

DECEMBER 4-5, 2024 – MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

EMIRATE OF DUBAI – BOD/2024/12 DOC 11 – FOR DECISION

STRATEGIC PARAMETERS FOR GPE 2030 FUNDING

Please note: In accordance with the GPE Transparency Policy, documents are public only after their appraisal by the relevant governance instance. Governance officials may circulate documents to their constituency for consultation purposes, except for documents of a confidential nature.

Key issues for consideration:

- The Board is asked to consider an approach to strategic parameters under GPE 2030, as well as the type of information that will be provided to the Board to inform its decisions on financial allocations to countries. Based on GPE 2025 implementation experience, and findings from the thematic and country-level evaluation, new approaches to top-up triggers and quality assurance are being proposed. The decision on GPE 2030 strategic parameters will inform the outputs of the mid-term reviews of partnership compacts.
- The Performance, Impact and Learning Committee (PILC) and the Finance and Risk Committee (FRC) considered the issues proposed in this document via a written, non-objection procedure due to the lack of time for an in-depth discussion during their meetings in October 2024. Members raised questions about the top-up triggers priority areas, proposed allocations and tailored approach to fragile and conflict-affected countries. Some members also raised concerns with the proposed discontinuation of the Independent Technical Advisory Panel (ITAP).
- While no objections were raised at the end of the written procedure period, some members suggested that the Board may want to include further details in the decision language to better reflect the issues raised in Annex A. To respond to members' comments and questions, the Secretariat will publish a FAQ document on the Governance Portal. A pre-Board webinar will also be organized.

Objective

1. This document sets out proposed strategic parameters for GPE 2030 country allocations for the Board's consideration. Annex A outlines the proposed strategic parameters. Annex B presents the mid-term review pipeline. Both the strategic parameters and the mid-term reviews process build on lessons learned and further sharpen GPE support to country reform implementation and results.

Recommended decision

BOD/2024/12-XX—GPE 2030 Strategic Parameters: The Board of Directors:

1. Recalling decision [BOD/2023/07-01](#), and recognizing the need to adapt and learn from GPE 2025 implementation and country-level evaluations, approves the strategic parameters for GPE 2030 funding as set out in Annex A of BOD/2024/12

DOC 11. This includes priority areas, eligibility, cap, and distribution, as well as compact requirement for GPE 2030 top-up funding.

Background and overview

1. In July 2023, the Board agreed to use mid-term reviews of partnership compacts to inform the strategic parameters for the subsequent funding period of 2026–2030 ([BOD/2023/07- 01](#)). This decision was intended to enable a smooth transition from one funding period to the next by allowing countries to maintain focus on reform implementation and adaptation, and avoiding time lags as new grants are developed and become effective. The proposals in Annex A have the potential to further streamline GPE’s operating model in support of country led reform efforts.
2. **Strategic parameters** set out the minimum commitments to be made by country partners and endorsed by the GPE Board of Directors, to make a decision on a country’s financial allocation.
3. **Mid-term reviews** are a key moment for governments and partners to assess the implementation of the priority reforms identified in the partnership compact and agree on next steps or new directions. Mid-term reviews are an opportunity to course-correct, strengthen the alignment of actors’ and partner interventions (including GPE grants), identify gaps or stubborn bottlenecks to reform delivery, mobilize additional financing and partners, and agree where future GPE support could add value.
4. Approximately 20 countries will be conducting mid-term reviews in 2025 and a few countries will do so in 2024 (see Annex B). A Board decision on the strategic parameters is needed at this stage to inform the focus of the mid-term reviews and serve as the basis for allocations of funding to be made available after the replenishment is completed.
5. The Board is being asked to consider, for its decision, the GPE 2030 strategic parameters (see Annex A), including the type of information that will be provided to inform Board decision on country allocations.

Annex A – Proposal for GPE 2030 strategic parameters

Annex B – Mid-term review pipeline

Annex A: Proposal for GPE 2030 strategic parameters

Item	Proposal	Rationale	Additional information
<p>Priority areas for top-up triggers</p>	<p>Limit top-ups to the enabling factors of (1) progress on learning outcome data, (2) addressing country specific bottlenecks to improving the volume, equity, and efficiency of domestic financing.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Simplifies the process of identifying and monitoring suitable context relevant triggers, without reverting to a one size fits all approach - Focuses attention on critical inputs (financing) and expected outputs (learning). - Removes the need to identify which of the enabling factors is of highest priority. - Reduces the need for an independent analysis on which areas should be given the highest priority and therefore eligible for top-ups. The Independent Technical Advisory Panel (ITAP) would therefore be disbanded. - Reduces the time and effort involved in submitting documents needed to conduct an ITAP assessment. - Enables savings (each ITAP panel costs about US\$20,000). - Would help manage the overall pipeline. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Actions on the other enabling factors (data and evidence, gender responsive planning, sector monitoring) and actions to accelerate progress on gender equality and inclusion in and through education will remain a core part of GPE’s engagement, including through country level inclusive dialogue. - Key actions at country level in enabling factor areas, and gender equality will continue to be identified, monitored, and supported through country dialogue and assessed through Secretariat quality assurance. - The Board would continue to receive a quality assurance assessment report from the Secretariat’s quality assurance

			<p>team (which is independent from the country teams).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Evidence on the usefulness of ITAP reviews at country level is mixed. Since making ITAP reviews optional there is not strong evidence of demand (4 countries opted in out of a possible 35. The non-availability of multiplier funds meant that some countries never got the chance to opt in or out).
Eligibility for top-up funding	<p>Top-ups would be applied to all countries eligible for GPE implementation grant resources over a threshold, regardless of grant type (currently limited to countries eligible for system transformation grants)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Applying top-ups to more countries reduces incentives to negotiate whether a top-up is applicable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This anticipates an increase in innovative financing across the country portfolio. - A threshold will be proposed for Board consideration once grant eligibility and replenishment scenarios are available in June 2025.
Caps on top-up funding	<p>For all eligible countries, allocation of top-up financing would be capped at 30 percent. For countries affected by conflict and fragility</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Prevents countries with lower capacity from shouldering an unfair proportion of results-based financing and helps spread the risk of non-disbursement more equally across the grant portfolio. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Applies to those with the lowest score on the Country Policy and Institutional Assessment (CPIA) public sector management and institutions cluster. - Exemptions for those countries operating under GPE's

	public sector and institutions CPIA scores, top-up allocation would be limited to 20 percent .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduces incentives to negotiate what proportion of the financing should be applied to top-ups. 	Operational Framework for Effective Support in Fragile and Conflict-Affected Contexts where GPE does not work with government, would be maintained.
Distribution of funding between priority areas for top-ups	<p>Ten percent of the country grant allocation would focus on improved reporting on SDG indicator 4.1.1a¹ to the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS).</p> <p>The current approach to context specific domestic finance triggers would be maintained.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Added incentive to report: Between 2010 and 2019, only 27 partner countries had comparable learning data points at two points in time, despite many conducting large-scale assessments, and receiving GPE and other partners' support. - Supports continuity of effort across funding periods, as to date about 85 percent of triggers approved are on domestic financing. 	<p>Reporting tailored to context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For example, countries not currently reporting would be required to report on the focus area at least once by 2030. - Those countries who have already reported once could be required to report again by 2030. - Countries already providing at least two comparable data points on indicator 4.1.1.a would be exempt. - Further methodological work would be needed to operationalize this proposal.
Requirement for a Partnership Compact	All countries eligible for GPE grants, regardless of grant type, would be required to develop a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Will create greater consistency across the country portfolio and allow for a more standardized approach to monitoring follow up actions. - Under GPE 2025, several Multiplier only countries opted to develop a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - FRC will be making this recommendation as part of the Financing and Funding Framework next steps.

¹ SDG indicator 4.1.1: Proportion of children and young people (a) in grades 2/3; (b) at the end of primary; and (c) at the end of lower secondary achieving at least a minimum proficiency level in (i) reading and (ii) mathematics, by sex.

	Partnership Compact (if not already done so).	<p>Partnership Compact recognizing the value-add of the compact in bringing partners behind a government led reform effort.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Under GPE 2025 all multiplier only countries conducted an enabling factors analysis. Improved guidance incorporated this into simplified guidance for Partnership Compacts. 	- Would build on experience under GPE 2025 of developing simpler Partnership Compacts which are not too broad in focus (finding from the thematic and country level evaluation).
--	--	---	--

Table 1: Documentation to support Board decision-making

Board Decision Documentation	
(i)	Total allocation from all eligible grant mechanisms (decision)
(ii)	Top-up triggers limited to learning outcomes data and domestic financing, up to 30% of the countries grant allocation (criteria for exemptions to be considered). (decision)
(iii)	Intended focus area for GPE funding (decision)
(iv)	Summary annex
Supporting annexes on the governance portal	
(v)	Secretariat quality assurance assessment
(vii)	A Memo on progress and next steps approved by government and local education group (most countries), or a partnership compact and local education group endorsement (for new partner countries, or where the country chooses a substantive revision).

Annex B: Mid-Term Review Pipeline.

INDICATIVE MID-TERM REVIEW DATES [2-3 YEARS AFTER COMPACT START]

Country	Indicative Date	Country	Indicative Date	Country	Indicative Date	Country	Indicative Date
El Salvador	May-2024	Timor-Leste	Nov-2025	Micronesia	Aug-2026	Togo	Mar-2027
Kyrgyz Rep.	Sep-2024	Senegal	Dec-2025	Samoa	Aug-2026	Malawi	Apr-2027
Tanzania	Nov-2024	Somalia Fed.	Dec-2025	Tonga	Aug-2026	Zambia	Apr-2027
Tajikistan	Oct-2024	Guinea	Dec-2025	Tuvalu	Aug-2026	Burundi	Apr-2027
Nepal	Nov-2024	Sierra Leone	Dec-2025	Vanuatu	Aug-2026	Mauritania	Apr-2027
Cabo Verde	Jan-2025	Gambia	Dec-2025	Comoros	Sep-2026	St. Lucia	Jun-2027
Uganda	Mar-2025	Eritrea	Dec-2025	Lesotho	Sep-2026	St. V. & Grenadines	Jun-2027
Kiribati	May-2025	Somaliland	Jan-2026	CAR	Oct-2026	Dominica	Jun-2027
Rwanda	May or Nov-2025	Chad	Jan-2026	Cameroon	Oct-2026	Grenada	Jun-2027
Guyana	May-2025	Liberia	Apr-2026	Mali	Oct-2026	Laos	Sep-2027
Kenya	By mid 2025	Solomon Islands	Apr-2026	Ghana	Nov-2026	Bangladesh	tbd
Zimbabwe	Jun-2025	Fiji	May-2026	Djibouti	Dec-2026	Guinea	tbd
Zanzibar	Jun-2025	Madagascar	May-2026	South Sudan	Early 2027	Bissau	tbd
DRC	Jul-2025	Cote d'Ivoire	Jun-2026	Balochistan	Jan-2027	PNG	tbd
Cambodia	Sep-2025	Mozambique	Jun-2026	Punjab	Jan-2027	Haiti	tbd
Sao Tome & Pr.	Sep-2025	Niger	Jul-2026	Sindh	Jan-2027	Syria	tbd
Indonesia	Nov-2025	Benin	Jul-2026	Yemen	Jan-2027	Myanmar	tbd
Bhutan	Nov-2025	Burkina Faso	Jul-2026	Rep. of Congo	Jan-2027	Afghanistan	tbd
Maldives	Nov-2025	Ethiopia	Jul-2026	Khyber Pakhtunk.	Mar-2027	Sudan	tbd
Nicaragua	Nov-2025	Marshall Islands	Aug-2026	Nigeria	Mar-2027		