**COMPLETION REPORT TEMPLATE**

System capacity grant

January 2023

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **OVERVIEW** | |
| Country: | Click to enter text. |
| Grant ID (where applicable): | Click to enter text. |
| Grant agent: | Click to enter text. |
| Grant effectiveness/start date: | Click or tap to enter a date. |
| Grant closing date (actual date): | Click or tap to enter a date. |
| Grant amount (in the grant approved currency): | Click to enter amount. |
| Date of report submission: | Click or tap to enter a date. |
| Area(s) and activity group(s) covered by grant (check all that apply):[[1]](#endnote-2) | |
| Financing window 1: Strengthen gender-responsive planning and policy development for system-wide impact  A. System diagnostics, compact development and education sector analyses  B. Gender-responsive sector planning, including operational planning and budgeting  C. Supporting policies and plans to identify and address multiple forms of exclusion (planning for children with disabilities, system resilience and inclusion of displaced children)  D. Strengthen evidence-based diagnosis of critical implementation bottlenecks and identifying potentially scalable, transformative solutions | |
| Financing window 2: Mobilize coordinated action and financing to enable transformative change  E. Strengthening sector coordination, including local education groups, joint sector reviews and monitoring the effectiveness of the country-level partnership  F. Establishing and operating pooled funding mechanisms  G. Strengthening budget processes and ministry of finance engagement; identifying opportunities to improve the equity and efficiency of education expenditure, including processes toward gender equality  H. Cross-sectoral convening | |
| Financing window 3: Strengthen capacity, adapt, and learn, to implement and drive results at scale  I. Strengthening data systems, including on improving the availability and use of sex-disaggregated data, and data on children with disabilities  J. Training and support for government staff and central and decentralized levels, including on the uptake and use of data and evidence  K. Support for implementation capacity, including sector plan implementation monitoring, gender responsiveness of the sector and evaluation of sector plans and policies/programs in priority areas; assess monitoring, evaluation and learning capacity, including use of evidence in policy process | |

|  |
| --- |
| **PURPOSE AND INSTRUCTIONS** |
| **Purpose** |
| This system capacity grant completion report is learning oriented and seeks to:   * Evaluate and report on **overall performance** by providing a complete and systematic account of the performance and results of the project, issues related to implementation and measures taken to address them. * Share **reflections** to improve the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of future such projects and Global Partnership for Education (GPE) processes. * Ensure **accountability** and **transparency** of the grant and its commitments.   By taking stock of what has worked or not, the process of writing this completion report should be forward-looking and serve as a basis for collaborative discussions around the future of GPE support in the country. |
| **Instructions** |
| This template is to be completed by the grant agent in consultation with the government and local education group. As per GPE’s [System Capacity Grants policy and guidelines](https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/guidelines-education-sector-plan-development-grants), the grant agent provides an implementation completion report covering the entire implementation period to the Secretariat following the end of implementation. The completion report should be submitted **within six months after the close of the grant**. [[2]](#endnote-3)  The full completion report package consists of the following deliverables:   * Completed template (present form, including relevant annexes) * Tangible outputs and knowledge products generated with support from the grant (if not already shared in previous progress reports) * Evaluations or any other relevant studies on the grant or its related results (if any) * Efficiency analysis (if any)   Text should be concise and clear. You may add annexes if you wish to only display key text in the report. Overlapping contents may be referenced cross-sectionally to avoid repetitions. It is encouraged to think of the questions as an interdependent whole to build the project’s story line. Some questions are self-reflective in nature and will necessitate using judgment inferred from triangulated quantitative/qualitative information and logical explanations.  Include a **gender and equity lens** in the narratives, as much as feasible. Evidence and findings should be placed back into the **national/subnational context** of the country at the time of the review, for better unpacking the information.  Data should be **triangulated**, presenting a balance of **quantitative and qualitative** information from varied sources and stakeholders. The review should use compare/contrast techniques to explain any diverging pieces of evidence. **Substantiate assertions with data and evidence**. Explore the **“how and how well”**, **“why or why not”** and **“so what”** aspects of the evidence to understand its underlying causes, effects and relative importance.  The grant agent should submit the report through the [GPE reporting portal](https://fifsgpe.worldbank.org/GATool/#/). Please contact the grant operations officer for your country if you do not have credentials to access the portal. Following submission, grant agents may be contacted by the GPE Secretariat for additional information or clarification. The final completion report will be publicly disclosed after it is submitted by the grant agent and reviewed by the GPE Secretariat. Please reach out to your GPE Secretariat primary contact in case of questions. |

|  |
| --- |
| **LIST OF ACRONYMS** |

|  |
| --- |
| Please insert the list of acronyms used in this report, if any.  Click here to add acronyms. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1. ASSESSMENT OF GRANT IMPLEMENTATION: RELEVANCE** | | | | | | | |
| **1.1 Overall relevance** | | | | | | | |
| **RELEVANCE – Extent to which grant activities responded to the capacity needs and priorities of the sector (for example in light of the weaknesses identified in the partnership compact), country partners and the beneficiaries, especially through the lens of girls’ and most marginalized/vulnerable children education and continued to do so throughout implementation.**[[3]](#endnote-4) Assess by ticking “**X**” in the answer that seems most appropriate and qualify your answer in the textbox below. | | | | | | | |
|  | | | High | | There were no shortcomings or at most minor shortcomings in the continued alignment between grant activities and the capacity needs/priorities. The grant provided clear evidence of such alignment. If circumstances changed, the objectives were changed accordingly to keep objectives fully relevant. | | |
|  | | | Substantial | | There were moderate shortcomings in the continued alignment between grant activities and the capacity needs/priorities. The grant provided limited information on such alignment. If circumstances changed, the objectives were changed accordingly to keep objectives fully relevant. | | |
|  | | | Modest | | There were significant shortcomings in the continued alignment between grant activities and the capacity needs/priorities. The project provided limited information on such alignment. If circumstances changed, the objectives were not changed accordingly to keep objectives fully relevant. | | |
|  | | | Negligible | | There were severe shortcomings in the continued alignment between grant activities and the capacity needs/priorities. The grant differed from those current needs or did not provide information to assess such alignment. If circumstances changed, the objectives were not changed accordingly to keep objectives fully relevant. | | |
| Reflect on the grant’s **continued relevance** during its lifecycle.[[4]](#endnote-5)Also reflect on whether the grant interventions **complemented well** other capacity-related activities in the country in the areas of gender-responsive planning, coordinated action/financing, and capacity to implement results at scale. | | | | | | | |
| Click here to enter text. | | | | | | | |
| **1.2 Beneficiaries’ views on relevance** | | | | | | | |
| [If a beneficiary/satisfaction survey, and so on was conducted] According to the grant **beneficiaries** (government, LEG, etc.):   1. Were the grant’s **capacity outputs and deliverables of quality** and did they **meet their needs** for system capacity strengthening? 2. Were the grant’s activities and deliverables sufficiently **demand driven**? Why or why not? | | | | | | | |
| Click here to enter text.  **2. ASSESSMENT OF GRANT IMPLEMENTATION: EFFICACY** | | | | | | | |
| **2.1 Overall efficacy** | | | | | | | |
| **EFFICACY – Extent to which the grant achieved its intended objectives (intended objectives or outcomes) at the time of closing.**[[5]](#endnote-6) Assess by ticking “**X**” in the answer that seems most relevant and qualify your answer in the textbox below. | | | | | | | |
|  | High | | | The project exceeded or fully achieved its objectives (intended outcomes) or is likely to do so. | | | |
|  | Substantial | | | The project almost fully achieved its objectives (intended outcomes) or is likely to do so. | | | |
|  | Modest | | | The project partly achieved (or is expected to partly achieve) its objectives (intended outcomes). | | | |
|  | Negligible | | | The project barely achieved or did not achieve (minimal achievement, if any) its objectives (intended outcomes). | | | |
| Briefly qualify your answer below. Also focus on the extent to which and how well the grant reduced specific barriers to access and learning faced by (a) **girls and/or in terms of gender equality** and (b) **most vulnerable/marginalized children, as defined in the country’s context**. | | | | | | | |
| Click here to enter text. | | | | | | | |
| **2.2 Efficacy by capacity area window** | | | | | | | |
| Provide in annex 1 information on the level of achievement for each capacity area window by the end of the grant:   * Efficacy ratings by window[[6]](#endnote-7) * Brief narrative on key achievements and challenges, by window. For each bucket, also focus on the extent to which and how well the grant activities successfully achieved system capacity strengthening in relation to addressing the specific needs of: a) **girls and/or in terms of gender equality**; and b) **most vulnerable children, as defined in the country’s context.** | | | | | | | |
| Click here to enter text. | | | | | | | |
| **2.3 Contribution to system capacity to deliver reforms** | | | | | | | |
| Reflect on the grant’s contribution to **system capacity to deliver reforms**, for example, the extent to which:   1. The grant helped remediate the **system capacity gaps/weaknesses** assessed and prioritized in the partnership Compact or beyond (see ties to specific ‘enabling factors’[[7]](#endnote-8) under the partnership compact). 2. The grant’s capacity activities helped reinforce **system-wide capacity**. 3. The system-level capacity gained through the grant supported (or has the potential to support) the **delivery of education reforms**. | | | | | | | |
| Click here to enter text. | | | | | | | |
| **2.4 Other effects** | | | | | | | |
| If applicable, describe **any other grant’s effects and impacts** (intended or unintended, positive or negative). Unintended effects should be shown to be causally linked to the intervention being assessed. | | | | | | | |
| Click here to enter text. | | | | | | | |
| **2.5 Conditions affecting the grant** | | | | | | | |
| Reflect on the internal/external **conditions that have facilitated or hindered grant success**, for example:   1. The **conditions that have inhibited or facilitated** grant design, implementation and the achievement of objectives(for example, internal factors such as management or supervision; and/or other factors related to the country, such as management, financial or fiduciary management capacity, monitoring and evaluation [M&E], partner coordination, and so on; external factors beyond the grant agent’s or implementor’s control).[[8]](#endnote-9) 2. In hindsight, whether the **risks identified** at the grant development stage (including sexual exploitation and abuse and sexual harassment, or SEAH-related risks, and any others if applicable) were accurate and the **mitigating measures** sufficient; whether there were any other risks unforeseen at the time. | | | | | | | |
| Click here to enter text. | | | | | | | |
| **2.6 Lessons and recommendations, successful practices and innovative interventions** | | | | | | | |
| If applicable and not shared in previous progress reports:  Briefly describe **major lessons**[[9]](#endnote-10)(positive or negative) related to the implementation of the grant. Also, share **key recommendations**[[10]](#endnote-11) that could feed into future grant planning cycles for improved practices.  Mentionany **successful practices** or **innovative interventions** in relation to the grant/project (if not already shared in previous progress reports). | | | | | | | |
| Click here to enter text. | | | | | | | |
| **2.7 Impact stories** | | | | | | | |
| If applicable and not shared in previous progress reports:  Have you identified any **stories of impact** of the grant on beneficiaries that you would like to share with the GPE Secretariat Communications Team? If so, provide below or as an attachment. These stories will be featured on GPE communications materials and platforms, with attribution to the provider. | | | | | | | |
| Click here to enter text. | | | | | | | |
| **2.8 Tangible outputs and knowledge products** | | | | | | | |
| If applicable and not shared in previous progress reports:  Attach the **tangible outputs and knowledge products** (for example, evaluations, pilots, studies) generated through the support of the grant. Also, attach any **photos, videos, advocacy posters**, and so on, as relevant, that can be showcased in GPE stories or blogs. | | | | | | | |
| **3. ASSESSMENT OF GRANT IMPLEMENTATION: EFFICIENCY** | | | | | | | |
| **3.1 Overall efficiency** | | | | | | | |
| **EFFICIENCY – Extent to which grant activities were implemented in a timely manner, and the costs were reasonable for the results achieved (that is, the resources were economically converted into outputs and outcomes).**[[11]](#endnote-12) Please assess by ticking “**X**” in the answer that seems most relevant and qualify your answer in the textbox below. | | | | | | | |
|  | | High | | | Efficiency exceeded expectations. | | |
|  | | Substantial | | | Efficiency was what would be expected in the sector. | | |
|  | | Modest | | | Efficiency was below expectations in the sector. | | |
|  | | Negligible | | | Efficiency was very low compared to both the benefits (if any) and recognized norms in the sector. | | |
| **3.2 Timeliness** | | | | | | | |
| Reflectonthe timeliness of the grant, that is, whether the project experienced any **delays at grant start or during implementation,** and why. | | | | | | | |
| **At grant start:**  - What was the time between GPE approval date and actual start of activities?  - If grant start experienced delays, what were the main reasons for these delays? How well were they remediated? | | | | | | | **During implementation:**  - To what extent were the aims under the capacity areas fulfilled within the planned timeline?  - If grant implementation experienced delays, what were the main reasons for these delays? What was the effect of delays on direct beneficiaries? How well were they remediated? |
| Click here to enter text. | | | | | | Click here to enter text. | |
| * 1. **Grant costs** | | | | | | | |
| - What were the **unit costs of delivering key outputs** (for example, analyses and knowledge sharing, strategy-policy-process development, technical services for system management, and so on)? Are there any **benchmarks** available for comparison? Did the unit costs **change** between grant design and actual implementation? If so, why?  - Were there any **exceeding costs or major savings** for the grant? If yes, please describe. | | | | | | | |
| Click here to enter text. | | | | | | | |
| **3.4 Partnerships and inclusive dialogue** | | | | | | | |
| Reflect on the grant’s experience with the following:[[12]](#endnote-13)   * Were there any **partnerships** (financial/in-kind/other) developed or leveraged, for example with the private sector, foundations, other sectors beyond education, research institutions etc. to support the grant? If yes, describe below these partnerships and explain their level of success, any challenges, and lessons * How inclusive was **sector dialogue** throughout the life of the grant? Coordinated/harmonized mechanisms, notably in the context of the partnership compact (synchronized actions between country actors, for example through the local education group) | | | | | | | |
| Click here to enter text. | | | | | | | |
| **3.5 Use of data and evidence for improvement** | | | | | | | |
| Explain how, and with which level of success, the grant has **used its grant monitoring data and research/evidence** throughout its life cycle to improve implementation and ensure that intended results would be achieved.  Provide any details related to **joint problem-solving** exercises, events or opportunities with country-level partners, the GPE Secretariat, and other stakeholders, and their relative level of usefulness, as well as any recommendations on how such mechanisms could be improved moving forward. | | | | | | | |
| Click here to enter text. | | | | | | | |
| **3.6 Use of GPE processes** | | | | | | | |
| Reflect on the extent to which the **key system capacity grant processes and mechanisms** have facilitated or impeded the design and implementation of the grant (in terms of the need for grant quality, timeliness, reasonable transaction costs, and so on).[[13]](#endnote-14) | | | | | | | |
| Click here to enter text. | | | | | | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **4. SUSTAINABILITY** | |
| If applicable:  Reflect on the **potential for continuity** beyond the closing date:   1. Which grant results, services or initiatives established have a potential to be continued or scaled, or if there are no tangible areas for continuity. 2. Whether the system’s weaknesses addressed through the system capacity grant have the potential to be durably remediated thanks to this grant. 3. The conditions in place or lacking for continuity, and any potential risks that may jeopardize continuity. Also, whether there is sufficient budget and other resources allocated to these elements that are sought to be continued. 4. Any sustainability plans or exit strategies developed to ensure the continuity of (some of) the benefits. 5. Any measures for scaling up capacity strengthening pilots or promising practices. | |
| Click here to enter text. | |
| **5. GRANT MANAGEMENT AND USE OF FUNDS** | |
| **5.1 Unspent funds** | |
| If applicable, if there were any **unspent funds** by the end of the grant, indicate (i) how much and (ii) why. | |
| 1. Click to enter amount of funds that were not spent by grant closing. | |
| 1. Click here to enter text. | |
| **5.2 Management performance** | |
| Provide a rating to indicate the level of performance of the grant during implementation in terms of its **management** over the life cycle of the grant. This includes financial, procurement, social/environmental safeguards, implementation arrangements, monitoring and evaluation, and other fiduciary management or compliance duties. | Select a rating.[[14]](#endnote-15) |
| Explain how these management arrangements/duties have affected, positively or negatively, the implementation of the grant and its achievement of results/outcomes by the end of the grant. | |
| Click here to enter text. | |

**Annex 1: Decision Trees for Overall Efficacy Rating and Window-Level Efficacy Ratings**

1. **Overall efficacy rating**Diagram

   Description automatically generated

**2. Window-level efficacy ratings**

Diagram

Description automatically generated

**Annex 2: Efficacy by Grant Window**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Efficacy by project component/objective** | | |
| Assess below **how successfully each grant window achieved its intended objectives/results**:   * By selecting a rating from the drop-down menu.[[15]](#endnote-16) If the grant did not undertake activities for certain windows, select ‘Not Applicable’ in the dropdown menu for that window. * Then by reflecting in a short narrative on the windows’ achievements, describing for example for each:  1. The **reliability of the results chain** (i.e. results achieved, extent to which the window’s activities/outputs contributed to results, whether key activities/outputs were delivered based on the inputs mobilized, the relative importance of the results achieved (or not), and reasons for non-achievement, etc. 2. Any **innovations** or **pilots** and their degree of success. 3. Any varying degrees of accomplishment across **groups of beneficiaries**. For each bucket, also focus on the extent to which and how well the grant activities successfully achieved system capacity strengthening in relation to addressing the specific needs of: a) **girls and/or in terms of gender equality**; and b) **most vulnerable children, as defined in the country’s context**. 4. Any **major challenges** experienced during implementation, their causes, and how well these were remediated, including any revisions/restructurings/adaptations. 5. Any significant **deviation** from the original grant design, Compact’s intended use of grant funding, or revised purposes during grant implementation, and their implications on the grant’s budget, achievements, etc. | | |
| Capacity area window: | Level of achievement at end of grant: | Brief narrative |
| Window 1: ‘Strengthen gender-responsive planning and policy development for system-wide impact’ | Select a rating. | Click here to enter text. |
| Window 2: ‘Mobilize coordinated action and financing to enable transformative change’ | Select a rating. | Click here to enter text. |
| Window 3: ‘Strengthen capacity, adapt, and learn, to implement and drive results at scale’ | Select a rating. | Click here to enter text. |

**Notes**

1. See the [Guidelines for System Capacity Grants](https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/guidelines-education-sector-plan-development-grants). Grant agents are reminded that administrative costs that are not directly applicable to the corresponding Financing Window are to be included in one component named ‘Other’, which does not require a separate rating. If applicable, grant agents are encouraged to provide some explanation on progress or achievements of any substantive activities (e.g. Monitoring and Evaluation) included in “other” component, if any. [↑](#endnote-ref-2)
2. If the grant implementation period is up to 12 months, and no implementation progress report was submitted, the completion report is due within three months after the close of the grant. [↑](#endnote-ref-3)
3. **Relevance** assesses the extent to which a grant’s activities continued to remain consistent with the needs and priorities of the sector. The **Relevance** test requires that the activities be judged by the development priorities and circumstances prevailing at the grant closing date, not at the time of the grant approval. It should take into account whether the grant’s intended activities reflected proper diagnosis of a capacity strengthening priority that remains relevant, and whether the implementation support was responsive to changing needs in the country. If country circumstances changed significantly during implementation, the completion report should explain whether and how these changes were accommodated (i.e. through formal restructuring or other means) to retain the relevance of the activities. If the stated activities are vague or not sufficiently monitorable, a relatively low rating is appropriate for the **Relevance** criterion. [↑](#endnote-ref-4)
4. For example, you may reflect on the following: (i) Did the grant **target the capacity gaps/needs** of the system, as identified and prioritized in the Compact or beyond, and continued to do so if new/different capacity needs emerged? How did the grant ensure that changing circumstances were being fed back into the grant? (ii) Was the **level of grant funding** sufficient and adequately **continuously available** (as per its intended design) to address persistent capacity challenges (as prioritized through the Compact or beyond)? (iii) Was the grant design adequatelybased on **consultations** with various country partners at varied levels, **lessons** from previous/similar grants, and **evidence/findings** from relevant diagnostic/research studies? (iv) Did the grant take into account the state of **national/subnational legislation and regulations** as well as **national and subnational capacities and conditions**? [↑](#endnote-ref-5)
5. See in annex 1 a decision tree to help determine an overall efficacy rating. **Efficacy** is defined as the extent to which the project objectives were achieved at the time of grant closing (or are expected to be achieved) and can be plausibly attributed to the project’s activities. In projects with multiple objectives or outcomes, provide only a single overall **efficacy** rating covering all objectives/outcomes. To come up with the overall **efficacy** rating, each objective should be separately assessed. Accomplishment of each objective should be discussed in the narrative, and their relative importance described. The project’s results framework and outcome targets provide the grounds for judging achievements of the outcomes/objectives; however, other sources of information, including other relevant research and impact evaluations, can be used to measure achievement of outcomes. Even in cases where indicators defined in the results framework were excellent for assessing the outcomes, multiple sources of information help with “triangulation” of outcome data for more accurate assessment of achievement of objectives. For each objective/outcome, it is important to include evidence showing the key elements of the results chain supported by the project (evidence explaining the interpretation of plausible causal relationships between the project’s activities/outputs and achieved outcomes, as distinct from other non-project factors that may have affected the observed outcomes, such as other interventions, policy changes natural events, market factors, and so on). [↑](#endnote-ref-6)
6. See in Annex 1 a decision tree to help determine window-level efficacy ratings. [↑](#endnote-ref-7)
7. The four **enabling** **factors** are: 1) volume, equity, and efficiency of domestic finance; 2) gender responsive sector planning, policy, and monitoring; 3) data and evidence; and 4) sector coordination. The SCG aims to support countries to make progress in these critical areas, according to their unique needs and context. [↑](#endnote-ref-8)
8. **Management** factors may includemanagement arrangements, roles, responsibilities, and so on. **Supervision** factors may includesupervision provided during implementation, including timely and proactive identification of issues and actions taken to address them, and so on. Factors related to **capacity** may include institutional and organizational capacities, human resources-related capacities and other issues that impact capacity. **Financial management/fiduciary** factorsmay include procurement, financing, budgeting and financial management mechanisms in place following the grant agent’s policies and procedures. **Monitoring and Evaluation**-related factors may include the quality of monitoring and evaluation arrangements, such as monitoring and evaluation design, implementation and utilization to inform project/grant management and decision making; issues related to data availability, and so on. Factors related to **coordination, partnership and participatory processes** may include principal project partners, their roles and engagement, information on frequency and reasons for consultations with the local education group during the project/grant implementation, and so on. **External factors, factors beyond the grant agent’s control and unforeseen circumstances** may include macroeconomic changes, conflict and instability, natural disasters, changes in government commitment and leadership, issues related to governance and politics, unforeseen technical and logistical difficulties, changes in scope, and so on. [↑](#endnote-ref-9)
9. **Lessons** are different from facts, findings or circumstances. Instead, they express the broader significance to be taken away from a given experience. A lesson is typically stated as a conclusion that has a certain degree of generalizability beyond the grant, country or period considered. It is also helpful to explain how/why a given context played a role in whether the experience unfolded successfully or not—a similar intervention/factor may have played out differently under different country or project/grant contexts. Lessons may draw from (a) key enabling/hindering circumstances or events (internal or external to the project/grant); (b) best practices, innovations or critical events experienced by the project/grant; and (c) assessment of which interventions/activities were comparatively more/less effective and why. [↑](#endnote-ref-10)
10. **Recommendations** should be forward-looking and provide actionable suggestions on how to proceed (strategically or operationally) in the future should a similar experience arise. Recommendations tend to have general applicability beyond the grant under review. [↑](#endnote-ref-11)
11. **Efficiency** is a measure of how economically resources and inputs are converted to results. The assessment asks whether the costs involved in completing SCG capacity strengthening activities were reasonable in comparison with both the benefits and with recognized norms (“value for money”). It may include aspects of design and implementation that either contributed to or reduced efficiency, including examples of delays in implementation of key activities, frequent staff turn-over, procurement issues and delays, component and administrative costs estimated at the grant planning stage compared to actual costs, cost overruns, and planned vs. actual grant timeframe (recognizing that delays are not always inefficient, and can in some instances result in achievement of additional outcomes and net efficiency gains). Underlying assumptions about costs and benefits need to be presented and defended. [↑](#endnote-ref-12)
12. For example: Were the grant’s activities/achievements featured in the sector’s annual action plans/budgets and progress reports? Did the grant agent, local education group, and other sector actors conduct joint monitoring sessions or events, site visits, or diagnostics? Did the grant agent, government, and other sector actors work together to coordinate their processes and interventions? [↑](#endnote-ref-13)
13. This may include the appropriateness of GPE’s grant processes, such as: (i) grant allocation process; (ii) processes for grant application, review, and approval; (ii) grant agent selection process; (iii) grant management, monitoring, and learning processes, etc., in terms of the need for quality, timeliness, and reasonable transaction costs. Also, strategically and operationally, how successful was the grant’s flexibility feature, such as: (i) drawing grant funding flexibly as capacity needs arise throughout the entire duration of the grant cycle (i.e. accessing SCG allocation through multiple applications at different periods throughout the country’s policy cycle); (ii) flexibility to have different grant agents depending on their comparative advantages, and so on. [↑](#endnote-ref-14)
14. **Highly Unsatisfactory** –Overall grant management performance prevented the achievement of one or more outputs. **Unsatisfactory** –Overall grant management performance limited or jeopardized the achievement of one or more outputs. **Moderately** **Unsatisfactory** – Overall grant management performance delayed the achievement of one or more outputs, but issues were resolved during the grant life cycle. **Moderately** **Satisfactory** – Overall grant management performance supported the grant to achieve most of its major outputs efficiently with moderate shortcomings. **Satisfactory** – Overall grant management performance supported the grant to achieve almost all of its major outputs efficiently with only minor shortcomings. **Highly Satisfactory** – Overall grant management performance supported the grant to achieve or exceed all of the major outputs efficiently without significant shortcomings. [↑](#endnote-ref-15)
15. See in Annex 1 a decision tree to help determine window-level efficacy ratings. Also the scale is as follows: **Negligible** – The window barely achieved or did not achieve (minimal achievement, if any) its intended objectives/results. **Modest** – The window partly achieved (or is expected to partly achieve) its intended objectives/results. **Substantial** - The window almost fully achieved its intended objectives/results or is likely to do so. **High** – The window exceeded or fully achieved its intended objectives/results or is likely to do so. [↑](#endnote-ref-16)