



## GPE Secretariat Management Response (as of end-March 2022):

### Internal Review of the GPE Multiplier Grant

The GPE Secretariat welcomes the [Internal Review of the GPE Multiplier Grant](#) conducted by Gauri Khanduja and Priyanka Pandey (a team of independent evaluators within the Secretariat), and thanks them for the useful analysis and lessons it provides. The evaluation offers timely and important information on three key areas: (a) The Multiplier’s financial additionality (whether it mobilized more funding or mobilized funding more quickly); (b) The Multiplier’s policy additionality (its development impact on the projects supported by the funds mobilized; and (c) The Multiplier’s process (guidelines, requirements, and transaction costs).

The evaluation’s findings and recommendations were discussed during the meeting of the Finance and Risk Committee (FRC), held 25-26 October, 2021. During this meeting, the FRC approved the proposed improvement set out in Annex B of FRC/2021/10 DOC 05, including delegation of authority to the Secretariat to approve indicative Multiplier allocations based on valid expressions of interest.

The evaluation shares recommendations which will be used by the GPE Secretariat for improvements in four areas: (a) Reducing the time required to secure allocations and develop grant applications; (b) Improving transparency about threshold/expectations for showing financial additionality; (c) Helping countries with limited external support access the Multiplier; and (d) Ensuring that providing co-financing does not preempt transparency and robust policy discussion at country level. The GPE Secretariat Management Team considers the evaluation findings **formulated for the Secretariat** to be fair and agrees with the recommendations made. Specifically, the Secretariat will take/has started taking the actions outlined below in response to the recommendations.

Recommendations for GPE Secretariat	Actions	Status of actions as of end-March 2022	Comments
<b>1- Additionality Requirement</b>			
<i><b>Simplify.</b></i> Overall, the Secretariat should explore ways to simplify the minimum that countries need to show to meet the financial additionality requirement in a low transaction way.	Improve publicly available guidance through the	Completed	Set of ‘example’ expressions of interest have been selected and are available on the GPE website. Partners are directed to these examples in outreach material / discussions / etc.

Recommendations for GPE Secretariat	Actions	Status of actions as of end-March 2022	Comments
<i>[Related challenge: Complexity of the additionality requirement]</i>	inclusion of a library of anonymized examples to share with partners and local education groups.		
<b>Align to country context.</b> In contexts where the evidence regarding financial additionality is less clear, the Secretariat should explore ways to help countries meet the requirement, by taking the potential for policy additionality into account. This would make it less burdensome and therefore easier for countries to access the grant.	Not pursued.	N/A	Policy additionality – for example using a more aligned modality—is a desirable outcome. It is actively encouraged by GPE’s requirements and policy dialogue. It was not taken forward as a potential substitute for financial additionality. The Board’s mandate for the Multiplier instructs the Secretariat that these funds should only be committed / secured by mobilizing new and additional cofinancing.
<b>Clarify.</b> The Secretariat should provide concrete examples to grant agents and co-financers to clarify how financial additionality can be demonstrated in different scenarios.  <i>[Related challenge: Hard to secure co-financing]</i>	Accomodate contexts of smaller sources of financing / less harmonized modalities.	n/a	GPE proposed to adjust its guidance to reflect some flexibility for cases of multiple partners and less harmonized modalities, while continuing to express a strong preference for harmonization  However, the Finance and Risk Committee decided not to take up this recommendation (FRC/2021/10-02)
<b>2- Transaction Costs</b>			
The Secretariat should explore ways to reduce the current 75 days average from EOI submission to EOI approval. In addition, wherever possible, the Secretariat should continue encouraging combining Multiplier with other GPE	Delegate authority to the Secretariat to approve indicative allocations.	Completed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Board approved delegation of authority in December 2021 (BOD/2021/12-03)</li> <li>• Secretariat has implemented a process to vet, review, and potentially approve indicative allocations in two weeks or less</li> </ul>

Recommendations for GPE Secretariat	Actions	Status of actions as of end-March 2022	Comments
<p>grants such that internal quality assurance processes can be aligned to save transaction costs.</p> <p><i>[Related challenge: Long processing / transaction time to secure allocations]</i></p>	<p>Board maintains control and would review and approve grant applications using these allocations, including evidence of additionality (aim to reduce review time 15 days or less).</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Board retains full control and will still review the EOI and associated documentation in its review of the grant application</li> </ul>
<b>3- Country Dialogue</b>			
<p>The Secretariat should ensure the Local Education Group dialog is inclusive and equitable driven by country priorities. This is particularly important in cases where the grant agent and the co-financier are the same.</p> <p><i>[Related challenge: Cofinancing partners dominate policy dialogue]</i></p>	<p>Update guidance to explicitly confirm that the source of cofinancing and program focus reflect input from / consultation with Local Education Group, including: discussion on potential</p>	<p>In progress</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An external consultant has been contracted to review all GPE operational guidance and related material to harmonize language, terminology, and writing style. As part of Phase 1, the Secretariat conducted series of consultations on the varied guidelines for about three months. The next phase (phase 2) is the inception report which will propose how to harmonize the different documents that compose the guidelines. This inception report will be presented to (1) some Secretariat supervisors for feedback; and (2) the RIRO leadership team for approval. Once the inception report is approved, the Secretariat will work during Phase 3 with the different guideline writers to produce the actual documents.</li> </ul>

Recommendations for GPE Secretariat	Actions	Status of actions as of end-March 2022	Comments
	cofinancing; inputs to the cofinanced program.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This update to the guidance and Expression of Interest (EOI) documentation requested from countries will be included in that refresh.</li> <li>• The Secretariat already emphasizes the need for clear LEG engagement and ownership in all discussions with countries and cofinancing partners.</li> <li>• Under existing documentation, any EOI received is only valid if countersigned by the CA, GA, and all cofinancing partners (which participate in the LEG).</li> </ul>