans to mitigate and manage these conflicts during the conduct of the evaluation. This applies at both the corporate and individual levels. Failure to disclose such conflicts would constitute grounds for disqualification or termination of the contract. The ways in which any potential or perceived conflicts of interest have been managed will also be disclosed in the final evaluation report.

5.13 Actual or perceived conflicts of interest might arise from the following non-exhaustive list of circumstances:

a. Involvement in the design, implementation or monitoring of GPE-funded strategies, programs or projects, including World Bank-funded projects that are closely related to GPE-funded projects
b. Preparation of major evaluation studies, or other assessment reports, since 2015 that are likely to contribute to significant findings of the ISE
c. Existing ongoing contracts with the GPE Secretariat
d. Relationship to GPE Board member or staff
e. Serving as a member or observer on the GPE Board or Committee
f. High dependency on funding from any organization that is a GPE Board member or partner

5.14 The consulting firm will be expected neither to engage in, nor to seek, any other GPE-funded work during the course of this consultancy. Further, the firm should report on a timely basis any possible conflicts of interest that may arise throughout the duration of the contract.
5.15 Firms are **strongly advised** to review the Corporate Procurement Policy Summary for Vendors Doing Business with the World Bank Group.

6 Inputs and Supervision from the Global Partnership for Education

6.1 The GPE Project Team will supervise the work of the Contractor and assist the evaluation in the following ways:

- Provide necessary documents and other GPE-related information from the Secretariat needed and requested by the firm
- Provide lists of GPE Board, Secretariat staff, and other GPE stakeholders, for the purpose of the evaluation and provide a letter of introduction for the purposes of the evaluation
- Provide the names and e-mail addresses for stakeholder surveys that are available at the Secretariat

6.2 The Secretariat will provide a form introductory letter that can be used, as appropriate, and depending on country contexts, to contact GPE actors at country level, such as for example the coordinating agencies, grant agents, or country focal points, who could be requested to:

- Provide information on GPE-supported, education-related activities since 2015
- Assist in identifying country-level stakeholders to interview or include in stakeholder surveys.

6.3 The Independent Evaluation Committee (IEC) is responsible for ensuring the overall independence and quality of the evaluation process while reporting to the Strategy and Impact Committee (SIC). This includes:

- Reviewing progress reports of the Contractor and approving all deliverables submitted by the Contractor.
- Reviewing and commenting on the Interim Report, the Inception Report, and the draft Final Report before deliverables are considered final and accepted by the Global Partnership for Education.
Annex A. Evaluation Issues and Questions

The evaluation will address the following evaluation issues and questions in relation to the development effectiveness and the organizational effectiveness of the GPE, each issue being explored at the applicable level (global and/or country).

Development Effectiveness

(1) Relevance

- What has been the validity of the GPE 2020 Theory of Change in practice in different country contexts? To what extent has this been an effective instrument to provide guidance on the achievement of education results in developing country partners (DCPs) in terms of systems strengthening, learning, and equity?
- To what extent has the GPE delivered on its commitment to align its activities with SDG 4 and to using SDG 4 indicators in the implementation of its monitoring and evaluation strategy?
- To what extent has the GPE contributed to greater coherence in the international financial support for education in GPE-eligible countries?
- To what extent have development partners shared ownership of the GPE, including the partnership’s emphasis on learning, data, gender equality, etc.?
- How well have the activities of development partners been aligned with and supported the GPE’s country model? How has the degree of alignment affected the operationalization of the model?
- To what extent have GPE-supported projects reflected government priorities, the priorities of grant agents, or the priorities of other actors?
- To what extent have the objectives and design of the approved grants been consistent with the GPEs vision, mission, and strategic goals and objectives?
- To what extent has GPE financing been based on needs? To what extent, and how has GPE financing incentivized reforms to increase public expenditure and improve performance of educational systems?

(2) Effectiveness and Contributions to Impact

- What outputs and outcomes have so far been achieved, or highly likely to be achieved by 2020, in relation to the stated goals and objectives in the GPE 2020 strategy and theory of change?
- Which aspects of the 2020 strategy and operational model have been working well for making progress towards results, which have been working less well, and what improvements should be made in the next GPE strategy going forward?
- How has the partnership model added value to what bilateral and other forms of programming might have achieved over the same period?
- How effectively has the GPE ensured that planning and dialogue are evidence-based, as advocated in the GPE’s theory of change?
• To what extent has GPE been successful in helping governments improve their ability to assess learning outcomes and use this information to improve educational quality?

**(3) EFFICIENCY, ADDITIONALITY AND LEVERAGE**

• To what extent have GPE funds been used efficiently? What have been the facilitators and barriers to efficient use of funds in different contexts?
• To what extent have GPE-supported projects been cost-effective in design and execution? How effectively has the GPE held grant agents accountable for cost-effectiveness?
• To what extent has GPE funding leveraged additional resources into the implementation of sector plans for education (a) from governments and other domestic sources, and (b) from bilateral and multilateral sources including private foundations?
• To what extent has GPE involvement led to increasing or maintaining both donor financing and/or domestic expenditures on education?
• To what extent has there been greater collective support for government priorities, rather than lots of separate projects? If so, is this delivering more sustainable results?

**(4) LIKELY SUSTAINABILITY**

• What is required for the country-level outcomes that have been achieved to be sustained? What is the likelihood that these requirements will be met?
• To what extent and under what conditions are GPE-supported projects likely to have long-lasting transformational impacts?
• To what extent have education sector plans focused on addressing educational issues in a sustainable way?
• To what extent have GPE-supported projects identified risks to the sustainability of outcomes and taken steps to mitigate these risks?
• To what extent have learnings about sustainability and risk been synthesized and shared across countries?
• To what extent are GPE-supported country programs financially sustainable? How effective has been GPE’s approach to leveraging domestic finance?
• What should the GPE do more of today to increase the likelihood that outcomes will be sustained in the future?
Organizational Effectiveness

(5) Governance and Management

- How well has the GPE Board performed its major functions including strategic direction, management oversight, resource mobilization, and partner relations?
- How effective has the GPE Board and management been in convening GPE stakeholders; in aligning its stakeholders towards the achievement of the GPE’s goals and objectives; and in building and sustaining political will and commitment to education?
- How have changes in governance and management since the 2015 evaluation affected the GPE’s organizational effectiveness?
- How well has the vision of equitable and quality education for all been communicated, promoted, operationalized in grant-making, and built into monitoring and evaluation?
- How well has the GPE communicated its findings and achievements to all stakeholders?

(6) Administrative Efficiency

- How efficiently has the GPE Secretariat carried out its administrative and management responsibilities, including managing GPE partnerships and external relations?
- How efficiently has the GPE Secretariat carried out its roles of effective leadership, budget management, and minimizing transaction costs? How efficiently has the Secretariat administered the GPE’s results-based financing approach?
- How efficiently has the Secretariat adapted GPE’s approach in fragile and crisis environments to allow more flexibility and a faster response in meeting urgent needs?
- How efficient have the Secretariat and grant agents been in exercising fiduciary oversight?

(7) Country-Level Arrangements and Processes

- How well have the Local Education Groups and coordinating agencies worked in relation to their GPE roles and responsibilities? To what extent have governments been in the driver’s seat in convening other actors and leading a collaborative process?
- How effective have been the in-country partnership arrangements in formulating robust national education plans and the design and implementation of individual projects? To what extent have these plans led to greater donor confidence and enabled better coordination of donor efforts?
- To what extent have these arrangements triggered institutional and procedural innovations at the country level, including the expanded involvement of civil society and marginalized groups?
- What value have country-level stakeholders found in the partnership? What constraints have they experienced?
To what extent have the resulting national plans been country-led and integrated into country-owned development strategies consistent with Paris Declaration, the Accra Agenda for Action, and the Busan Partnership for Development?

(8) MONITORING AND EVALUATION

- To what extent has the GPE achieved the three purposes and four main streams of work specified in its 2017 M&E strategy? To what extent have partners fulfilled their expected roles and responsibilities effectively?
- To what extent have the M&E Strategy and the Results Framework been useful tools in guiding and overseeing the GPE activities and overall operation? How well have these tracked the GPE’s value added and results?
- To what extent have actors used government or partner systems of data collection and monitoring? To what extent has there been duplication of effort and increased transactions costs?
- To what extent have country-level evaluations employed consistent methodologies, and thereby generated comparable results useful for learning lessons about what works well, and what works less well? How have these lessons been synthesized and disseminated, and to what effect?
- To what extent have donors’ preferences for stand-alone projects affected the frequency of Joint Sector Reviews and the monitoring of the implementation of Education Sector Plans?
Annex B. Background Documents on, and Existing/Ongoing Evaluations and Studies of Global Partnership for Education

- **Background Documents on GPE**
  
  - [GPE 2020 Strategic Plan](#)
  - [GPE M&E Strategy](#)
  - [How GPE works in partner countries](#)
  - [Charter for the Global Partnership for Education](#)
  - [GPE operational model](#)

- **Previous Evaluations of GPE**
  
  - [Independent Interim Evaluation of GPE 2010-2014](#)
  - [Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative](#)

- **Existing Studies under GPE’s M&E Strategy**
  
  - Annual Results Report: Published in *2017* and *2018*
    - Monitoring information on theory of change indicators
  - Portfolio Review: Published in *2017* and *2018*
    - Information on grant implementation
  - Country-level evaluations: [Summative and prospective case studies](#) and [first-year synthesis report](#)
    - Relevance and validity of GPE’s country-level operational model, deeper evidence on GPE’s relevance and effectiveness at the country level
  - Programmatic evaluations: [Education Sector Plan Development Grants evaluation](#), [Civil Society Education Fund evaluation](#), and [DCP pre-Board meeting evaluation](#)
    - Relevance and effectiveness of these three instruments

- **Other Key Sources of Information**
  
  - Governance: [Board and Committee documents](#)
    - Partnership governance and operational processes, data on GPE operations
  - Partnership study (external to GPE): [Effective and Efficient Partnership Review](#) (and related [annexes](#))
    - Partnership processes, organizational management processes
  - Donor evaluations: Australia (not available online); Finland (*2018*); G7 2017 Italia (*2017*); Norway (*2015* and *2017*); United Kingdom ([Annual Reviews of GPE 2015, 2016 and 2017](#) and [Multilateral Aid Review 2016](#))
    - Partnership processes, organizational management processes, results
  - [Multilateral Organization Performance Assessment Network](#) (MOPAN) (*2019*)
    - Partnership processes, organizational management processes, results
• **Forthcoming Evaluations, Studies, and Reports**

  **Annual Results Report (June 2019)**  
  **Portfolio Review (October 2019)**  
  **Desk study of Variable tranche (October 2019)**  
  - How much is invested through the Variable Tranche, for what types of outcomes, evidence on shift to or focus on outcomes, unintended effects, etc. (Only partial information is available through CLEs and current Secretariat reports.)

  **Desk studies of key thematic areas of GPE's grant/fund investments (November/December 2019)**  
  - Early childhood care and education (ECCE), learning assessment systems, teachers and teaching, gender, and data systems. What are GPE’s investments in those areas? What is the progress with respect to achieving objectives/outcomes in these areas?

  **Performance of closed Education Sector Plan Implementation Grants (June 2019)**  
  - What is the overall, comprehensive evidence on grant performance? What can we learn from closed grants?
Annex 2.2.1: Evaluation Matrix for Desk Study
## Annex 2.2.1: Evaluation Matrix for Desk Study

### Relevance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question from ToR</th>
<th>Key indicators and approaches (from evaluation matrix)</th>
<th>Documents to consult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| What has been the validity of the GPE 2020 ToC in practice in different country contexts? | • Understanding the Global TOC (what do the concepts and their connections mean)  
• Adaptation into a country-level ESP process / way of working / ESPIG grants, for the five categories. This is the extent to which the global TOC is used in ESPIG applications and programmes  
• Value of having a global TOC for GPE staff  
• Extent to which the global TOC captures the latest evidence on education interventions. Using the 2016 impact-level data from the results’ report, as that data shows the trends on the impact level at baseline | • GPE TOC and operational model documents  
• Independent Interim Evaluation of GPE 2010-2014 (baseline)  
• Learning results report 2019  
• Summative and prospective country evaluation reports (12 cases)  
• Synthesis of donor evaluations  
• Synthesis report of country-level evaluations. February 2019  
• Programmatic Evaluations (Evaluation of GPE support to civil society engagement, Evaluation of GPE’s support to sector plan development) |
| To what extent has this been an effective instrument to provide guidance on the achievement of education results in DCPs in terms of systems strengthening, learning, and equity? | • SDG 4 has 10 targets and 10 indicators.  
• Do the TOC mission/objectives connect with the SDG targets and indicators?  
• Do grant objectives formally connect with the SDG 4 targets and indicators? | |
| To what extent have GPE-supported projects reflected government priorities, the priorities of grant agents, or the priorities of other actors? | • Is there a way to report and consolidate results / funding across donors?  
• Do sector-wide plans enable donors to fund investments under the same framework and using the same funding vehicle?  
• Donors’ portfolio of investments in a country (who has funded what in that country). Are there overlaps / duplication / dispersion of funding in a country? | |
| To what extent has the GPE delivered on its commitment to align its activities with SDG 4 and to using SDG 4 indicators in the implementation of its monitoring and evaluation strategy? | • Development partners’ participation in the process of shaping the global ToC.  
• Development partners’ participation in the process of shaping the ESP and ESPIGs, targets for investment, and ways of working (at global and country level). Collect data divided by: Donors, | |
| To what extent has the GPE contributed to greater coherence in the international financial support for education in GPE-eligible countries? |  | |
| To what extent have development partners shared ownership of the GPE, including the partnership’s emphasis on learning, data, gender equality, etc.? |  | |

Additionally (when time left):

- Discussions papers
- Donor evaluations
- Results reports 2015-2016, 2018 and 2019
- Portfolio reviews 2019
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question from ToR</th>
<th>Key indicators and approaches (from evaluation matrix)</th>
<th>Documents to consult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| How well have the activities of development partners been aligned with and supported the GPE’s country model? How has the degree of alignment affected the operationalization of the model? | - Government – Ministry, Government – Implementing / front line agencies, Civil society – national, Civil society – international  
- At the country-level, development partners’ acceptance of the outcome of the planning process. Development partners’ feeling responsible and proactively acting in the GPE country and global processes. Collect data divided by: Donors, Government – Ministry, Government – Implementing / front line agencies, Civil society – national, Civil society – international  |                      |
| To what extent have the objectives and design of the approved grants been consistent with the GPE’s vision, mission, and strategic goals and objectives? | - Spending per goal, strategic objective, and them  
- Vision is “To ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all”.  
- Vision is operationalized in three goals: “Improved and more equitable learning outcomes” and “Increased equity, gender equality and inclusion”, and “Effective and Efficient education systems”  
- The GPE will achieve its goals by producing five outputs: “Strengthen sector planning and policy implementation”, “Support mutual accountability through inclusive policy dialogue and monitoring”, “Ensure efficient and effective delivery of GPE financing”, “Mobilize more and better financing”, and “Build a stronger partnership”  
- Map the objectives of the GPE grants against the outputs and goals (for the 12 countries)  |                      |
| To what extent has GPE financing been based on needs?                           | - How does the GPE conceptualize and operationalize the concept of “needs”?  
- Is the conceptualization and operationalization of the concept of “needs” accepted by GPE stakeholders, and also by the people in need?  
- Are GPE grants actually identified based on needs? Does the GPE take into consideration other practical or political considerations?  |                      |
What outputs and outcomes have so far been achieved, or highly likely to be achieved by 2020, in relation to the stated goals and objectives in the GPE 2020 strategy and ToC?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contribution</th>
<th>Key indicators and approaches (from evaluation matrix)</th>
<th>Person responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Which aspects of the 2020 strategy and operational model have been working well for making progress towards results, which have been working less well, and what improvements should be made in the next GPE strategy going forward?</td>
<td>Progress against indicators at country and global level</td>
<td>GPE ToC and operational model documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How has the partnership model added value to what bilateral and other forms of programming might have achieved over the same period?</td>
<td>Harvest of outcome statements (sign of change in capacity or behavior of stakeholders and beneficiaries, and in well-being of beneficiaries) Paola, only for the equity/inclusion part.</td>
<td>Independent Interim Evaluation of GPE 2010-2014 (baseline)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How effectively has the GPE ensured that planning and dialogue are evidence-based, as advocated in the GPE’s ToC?</td>
<td>Categorize outcome statements by result area, per actor (use the different type of constituencies) and using the COM-B approach). We also indicate the initial finding in terms of contribution to those changes in terms of capacity, opportunities or motivation that seem to affect behavior.</td>
<td>Learning results report 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent has GPE been successful in helping governments improve their ability to assess learning outcomes and use this information to improve educational quality?</td>
<td>Actual causal connections between aspects of the 2020 strategy and operational model, and results: looking at the actual causal connections in the 12 case studies</td>
<td>Portfolio reviews 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent, and how has GPE financing incentivized reforms to increase public expenditure and improve performance of educational systems?</td>
<td>Actual causal connections between the partnership model and results which could not otherwise have been achieved (by other models)</td>
<td>Programmatic Evaluations (Evaluation of GPE support to civil society engagement, Evaluation of GPE’s support to sector plan development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual causal connections between the GPE and partner government capacity to assess learning outcomes and use this information to improve educational quality (production of education statistics and information, use of education statistics and information in planning and policy)</td>
<td>Results reports 2018 and 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual causal connections between GPE financing and reforms to increase public financial management for education and education systems</td>
<td>Summative and prospective country evaluation reports (12 cases)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Synthesis of donor evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Synthesis report of country-level evaluations. February 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally (when time left):
- Discussions papers
- Donor evaluations
- Results reports 2015-2016, 2018 and 2019
- Portfolio reviews 2019

Efficiency, additionality, and leverage
To what extent have GPE funds been used efficiently? What have been the facilitators and barriers to efficient use of funds in different contexts?

- Appropriate transparency, accountability, and oversight procedures (presence and use)
- Appropriate financial reporting and auditing procedures (presence and use)
- Risk analysis and mitigation measures (presence and use)

To what extent have GPE-supported projects been cost-effective in design and execution? How effectively has the GPE held grant agents accountable for cost-effectiveness?

- Overview of expenditure on grant (budget vs actual)
- Overview of expenditure for grant design
- Comparison for each grant costs and results

To what extent has GPE funding leveraged additional resources into the implementation of sector plans for education (a) from governments and other domestic sources, and (b) from bilateral and multilateral sources including private foundations?

- Total amount of funding for education at the country level (budget + non-budget) Funding dedicated to worst-off groups.
- % of GDP spent on education
- Comparisons of trends in education with trends in similar sectors not supported by GPE (health care, justice, safety nets etc…) Including funding dedicated to worst-off groups? Harvest of signs of change that point to additional pledges or funding connected to GPE actions

To what extent has GPE involvement led to increasing or maintaining both donor financing and/or domestic expenditures on education?

- % of GDP spent on education over time by government
- % of education expenditure derived from non-government sources

In addition to the above,

- Desk studies of key thematic areas of GPE’s grant/fund investments (Nov/Dec 2019)
- Discussion papers
- Donor evaluations
- Education sector plan development grants desk review
- Evaluation of GPE support to civil society engagement
- Evaluation of GPE’s support to sector plan development
- Financial procedure agreements
- Independent Interim Evaluation of GPE 2010-2014 (baseline)
- Performance of closed Education Sector Plan Implementation Grants (June 2019)
- Results data
- Summative and prospective country evaluation reports (12 cases)

Sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question from ToR</th>
<th>Key indicators and approaches (from evaluation matrix)</th>
<th>Documents to consult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is required for the country-level outcomes that have been achieved to be</td>
<td>• Do mechanisms that can lead to sustainability exist for the grant? • Are there signs that the mechanism is working?</td>
<td>• Annual reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question from ToR</td>
<td>Key indicators and approaches (from evaluation matrix)</td>
<td>Documents to consult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent are GPE-supported country programs financially sustainable? How effective has been GPE’s approach to leveraging domestic finance?</td>
<td>• Does a risk analysis exist as part of the grant? Does the context analysis, gender, vulnerability analysis exist? • Is the risk context, gender, vulnerability analysis complete? • Are there mitigation measures commensurate and appropriate to the risks?</td>
<td>• Desk studies of key thematic areas of GPE’s grant/fund investments (November/December 2019) • Desk studies of key thematic areas of GPE’s grant/fund investments (November/December 2019) • Discussion papers • Donor evaluations • Education sector plan development grants desk review • Education Sector Plans • Evaluation of GPE support to civil society engagement • Evaluation of GPE’s support to sector plan development • GPE 2020 Strategic Plan • GPE M&amp;E Strategy • Minutes of the Board Meetings • National Development Plans • Performance of closed Education Sector Plan Implementation Grants (June 2019) • Policy on risk analysis and mitigation measures • Summative and prospective country evaluation reports (12 cases)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent and under what conditions are GPE-supported projects likely to have long-lasting transformational impacts?</td>
<td>• Did GPE’s support lead to a tipping point that change the quality of the system? the inversion of a trend, which is now self-sustained • Is there a clear mechanism(s) for scale-up the change? • Is the GPE operating already at scale? • Is the plan inclusive of all disadvantaged and powerful groups?</td>
<td>• Desk studies of key thematic areas of GPE’s grant/fund investments (November/December 2019) • Discussion papers • Donor evaluations • Education sector plan development grants desk review • Education Sector Plans • Evaluation of GPE support to civil society engagement • Evaluation of GPE’s support to sector plan development • GPE 2020 Strategic Plan • GPE M&amp;E Strategy • Minutes of the Board Meetings • National Development Plans • Performance of closed Education Sector Plan Implementation Grants (June 2019) • Policy on risk analysis and mitigation measures • Summative and prospective country evaluation reports (12 cases)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent have education sector plans focused on addressing educational issues in a sustainable way?</td>
<td>• Do mechanisms that can lead to sustainability exist in the plan? For example ownership / political support / management support, etc. • Are there signs that the mechanism is working? • Is the plan inclusive of all disadvantaged and powerful groups? (Paola, only for the inclusiveness part)</td>
<td>• Desk studies of key thematic areas of GPE’s grant/fund investments (November/December 2019) • Discussion papers • Donor evaluations • Education sector plan development grants desk review • Education Sector Plans • Evaluation of GPE support to civil society engagement • Evaluation of GPE’s support to sector plan development • GPE 2020 Strategic Plan • GPE M&amp;E Strategy • Minutes of the Board Meetings • National Development Plans • Performance of closed Education Sector Plan Implementation Grants (June 2019) • Policy on risk analysis and mitigation measures • Summative and prospective country evaluation reports (12 cases)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent have GPE-supported projects identified risks to the sustainability of outcomes and taken steps to mitigate these risks?</td>
<td>• What did GPE learn from its experience? • How did it disseminate? • How did it act on it?</td>
<td>• Desk studies of key thematic areas of GPE’s grant/fund investments (November/December 2019) • Discussion papers • Donor evaluations • Education sector plan development grants desk review • Education Sector Plans • Evaluation of GPE support to civil society engagement • Evaluation of GPE’s support to sector plan development • GPE 2020 Strategic Plan • GPE M&amp;E Strategy • Minutes of the Board Meetings • National Development Plans • Performance of closed Education Sector Plan Implementation Grants (June 2019) • Policy on risk analysis and mitigation measures • Summative and prospective country evaluation reports (12 cases)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent have learnings about sustainability and risk been synthesized and shared across countries?</td>
<td>• Availability of other sources of funding (pledged funding vs prospects vs suspects)</td>
<td>• Desk studies of key thematic areas of GPE’s grant/fund investments (November/December 2019) • Discussion papers • Donor evaluations • Education sector plan development grants desk review • Education Sector Plans • Evaluation of GPE support to civil society engagement • Evaluation of GPE’s support to sector plan development • GPE 2020 Strategic Plan • GPE M&amp;E Strategy • Minutes of the Board Meetings • National Development Plans • Performance of closed Education Sector Plan Implementation Grants (June 2019) • Policy on risk analysis and mitigation measures • Summative and prospective country evaluation reports (12 cases)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What should the GPE do more of today to increase the likelihood that outcomes will be sustained in the future?</td>
<td>• Review of recommendations from past evaluations on this topic • Sense-making discussions</td>
<td>• Desk studies of key thematic areas of GPE’s grant/fund investments (November/December 2019) • Discussion papers • Donor evaluations • Education sector plan development grants desk review • Education Sector Plans • Evaluation of GPE support to civil society engagement • Evaluation of GPE’s support to sector plan development • GPE 2020 Strategic Plan • GPE M&amp;E Strategy • Minutes of the Board Meetings • National Development Plans • Performance of closed Education Sector Plan Implementation Grants (June 2019) • Policy on risk analysis and mitigation measures • Summative and prospective country evaluation reports (12 cases)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| How well has the **GPE Board** performed its major functions including strategic direction, management oversight, resource mobilization, and partner relations? | • Mapping of formal requirements (ToR, Charter) for the Board  
• Mapping of governance practices to carry out main governance functions:  
  • strategic direction  
  • management oversight  
  • resource mobilization,  
  • and partner relations  
• Equity specialist: is there one and what is this person role?  
• Review of evaluative material (annual reports, donor reports, self-assessment by board) that refer to board performance  
• Analysis of trends related to resource mobilization (Indicators: volume and diversity / origin of resources) Are there earmarking stipulations? (Funds that have to be spent for specific purposes/country/topic etc.) |
| --- | --- |
| How effective has the **GPE Board and management** been in (a) convening GPE stakeholders; (b) in aligning its stakeholders towards the achievement of the GPE’s goals and objectives; and (c) in building and sustaining political will and commitment to education? | • Mapping of convening practices of stakeholders at global and country levels  
• (Participatory) analysis of trends of frequency, # and diversity of participation including gender equality and inclusiveness  
• Mapping and analyzing (trends in) alignment of stakeholders (indicators: proportion of GPE funding in line with national ESP, proportion of GPE funding addressing equity; & of grants aligned to GPE objectives, and aligned with equity, HR and SDG goals on education; % of stakeholders per country aligned with national education plan, etc.)  
• Mapping and analyzing (trends in) building/sustaining political will, and if this includes addressing equity (is there a political will to address equity?) (indicators: trends in budget allocation, # and quality of ESPs, frequency and quality of progress reports, and if the reports include information on progress toward equity in education) |
| How have **changes in governance and management since the 2015 evaluation** affected the GPE’s organizational effectiveness? | • Mapping of purpose and content of main changes in governance and management since 2015 (showing changes in the formal rules and informal practice of the Partnership since 2015, other)  
• Define organizational effectiveness and inventory of changes in organizational effectiveness documented in relation to changes in governance and management.  
• Is there any change made to address equity?  
• What changed after recruitment of Senior gender specialist in 2017? What about other aspects of equity? Marginalized groups? (discrimination based on race, religious beliefs, income, physical attributes, geographical location, or other status)  
• Charter of the GPE (Roles and responsibilities Chapter IV GLOBAL-LEVEL GOVERNANCE, pp 11-14)  
• GPE 2020 Strategic Plan  
• Board meetings on Strategic plan  
• ToRs of the Board committees  
• Board and Committee Operating Procedures (December 2018)  
• Board decisions (folders new funding model and governance)  
• Board approvals of implementation grants by year (2013 – 2018)  
• Annual reports 2017,2018, 2019  
• Annual reports (for resource mobilization) or additional information on donors’ contribution to the GPE  
• DCP pre-Board meeting evaluation (a programmatic evaluation)  
• Independent Interim Evaluation of GPE 2010-2014 (baseline)  
• Report Interim Evaluation 2015 incl. management response  
• External/donor reports: DFID, BMZ, Norad, MOPAN  
• Charter of the GPE, old version  
• Policies, guidelines, MOUs and terms of reference (old version) |
How well has the vision of equitable and quality education for all been communicated, promoted, operationalized in grant-making, and built into monitoring and evaluation?

How well has the GPE communicated its findings and achievements to all stakeholders?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Communication material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Mapping and assessing the way the GPE vision has been communicated, promoted, operationalized in grant-making and in M&amp;E.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is there a communication strategy and how is it implemented and monitored?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What tools are used to track uptake of communication messages?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Communication material</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• M&amp;E strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• documents describing new funding model and other grant-making procedures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Administrative Efficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question from ToR</th>
<th>Key indicators and approaches (from evaluation matrix)</th>
<th>Documents to consul</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| How efficiently has the GPE Secretariat carried out its administrative and management responsibilities, including managing GPE partnerships and external relations? | - Administrative efficiency covers both time and financial efficiency. In both cases, the ISE will map and compare actual situation (annual (financial) progress reports) with intentions as reflected in annual plans and budgets.  
- Mapping of how the Secretariat plans (incl. budget) its work to fulfil its 6 functions  
- How do the Secretariat plans (incl. budget) its work to fulfil its 6 functions  
- Analysis of planned vs. actual.  
- Trends over time of relevant efficiency indicators will be mapped and analyzed, which could include:  
  - Input/output ratios (to the extent inputs are related to specific outputs)  
  - Indirect / direct cost ratios  
  - In-kind / cash contributions  
- Mapping of managerial practices, e.g. documented cost-consciousness in management decisions, streamlining of decision-making processes, procurement policies and practices.  
- Signs and trends of result-based financial reporting  
- How does the cost of implementing GPE and ESPIG supporting directly girl’s education compare to countries where this is not happening? Pg. 4 GPE gender strategy  
- How costs for reaching worst off groups compare with average costs? | (a) Charter of the GPE (old and updated versions) (Roles and responsibilities Chapter IV GLOBAL-LEVEL GOVERNANCE, pp 11-14)  
(b) ToR-secretariats-country-level-role  
(c) Same as in section on Board (above):  
- (a) Board decisions (folders new funding model and governance)  
- (b) Annual reports 2017, 2018, 2019  
- (c) DCP pre-Board meeting evaluation (a programmatic evaluation)  
- (d) Independent Interim Evaluation of GPE 2010-2014 (baseline)  
- (e) Report Interim Evaluation 2015 incl. management response  
- External/donor reports: DFID, BMZ, Norad, MOPAN, External/donor reports: DFID, BMZ, Norad, MOPAN |
| How efficiently has the Secretariat administered the GPE’s results-based financing approach? | | |
| How efficiently has the Secretariat adapted GPE’s approach in fragile and crisis environments to allow more flexibility and a faster response in meeting urgent needs? | - Mapping and analysis of existence and costs of specific measures to adapt operations to fragile and crisis environments  
- Mapping and analysis of the effect of such measures in providing rapid responses (average and trends in throughput time fund applications compared to regular processes) | Summative and prospective country evaluation reports (12 cases, only the ones relevant for crisis and conflict situations) |
| How efficient have the Secretariat and grant agents been in exercising fiduciary oversight? | - Mapping and comparing actual costs and efforts with intentions as reflected in annual reports, plans, and budgets  
- Trends in resources allocated for fiduciary oversight as % of total grants.  
- Trends in resources spent on auditing processes and trends in # of critical audit findings | Financial report documents |
Country level arrangements and processes (case countries)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question from ToR</th>
<th>Key indicators and approaches (from evaluation matrix)</th>
<th>Documents to consul</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| How well have the LEGs and CAs worked in relation to their GPE roles and responsibilities? | • Mapping of roles and responsibility in relation to GPE work in country: LEG, government, coordinating agency. To what extent is partnership inclusive? Which groups are represented and how? How are worst-off group represented in LEGs?  
  • Findings from evaluative material on functioning of LEG, government, coordinating agency | • Charter for the Global Partnership for Education (Roles and responsibilities in Chapter III COUNTRY-LEVEL GOVERNANCE, pp 4-11)  
  • Annual reports  
  • Country level evaluations for a sample of countries  
  • Synthesis report of CLEs  
  • Programmatic evaluation on CSEF  
  • Programmatic evaluation on ESPDG  
  • Synthesis of donor evaluations  
  • Desk studies of key thematic areas of GPE's grant/fund investments (November/December 2019)  
  • Performance of closed Education Sector Plan                                                                                     |
| To what extent have governments been in the driver’s seat in convening other actors and leading a collaborative process? | |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| How effective have been the in-country partnership arrangements in formulating robust national education plans and the design and implementation of individual projects? | • Analysis of composition of partnerships and sector plans and programmes. Are sector plans and programmes targeting root causes of exclusion?  
  • Connection between dimension 1 and others in JSR (if possible, analysis of correlation between partnership quality and plans/project/programmes quality), done for sample  
  • How does the quality of public systems targeting worst-off groups compare to the quality of conventional public systems? What about private systems? (only for second phase)  
  • Trend analysis of donor commitment and funding and relation to quality of sector plans (e.g. look at the biggest contributions) |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| To what extent have these plans led to greater donor confidence and enabled better coordination of donor efforts? | |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| To what extent have these arrangements triggered institutional and procedural innovations at the country level, including the expanded involvement of civil society and marginalized groups? | • Mapping of institutional and procedural evaluations in country evaluation reports for a sample of 12 countries (for which evaluations reports are available) |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| What value have country-level stakeholders found in the partnership? | • Perception of country-level stakeholders (including marginalized groups) if information is available in country evaluation reports (possible more info is available when sample is selected e.g. grant agent reports, LEG reports, etc.) |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| What constraints have they experienced? | |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| To what extent have the resulting national plans been country-led and integrated into country-owned development strategies consistent with Paris | • How did country governments operationalize the sector education-plans? How were the worst-off groups targeted in the implementation?  
  • How the overall development strategy of the partner country governments incorporate the sector plans made by LEG? |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| Declaration, the Accra Agenda for Action, and the Busan Partnership for Development? | Implementation Grants (June 2019) |
### Monitoring and Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question from ToR</th>
<th>Key indicators and approaches (from evaluation matrix)</th>
<th>Documents to consult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| To what extent has the GPE achieved the three purposes and four main streams of work specified in its 2017 M&E strategy? To what extent have partners fulfilled their expected roles and responsibilities effectively? | ● Overall performance against objectives (all cross-country)  
● + harvest of outcomes from the effectiveness criteria section (  | ● Annual reports 2017, 2018, 2019  
● Donor evaluations  
● Effective and Efficient Partnership Review  
● GPE M&E Strategy  
● Overview on outcomes from the effectiveness section  
● Programmatic evaluations  
● Results’ data (37 indicators)  
● SIC survey?  
● Summative and prospective country evaluation reports (12 cases)  
● Synthesis country evaluations |
| To what extent have the M&E Strategy and the Results Framework been useful tools in guiding and overseeing the GPE activities and overall operation? How well have these tracked the GPE’s value added and results? | ● Perception of stakeholders and GPE staff that the M&E tools give them the information they need, when they need it |                                                                                       |
| To what extent have actors used government or partner systems of data collection and monitoring? To what extent has there been duplication of effort and increased transactions costs? | ● Does the GPE use country systems for monitoring?  
● Why yes, why not? |                                                                                       |
| To what extent have country-level evaluations employed consistent methodologies, and thereby generated comparable results useful for learning lessons about what works well, and what works less well? How have these lessons been synthesized and disseminated, and to what effect? | ● Do the country level evaluations use the same methodology?  
● Is the methodology appropriate for answering the needs of the GPE staff and stakeholders? |                                                                                       |
| To what extent have donors’ preferences for stand-alone projects affected the frequency of Joint Sector Reviews and the monitoring of the implementation of Education Sector Plans? | ● Actual causal connections between donors’ funding choice and the progress of monitoring and implementation of sector-wide plans |                                                                                       |
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## Annex 4.1.1: Progress against goal 3 and objectives 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Last year for which data is available</th>
<th>N of countries reporting data</th>
<th>Achieved at baseline (2015)</th>
<th>Target (last year with available data)</th>
<th>Achieved (2018)</th>
<th>Variance against target</th>
<th>Variance against baseline</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of DCPs that increased their share of education expenditure or maintained it at 20% or above</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>46 countries (19 FCACs)</td>
<td>64% overall 59% FCACs</td>
<td>83% overall 81% for FCACs</td>
<td>65% overall 53% FCACs</td>
<td>-18%</td>
<td>-28%</td>
<td>Stable overall Downwards for FCACs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equitable allocation of teacher (proportion of countries for which at least 80% of teacher allocation is explained by N of students in school)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of DCPs that had less than 40 pupils for trained teachers</td>
<td>2016 (data published by UIS in 2018 but refers to the period 2011-2016)</td>
<td>30 countries</td>
<td>25% overall 13% FCACs</td>
<td>31% overall 17% FCACs</td>
<td>30% overall 12% FCACs</td>
<td>-1% overall -5% FCACs</td>
<td>-5% FCACs</td>
<td>Upwards overall Stable for FCACs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition and drop-out impact</td>
<td>2015 (only six countries have data after 2015)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of DCPs that reported at least 10 of 12 key education indicators to UIS</td>
<td>2016 (data published by UIS in 2018 but refers to the period 2011-2016)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>30% overall 32% FCACs</td>
<td>43% overall 43% FCACs</td>
<td>34% overall 32 FCACs</td>
<td>-9% overall -11% FCACs</td>
<td>-4% FCACs</td>
<td>Upwards overall Stable for FCACs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of DCPs that had a learning assessment</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>40% overall</td>
<td>38% overall 29% FCACs</td>
<td>48% overall 36 FCACs</td>
<td>+10% overall +7%</td>
<td>+8% overall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
system that met quality standards (classification of the overall system into the categories “established”, “under development”, “nascent”, “no information”).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 1</th>
<th>Education plans met quality standards (and ESP must meet at least 5 out of 7 criteria)</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>32</th>
<th>58</th>
<th>95% overall</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>+5%</th>
<th>+42%</th>
<th>Upwards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education plans had teaching and learning, equity, and efficiency strategies that met quality standards (meet 4 out of 5 of the quality standards)</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>63% for strategies in equity, 53% on strategies on teaching and learning, 47% on strategies in efficiency</td>
<td>95% overall</td>
<td>97% equity, 94% efficiency, 84% teaching and learning</td>
<td>+2% for equity, -1% for efficiency, -11% on teaching and learning</td>
<td>+34% for strategies on equity, +41% for strategies on teaching and learning, +37% for strategy on efficiency</td>
<td>Upwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of DCPs applying for GPE grant published data at national level.</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Objective 2 | % of joint sector reviews that met quality standards (at least three out of four quality standards) | 2018 | 26 | 29% overall, 25% FCACs | 66% overall, 64% FCACs | 27% overall, 38% FCACs | -39% overall, -26% FCACs | +2% | Stable |

1 Quality standards for ESPs:
2 Quality standards for education plans:
3 Quality standards for JSRs:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 3</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>All grants</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>16 FCACs</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>16 FCACs</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>16 FCACs</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of LEGs that represent civil society and teachers</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>44% overall</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>55% FCACs</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>52% overall</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>59% FCACs</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>59% overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of grants that supported EMIS and / or learning assessment systems</td>
<td>83% overall</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>94% overall</td>
<td>44% overall</td>
<td>55% FCACs</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>55% FCACs</td>
<td>44% overall</td>
<td>59% FCACs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of GPE grants that achieved their target for textbook distribution</td>
<td>74% overall</td>
<td>82% overall</td>
<td>91% overall</td>
<td>9% overall</td>
<td>71% FCACs</td>
<td>81% FCACs</td>
<td>106%</td>
<td>25% FCACs</td>
<td>90% overall</td>
<td>91% FCACs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(proportion of textbook purchased and distributed through GPE grants, out of total planned by GPE grants)</td>
<td>86% overall</td>
<td>88% overall</td>
<td>90% overall</td>
<td>2% overall</td>
<td>83% FCACs</td>
<td>87% FCACs</td>
<td>91% FCACs</td>
<td>4% FCACs</td>
<td>65% overall</td>
<td>73% overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of GPE grants that achieved their target for teacher training</td>
<td>86% overall</td>
<td>88% overall</td>
<td>90% overall</td>
<td>2% overall</td>
<td>83% FCACs</td>
<td>87% FCACs</td>
<td>91% FCACs</td>
<td>4% FCACs</td>
<td>65% overall</td>
<td>73% overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(proportion of teachers trained through GPE grants, out of total planned by GPE grants)</td>
<td>65% overall</td>
<td>73% overall</td>
<td>89% overall</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>71% FCACs</td>
<td>76% FCACs</td>
<td>85% FCACs</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>95% overall</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of GPE grants that achieved their target for classroom construction</td>
<td>65% overall</td>
<td>73% overall</td>
<td>89% overall</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>71% FCACs</td>
<td>76% FCACs</td>
<td>85% FCACs</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>95% overall</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(proportion of classrooms built or rehabilitated through GPE grants, out of total planned by GPE grants)</td>
<td>65% overall</td>
<td>73% overall</td>
<td>89% overall</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>71% FCACs</td>
<td>76% FCACs</td>
<td>85% FCACs</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>95% overall</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of GPE grant applications that identified variable part grants</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>95% overall</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>95% overall</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>95% overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 4</td>
<td>Amount contributed by non-traditional donors (USD millions)</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>+6.4</td>
<td>Upwards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of pledges fulfilled</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>All donors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of GPE donors that increased or maintained their education funding</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>All donors</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of GPE grants aligned with national systems (a grant must fulfil at least seven out of ten dimensions of alignment)</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>All countries</td>
<td>34% overall 27% FCACs</td>
<td>44% overall 34% FCACs</td>
<td>36% overall 24% FCACs</td>
<td>-8% -20%</td>
<td>+2% -3%</td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of GPE grants that were co-financed or sector pooled</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>All countries</td>
<td>40% overall 32% FCACs</td>
<td>52% overall 40% FCACs</td>
<td>34% overall 27% FCACs</td>
<td>-18% -13%</td>
<td>-6% -5%</td>
<td>Downward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31) % of country missions addressed domestic financing</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>NA (Secretariat)</td>
<td>47% overall 62% FCACs</td>
<td>58% overall 65% FCACs</td>
<td>83% 86%</td>
<td>+25% +21%</td>
<td>+36 +24%</td>
<td>Upwards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Objective 5 |

---

4 Dimensions of alignment: with ESPs, with ESPs annual implementation report, with medium-term expenditure framework, with national budget information, with procurement rules, with specific budget appropriations, with treasury, with national external audit, with PFM expenditure process, and with accounting systems
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of DCPs and other partners reporting strengthened clarity of roles, responsibilities, and accountabilities</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of technical products produced</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of advocacy events undertaken</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>NA (Secretariat)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Upwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of audit issues addressed</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>NA (Secretariat)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Secretariat staff time spent on country-facing functions</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>NA (Secretariat)</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>+17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of results and evaluation reports published</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>NA (Secretariat)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Annex 4.1.2: Approach to selecting CLEs

Why the selection of 12 CLEs?
Selecting 12 CLEs out of the around 20 available was dictated mainly by constraints in the time available for reviewing and coding documents during phase 1. The choice was done with an eye to prioritizing 12 CLEs that would represent adequately the 20 CLEs, at least under some key dimensions.

What criteria for selecting the case studies?

1. CLEs available by the end of September.
2. CLEs that represented the portfolio of GPE countries under key dimensions that are critical for receiving and implementing successfully a GPE grant. The CLEs selected cover:
   - FCAC countries and stable countries
   - Countries at different level of human development according to the HDI.
   - Countries with different levels of government effectiveness
   - Countries at different levels of inequality
   - Countries with different levels of education funding per capita as a proxy for priority given by a country to education.
   - Countries at different levels of education per capita.
3. The 12 CLEs include countries that can be grouped together according to how similar they are under these six dimensions, allowing for an analysis of how contextual conditions influence GPE support.

To understand how countries fared on the six dimensions compared with the other GPE countries, each country performance on these dimensions was compared and scored against the average value of all GPE countries. From the iteration of this analysis emerged five broader categories that grouped countries that were similar in scores compared with average values in the portfolio, and that were similar for similar reasons (Table 1). From each category, we selected two / three countries, with a preference for countries that had summative evaluations. Finally, we checked that the 12 CLEs were representative of different grant agents, coordinating agents, and co-financing instruments, and submitted the selection to the Secretariat for validation.

---

5 “0” was the condition most unfavourable to GPE contribution, meaning that the country scored worse than the average. 0.5 was the average condition. 1 the most favourable to GPE contribution, meaning that the country scored better than the average for all GPE countries with active grants in this phase.
Table 1 Countries in each category and country chosen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>All countries</th>
<th>Countries chosen for phase 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category 1. FCAC countries with below average scores for HDI, government effectiveness, rule of law, and education funding per capita.</td>
<td>DRC, South Sudan, Gambia, Sierra Leone</td>
<td>DRC and South Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 2. Countries with above average scores in almost all dimensions and the best overall scores.</td>
<td>Guyana, Kenya, Senegal, and Burkina Faso</td>
<td>Guyana, Senegal, Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 3. Countries with below average scores for HDI, but above average scores for government effectiveness and funding for education.</td>
<td>Cote d’Ivoire, Ethiopia, Malawi, Mozambique</td>
<td>Malawi and Mozambique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 4. Heterogeneous countries that constitute a sort of “other” category. The category track the diversity in the overall portfolio of countries, but with less variation, because all countries score close to the average for most dimensions and in aggregate.</td>
<td>Liberia, Mali, Mauritania, Nepal, Pakistan, Rwanda, and Zambia.</td>
<td>Nepal, Pakistan, and Rwanda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 5. The countries here have average / or above average scores for HDI, but FCAS status, with particularly low government effectiveness and civil liberties.</td>
<td>Nigeria, Zimbabwe, and Cambodia.</td>
<td>Cambodia and Zimbabwe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Goal 3

Signs of change

ESP implementation: one country did not implement the ESP (South Sudan), one country experienced weak progress (Pakistan), five countries experienced uneven progress (DRC, Malawi, Senegal, Cambodia, and Zimbabwe), five had robust progress (Kenya, Guyana, Mozambique, Nepal, and Rwanda).

Strengthening education systems: in one country, education systems deteriorated (South Sudan), in seven countries there was uneven progress (DRC, Guyana, Malawi, Senegal, Cambodia, Pakistan, and Zimbabwe), in five countries, there was robust progress (Kenya, Senegal, Mozambique, Nepal, and Rwanda).

Contribution claims

- Political will of the government for education sector reforms and funding
- Weak capacity at the decentralised level of government and higher requirements for coordination prevented more progress in ESP implementation
- Rapid population growth increases the stress on education systems
- GPE small but meaningful support in the forms of ESPIGs contributed to start up progress on ESPs and to dedicated sub-sectors of education
- No effect of GPE advocacy and multiplier in raising domestic financing
- Scandals around abuse of donors’ funds weakened donors’ confidence in the DCP government and GPE funding contributed to restoring it
- Weak capacity for implementing the ESP and GPE did not include an effective strategy for capacity building for implementation
- Funding capital expenditures is more difficult than funding teachers’ salaries
- Government was not in control of its entire territory, and this led to a deterioration of service delivery

Strong leadership of MoE in security funding from MoF contributed to increased domestic finance (Senegal and Cambodia)

---

This follows the overall judgement of the CLEs rather than presenting separately each of the GPE criteria for progress against outcome 3.
Objective 1

Signs of change

Eleven CLEs report that sector planning met quality standards, improved from the previous experience of planning, and was inclusive and participatory, with the partial exception of Guyana, where planning was not inclusive of civil society. One country, Mozambique, reports that the latest planning process was weaker than the previous one, as it was conducted together with the ESPIG application and rushed.

The CLEs report as the most common weaknesses in ESPs:

- GPE quality assurance process for ESPs contribute to ESPs that are better quality (10 CLEs)

Contributory claims

- Level of starting capacity for planning in the DCP government explains quality planning (8 CLEs)
- ESPDG support contribute to better quality plans (6 CLEs)
- Conditionality from ESPIGs contributes to countries accepting GPE quality assurance process (6 CLEs)
- GA and CA contributes to quality planning (4 CLEs)
- Rushed nature of both plan development processes (2)
- Focusing too much on basic education (1)
- Presence of a strong sector dialogue to fill the gaps in the planning (1)
- Strong plan monitoring improved the quality of the ESP (1)
- Secretariat technical capacity building (1)
- Incomplete participation of key donors in planning (as they were stretched thin) (1)
- NFM Increasing complexity of GPE requirements for funding increase the burden on stakeholders and diminish ownership of the plan (1)
- GPE focus has been on supporting planning (1)
- Advocating for a more inclusive planning process (1)
- Being flexible in implementing the ESP criteria (1)
- Budget support helped transition in the policy cycle (1)
Objective 2

Signs of change

- 6 CLEs report that LEGs are now more inclusive of CSOs and TOs (Kenya, Senegal, Cambodia, Pakistan, Rwanda, and Zimbabwe). But 3 CLE report that the dialogue is not two-way, the government does the talking (Cambodia, Guyana, and Pakistan). 3 CLEs report problems with duplication of dialogue (DRC, SS, and Cambodia). 1 CLE report that dialogue is not government-led (SS)
- 1 CLE reports that the country does not have the LEG (Guyana) and 1 CLE reports that the country established new LEGs (Pakistan)
- 5 CLEs report problems with monitoring that are connected with the lack of monitoring data (DRC, SS, Malawi, Nepal and Senegal). 3 CLEs report problems in translating monitoring into action (SS, Senegal, Zimbabwe, and Rwanda). 2 CLES report that monitoring improved even if gaps remain (Mozambique and Zimbabwe). 2 CLEs report that JSRs did not happen (Kenya and Guyana). 1 CLE reports that the quality of sector dialogue and monitoring regressed (DRC). Only 1 CLE (Nepal) reports that the country conducted JSRs all years according to quality standards.

Contribution claims

- The tradition of dialogue played as a factor in three cases. Senegal strong tradition of effective dialogue played a positive role. Rwanda and Cambodia less strong traditions of inclusive monitoring of the government prevented mutual accountability.
- Duplication of structures prevented sector-wide dialogue or made sector dialogue less effective in two cases: SS and DRC
- Lack of data prevented effective monitoring in two cases: DRC and SS
- Lack of government ownership of the ESP prevented follow-up monitoring in two cases: SS and Senegal
- GPE contributed through its convening power to expanding LEG participation and JSR in two cases: Kenya and Zimbabwe
- The model of LEG-based dialogue through formal meetings prevented effective dialogue and monitoring in two cases: Guyana and Cambodia. Guyana had only a few donors and actors active in the sector, which meant that a formal setting was not appropriate. In Cambodia, the formal setting chosen by the government for the sector-wide dialogue was also too formal for effective dialogue.
- Conditionality was a factor in two cases. In Guyana, the small size of the ESPIG grant prevented the mechanism of conditionality to work, as the government did not implement legislation establishing the LEG variable. In Mozambique, the variable tranche (Moz) introduced disbursement-linked indicators to the OP results framework, which contributed to better monitoring
- GPE technical assistance through the Grant Agent contributed to support monitoring against ESSP results in Zimbabwe
- Engaging civil society in dialogue and monitoring contributed to more effective monitoring in Zimbabwe
- Being flexible in following the Government-preferred approach to monitoring meant that the monitoring would actually take place in Cambodia (even if the monitoring itself was not inclusive)

Objective 3

Signs of change

In 6 countries (SS, Guyana, Zimbabwe, Cambodia, Nepal, and Rwanda) the ESPIG was a very small part of the ESP implementation funds. The exceptions was DRC, where ODA covered 50% of the ESP implementation, and Mozambique. 4 countries did not report this judgement.
Nevertheless, in 10 of these countries (SS, Guyana, Kenya, Senegal, Mozambique, Zimbabwe, Cambodia, Pakistan, Malawi, and Rwanda) stakeholders reported that the ESPIG made limited but significant contributions to ESP implementation. In South Sudan, funding clearly feel short of needs.
The issues raised have been:
- Concerns about clarity on deciding how to use GPE funds (DRC)
- The design process did not identify effective institutional/ operational arrangement for the ESPIG (Malawi)
- The design process was challenging, especially for the variable tranche (Cambodia)

**Contributing claims**

- Scale of ESPIG funding against domestic funding was a factor in determining how significant an ESPIG can be for ESP implementation. ODA was a significant part of the resources for ESP implementation in SS and DRC. However, in the other countries, the scale of ESPIG funding is a small fraction of domestic resources for education.
- Not being attentive to the implementation capacity gaps in the MoE during ESPIG design prevented better ESPIG management in one case, Malawi
- The fact that variable part indicators were unclear to stakeholders contributed to a more challenging design process in Cambodia
- The role of the GA in ESPIG management. Transitioning from 1 GA to another and also from 1 to 2 GAs created challenges in Cambodia. Two CLEs mention the strong role of the GA for ESPIG implementation (Pakistan and Rwanda).
Objective 4 and 5

Signs of progress

2 CLEs (Guyana, Cambodia) report that international financing for education increased, at least in relative terms against total ODA. 2 CLEs (Senegal, Pakistan) report that the % of education ODA on total ODA fell. 7 CLEs (DRC, Kenya, Senegal, Malawi, Mozambique, Nepal, Rwanda) report that donors are improving in providing more financing with co-funding and sector pooled arrangements. 2 CLEs (Guyana, Cambodia), report no progress in coordination. 3 CLEs did not report this information. 2 CLEs (Senegal and Rwanda), report improvements in international funding, at least from GPE, being aligned with PFM national systems. 3 CLES report no progress (DRC, SS, Cambodia). 7 CLEs did not report this information. One CLE, Zimbabwe, report that GPE contributed to strengthening the partner country PFM systems.

Contribution claims

- Five CLEs report that the starting capacity of national PFM systems and presence of strong pooled funds contributed or prevented donors’ behaviour in using them (DRC, SS, Mozambique, Rwanda, Malawi)
- Four CLEs report that GPE advocacy was ineffective in increasing coherence’s confidence (Cambodia, Senegal, Pakistan, and Rwanda)
- Two CLEs report that a country’s economic growth influenced donors’ funding, as the consequent rising domestic revenues justified decreased aid
- Two CLEs report that the presence of only a few donors in the education sector made coordination easier (Guyana and Zimbabwe)
- Two CLES report that the commitment and competence of the CA and GA had a positive influence on the coordination of international funding (Nepal, Kenya)
- One CLE report that donor splitting funding along the humanitarian and development divide created problem for (SS), GPE multiplier did not lead to additional funding (Senegal), and weak demand from the GoC on aligning donors with national systems (Cambodia)
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Areas of GPE contribution:

- 10 CLEs report that GPE contributed to improving planning (CA, DRC, Guyana, Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Nepal, Pakistan, Rwanda, and South Sudan). 4 CLEs qualify the contribution as small: Guyana, Nepal, and Pakistan, Rwanda
- 8 CLES report that GPE contributed to implementing some ESP sub-sectors (CA, DRC, Guyana, Kenya, Nepal, Rwanda, Senegal, Zimbabwe). 5 CLEs qualify the contribution as small: Guyana, Malawi, Nepal, Rwanda, and Zimbabwe
- 6 CLEs report that GPE contributed to improving dialogue (CA, Guyana, Kenya, Mozambique, Nepal, Pakistan, Rwanda, Senegal, Zimbabwe). 5 CLEs qualified the contribution as small: Guyana, Nepal, Pakistan, Rwanda, and Senegal
- 6 CLEs report that GPE contributed to improving sector monitoring (Mozambique, Nepal, Pakistan, Rwanda, South Sudan, and Zimbabwe). 3 CLEs qualify the contribution as small: Nepal, Pakistan, and Rwanda
- 4 CLEs report that GPE contributed to strengthening the education systems (Kenya, Mozambique, Senegal, South Sudan). 3 of them quality GPE contribution as small
- 2 CLEs report that GPE contributed to improving the quality of international funding (Kenya, Senegal). The CLE for Senegal qualifies the contribution as limited
- 1 CLE report that GPE contributed to stronger PFM mechanisms (Zimbabwe)

Most common mechanisms for contribution

Internal contributing mechanisms:

- 10 CLEs report that ESPIG funding has contributed to implemented sub-sectors of the ESPs (CA, DRC, Guyana, Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Pakistan, Senegal, South Sudan, and Zimbabwe)
- 9 CLEs report that the standards and quality assurance process for ESP and ESPIG contributed to better quality planning and design (CA, DRC, Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Pakistan, Rwanda, Senegal, South Sudan)
- 5 CLEs report that the GA and CA contributed to better planning, dialogue, monitoring, and implementation, including through advocacy and technical assistance (World Bank in Kenya, Nepal, and DFID in Rwanda, and Senegal, and Zimbabwe)
- 4 CLEs report that ESPIG funding functioned as conditionality for getting countries to use GPE standards and quality assurance processes for ESPs (CA, Mozambique, Rwanda, and Zimbabwe). In Mozambique and Rwanda, the conditionality operated through the variable tranche
- 4 CLEs report that the ESPDG funding contributed to quality planning, including the sector analysis (CA, Kenya, Malawi, and Pakistan)
- 4 CLEs report that Secretariat’s technical support and advocacy contributed to better planning and dialogue (DRC, Pakistan, Zimbabwe, and Malawi)
- 1 CLE report that GPE flexibility in following the government’s ways of doing planning and monitoring contributed to government ownership (CA)
- 1 CLE report that the guidance on JSRs contributed to better monitoring (Nepal)

---

7 This refers to mechanism internal to the TOC logic, which explains what GPE approach is.
1 CLE report that reforming the LEG composition to include non-state actors contributed to better dialogue and monitoring (Senegal)

**External contributing mechanism:**

- 9 CLEs report that political willingness in the government to increase funding and progress with education reforms contributed substantially to progress on planning, dialogue, ESP implementation, and ultimately strengthening education systems (Cambodia, Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Nepal, Pakistan, Rwanda, Senegal, and Zimbabwe).
- 7 CLEs report that strong planning capacity in the government contributed to quality planning (CA, Guyana, Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Nepal, Senegal)
- 4 CLEs report that strong economic growth contributed to making resources available for education (Guyana, Kenya, Rwanda, Senegal)
- 1 CLE report that MoE leadership in advocacy for funding with MoF contributed to additional education funding (CA)
- 1 CLE report that raising salaries of civil servants, including in education, contributed to better service delivery (CA)
- 3 CLEs report that the presence of established donor-pooled funding mechanisms or strong PFM systems contributed to donors’ providing sector pooled funds or funding aligned with the government systems (Malawi, Mozambique, Rwanda)
- 1 CLE report that the country strong tradition of dialogue contributed to quality dialogue (Senegal)
- 1 CLE report that it was stand-alone projects by donors that contributed to ESP implementation (South Sudan)

**Internal preventing mechanisms:**

- 4 CLEs raised issues with the GPE approach to building country capacity. 3 of them report that the lack of an approach to building the capacity for ESP implementation prevented stronger progress there. (Malawi, Mozambique, Pakistan). 2 of them report that not considering broader management and governance issues during grant design prevented the ESPIG to be managed as well as it could have been (DRC, Malawi)
- 2 CLE reports that the LEG meetings were too formal for proper programming discussions and proper accountability (CA, Guyana)
- 2 CLEs report that duplication of dialogue was a challenge (DRC, South Sudan)
- 2 CLEs report that the small size of the ESPIG did allow it to be used as conditionality (Guyana, Nepal)
- 2 CLEs report weaknesses in the approach and guidance to JSRs (Pakistan, Rwanda). In Rwanda, it was about lack of clarity on who and how follows up on the monitoring.
- 1 CLE report that the requirements for the variable tranche caused challenges at the ESPIG design (CA)
- 1 CLE report that changing Gas caused confusions in the process
- 1 CLE report that the weaker role for Secretariat and GA during sector dialogue and monitoring contributed to weaker progress there (DRC)

---

8 This refers to mechanism external to the TOC logic, contextual factors that are outside of the control of GPE.
9 This refers to mechanism internal to the TOC logic that do not work as they are supposed to.
1 CLE report that conducting ESPIG application and ESP planning at the same time eroded the capacity of the government for planning (Mozambique).

**External preventing mechanisms:**

- 5 CLEs report that decentralization reforms or decentralized structures for governance and service delivery created challenges to ESP implementation and strengthening education systems (DRC, SS, Nepal, Pakistan, Rwanda)
- 4 CLEs reported that rapid population growth (coupled with extreme poverty) was outrunning the expansion of service delivery (DRC, Malawi, Mozambique, South Sudan)
- 3 CLEs report that weaknesses in implementation capacity at baseline prevented stronger progress in implementing ESPs (Pakistan, Malawi, and DRC)
- 2 CLEs reported that lack of sector data prevented stronger sector monitoring (DRC, and Malawi)
- 1 CLE reported that the Government-preferred JSR model was a one-way information exchange, which did not contribute to real policy inputs (CA)
- 1 CLE reported weak demand on the government side for sector alignment (CA)
- 1 CLE reported that changes in political leadership and of priorities for the education sector prevented stronger progress on ESP implementation (Guyana)
- 1 CLE report that government inaction implement legislation that was supposed to establish LEGs was the main reason why the country does not have a LEG (Guyana)
- 1 CLE reports that regional inequality makes it harder to allocate teachers to under-served areas
- 1 CLE reports that high level of turn-over in the partner government prevented stronger progress in planning (Mozambique)
- 1 CLE reports that there are political barriers to raising additional financing for education, as governments may refuse to raise additional taxes (Pakistan)
- 1 CLE reports that the limited space for civil society prevented further progress (Rwanda and Zimbabwe)
- 1 CLE reports that differences in strength in Ministries and Agencies lead to unequal influence in planning and dialogue (Senegal)
- 1 CLE reports that open civil conflict connected insecurity, loss of territory, and population displacement, and led to a regression in the quality of service delivery

---

10 This refers to mechanism external to the TOC logic that act as barriers to limit GPE contribution.
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### Annex 4.2.1: Summary of Barriers to and Enablers of Efficient use of Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers</th>
<th>Enablers/mitigating factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grant level</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Methodology used to assess grants</td>
<td>• Negotiating agreements and arrangements between development partners, implementation agencies and other providers at project preparation stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Delays in grant approval process</td>
<td>• Investing more time and resources in thorough assessments of needs and capacity at project appraisal stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Delays in grants’ transfers to DCPs</td>
<td>• Clearly define scope, and targets of the program and activities that are achievable during the project timeframe given country contexts e.g. security situation; government capacity; availability of contractors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recruitment for key positions for implementation of grants</td>
<td>• Improve realism and priority-setting of ESPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• World Bank procedures not always applied in DCPs</td>
<td>• Enhance systematic collection of cost data related to the achievement of outputs, outcomes and longer-term impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project level</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Project design e.g. overly complex in relation to implementation capacity in DCPs</td>
<td>• Project restructuring and extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Development of need’ assessments</td>
<td>• Provision of technical assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Program planning</td>
<td><strong>Country level</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Activity preparation</td>
<td>• Improve coordination between GAs and DCP governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Procurement e.g. irregularities</td>
<td>• Higher allocations of resources to overall sector development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Program management e.g. setbacks at launch, or during implementation</td>
<td>• Facilitation of in-country dialogue by GPE’s Secretariat to reach common understandings of implementation issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Delays with technical support from development partners</td>
<td><strong>Project level</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country level</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Changes in political leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Changes in national education policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Capacity constraints e.g. weaknesses in EMIS and PFM and decentralized structures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conflict-affectedness and lack of accessibility due to security concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Irregularities in safeguards procedures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Withdrawal of funding agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Delays in approvals from government authorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Coordination issues between GA and government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Validity of the TOC in contexts of extreme fragility - Grouping together the CLEs for South Sudan and DRC gives us a glimpse on if and how GPE TOC might hold in situations of extreme fragility and open civil conflict (South Sudan). Both CLEs report progress at all levels was more modest, but particularly in implementing the ESP and strengthening education systems. The connection between GPE support and planning is still operative, in the sense that GPE has been able in both cases to make sure that the ESP met the ESP quality criteria. However, other parts of the TOC have not been operative. The situation of open civil conflict in South Sudan has proven to be fundamentally different from a situation of fragility. This is because of the loss of government control on territory, large scale population movements, decreasing and diversion of resources from other sectors to the ongoing conflict, the ESP planned for a peace situation being meaningless in an emergency situations, and donors reallocating budgets and splitting dialogue across the humanitarian and development divide, and sometimes exiting the country. The GPE

Added value of the GPE TOC in a situation where government is effectiveness. Grouping together the CLEs for Malawi and Mozambique allow to review if and how the GPE TOC works in countries that rate much higher on measures of government effectiveness than they do on human development. This is because these countries have already a strong capacity for planning, but high needs and poverty levels. The CLEs for Mozambique and Malawi suggest that the part of the TOC connecting GPE support with quality planning worked as expected, but constituted also lower value-added than in other CLEs, because of a lower need for support to the government. They also suggest that government capacity for planning does not necessarily extend to implementation (Malawi), nor is necessarily enough for progress at the education systems strengthening. This because of reasons connected with high population growth, coupled with extreme poverty, that makes more problematic for catching up with an expanding school population and also improving the quality of service delivery. In both countries, government effectiveness did translate in the presence of established and reliable mechanisms for co-financing, which made providing co-financing easier for the donors. Both government were also providing adequate domestic resources for education already at baseline.

Added value of the GPE when income and human development are rapidly rising. Grouping together the CLEs for Guyana, Kenya, and Senegal, which are countries that performed better on all dimensions of development, provides a glimpse on whether there is still a need and a role to play for GPE in countries that are graduating from the lowest development categories. All three CLEs report that the share of ESPIGs funding, but also ODA in general, in these countries is small compared with national resources, and rapidly decreasing because of economic growth, higher government revenues, and the revised country allocations under the allocation formula introduce in 2014. In this sense, the link between objective 3 and goal becomes much smaller in scale than in other countries. The CLEs for Senegal and Kenya reported that GPE support to planning and dialogue found fertile ground for expanding civil society involvement in dialogue, but also the MoE were confidently coordinating the education sector, which might suggest that in these countries there is less of a need for donors to have a leading role in sector coordination. The role of the GA is still appreciated at least if limited to grant management. The case of Guyana is different, there sector dialogue was much more limited, because of the limited number of donors present in the country, the fact that they were mainly funding regional programmes, and because of the overall size of the country (Guyana’s population is only 800,000). Finally, the connection between GPE support and effective sector monitoring was weak in these easiest conditions, pointing out to the fact that perhaps the part of the GPE connecting GPE support with objective 2 and objective 2 to goal does not work overall.

Validity of the TOC in cases where the space for civil society is limited. Grouping together the CLEs for Cambodia and Zimbabwe, countries that rate much lower on space for civil society against other GPE countries than they do on overall level of human development, gives a glimpse on the role that space for civil society might have dialogue and monitoring. The CLEs for Zimbabwe and Cambodia suggest that GPE can make contributions to planning and dialogue in these contexts as well, as long as the reform processes for education are sustained by political will
in the government. The CLE for Zimbabwe also suggests that country-conditions for dialogue can evolve in a positive direction rapidly after long periods of stasis. They do suggest that on the more delicate issue of monitoring for mutual accountability, GPE might accept government-preferred ways of doing things, and that these ways of doing things might not constitute a two-way dialogue or real mutual accountability between government and civil society. The case of Rwanda, which however has been kept separated because of much lower human development levels, suggest the same. The case in Cambodia, in particular, suggest that monitoring might have to follow government ways of doing things for being held regularly, and, at the same time and because of it, not lead to mutual accountability, but still have a positive effect on better ESP implementation.

**Decentralized levels of government.** The analysis did not group together CLEs based on whether they concerned countries with a decentralized structure for sector governance. However, a patter emerged in the sense that CLEs tend to associate challenges in implementing ESPs, collecting and aggregating sector data, and raising and using domestic funds with the split between stronger central capacity and weaker capacity at the decentralized level of government, which, depending on country conditions, are Provincial States, Districts, or Municipalities. The connection between GPE support, objectives 1, 2, 3, and 4, and goal 3 might be less valid currently when GPE faces this split.