

THE WORLD BANK

Global Partnership for Social Accountability

Program Evaluation

FINAL REPORT

Mark Robinson*

March 2015

*Mark Robinson is Global Director, Governance at the World Resources Institute in Washington D.C. and can be contacted at mrobinson@wri.org

Table of Contents

I.	INTRODUCTION, PURPOSE AND METHODOLOGY	7
II.	STRATEGY AND PROGRAM DESIGN	8
III.	IMPLEMENTATION	16
III.A	OVERALL PROGRAM.....	16
III.B	GRANT MAKING	17
III.C	KNOWLEDGE AND LEARNING	29
III.D	PARTNERSHIPS AND COMMUNICATIONS.....	35
III.E	CAPACITY BUILDING.....	38
III.F	MONITORING AND EVALUATION.....	40
IV.	RESOURCE MOBILIZATION	43
V.	RISKS AND SUSTAINABILITY	48
VI.	FUTURE DIRECTIONS	52
VII.	CONCLUSIONS	55

ANNEXES

ANNEX 1	TERMS OF REFERENCE	58
ANNEX 2	LIST OF PEOPLE INTERVIEWED.....	68
ANNEX 3	GPSA GRANTEE PROJECTS OVERVIEW.....	72
ANNEX 4	GPSA GRANTS AND WORLD BANK PROGRAMS.....	82
ANNEX 5	GPSA GRANTEE FUNDING	86
ANNEX 6	GPSA KNOWLEDGE & LEARNING PRODUCTS AND TOOLS.....	88
ANNEX 7	EFFICIENCY GAINS IN THE GPSA GRANT-MAKING PROCESS.....	96
ANNEX 8	GPSA BUDGET	97
ANNEX 9	SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS.....	98

GLOSSARY

BRICS	Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa
CSF	Civil Society Fund
CfPs	Call for Proposals
CDs	Country Directors
CMs	Country Managers
CMU	Country Management Unit
CSOs	Civil Society Organizations
DFGG	Demand for Good Governance
FM	Financial Management
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
ED	Executive Director
GAC	Governance and Anti-Corruption
GGP	Governance Global Practice
GRM	Grant Reporting and Monitoring
GPF	Governance Partnership Facility
GPSA	Global Partnership for Social Accountability
GPVP	Global Practice Vice President
GTF	Governance and Transparency Fund
IFC	International Finance Corporation
KP	Knowledge Platform
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MAVC	Making All Voices Count
MDTF	Multi Donor Trust Fund
MENA	Middle East and North Africa
MICs	Middle Income Countries
NGOs	Non-Governmental Organizations
OGP	Open Government Partnership
OSF	Open Society Foundations
PDF	Portable Document Format
PEA	Political Economy Analysis
RETF	Recipient Executed Trust Fund
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
SA	Social Accountability
SAI	Supreme Audit Institution
SC	Steering Committee
SURR	Social, Urban, Rural and Resilience
TAI	Transparency & Accountability Initiative
TTLs	Task Team Leaders
VP	Vice President
WBG	World Bank Group
WBI	World Bank Institute
WBISG	World Bank Institute Social (Accountability) and Governance

GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP FOR SOCIAL ACCOUNTABILITY

PROGRAM EVALUATION: FINAL REPORT

Mark Robinson

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. **Purpose.** The Board paper mandating the creation of the Global Partnership for Social Accountability (GPSA) stipulated a requirement for an independent evaluation at the end of the second year of operation. The program evaluation was designed as a formative exercise as the GPSA is still in a very early stage of implementation. It was conducted by a sole external consultant based on an evaluation framework agreed with the GPSA Secretariat. The main aims were to assess the initial phase of implementation and the prospects for successfully achieving project outputs and outcomes, and to generate findings and lessons for improving future design and performance. As it was not possible to assess impact, the evaluation was primarily designed as a qualitative assessment, drawing on a review of program documentation and 80 semi-structured interviews with Bank technical and senior management staff, Steering Committee members, academics and Global Partners. Five grantees were selected for more detailed examination to provide insights from a range of regions, sectors, and types of organization through a review of project documentation and interviews with grantees and relevant World Bank operational staff.

2. **Background.** The Global Partnership for Social Accountability (GPSA) was launched in June 2012 following the approval of a Board Paper that set out the parameters for program design and intended results. Implementation started in August 2012. The GPSA builds on previous Bank programs for supporting civil society organizations (CSOs) and a track record of analytical and operational work on social accountability over the past decade, guided by an ambitious vision of creating a 'Third Arm' of the World Bank Group (WBG) in support of civil society. The GPSA is managed by the Governance Global Practice (GGP) but in practice works across various sectors and Practices in the Bank. GPSA governance is anchored in a Steering Committee (SC) which has balanced representation between donors, government representatives, and CSOs. The Board Paper set out a compelling vision for the GPSA as a vehicle to 'reflect the voice of beneficiaries, promote greater transparency and accountability, and achieve stronger development results'. The GPSA design embodies many of these features and it is well positioned both to produce meaningful results and contribute to the broader evolution of the social accountability field through investments in funding and knowledge. The Board Paper envisaged that the GPSA 'would start small, learn from experience, and expand on the basis of lessons learned and

rigorous demonstration of positive impact'. Building on the results achieved over the first two years and addressing areas of potential improvement would enable the GPSA to pursue a strategy of going to scale and becoming a key component of the Bank's evolving agenda of placing social accountability and citizen engagement at the heart of its efforts to reduce absolute poverty and foster shared growth.

3. Program Design. The GPSA aims to improve development results by supporting capacity building for enhanced beneficiary feedback and participation. It has two main strands: providing funding for CSOs through grant support and building knowledge and wider learning. The GPSA is premised on partnerships at several levels: with grantee organizations and their implementing partners, like-minded governments, and a wider constituency of Global Partners that includes more than 215 CSOs, academic organizations, corporations, and donors. Capacity building has also emerged as a priority for the GPSA to address capacity constraints in the sector and to build knowledge and understanding of social accountability approaches in civil society. These constitute the main components of the program along with communications. Governments need to opt in to the GPSA for CSOs in those countries to become eligible for grants, but they cannot exercise veto power over grants. Initial concerns that this provision would limit the independence of the GPSA and civil society have proved unfounded with 43 governments opting-in to date from all six regions, with some of these countries contributing funding to the GPSA's MDTF. Additional large middle income countries have yet to opt in alongside Mexico, Brazil and Indonesia and the GPSA Secretariat and GGP have a role in encouraging other governments to join the effort. The design of the program is widely acknowledged to reflect the Bank's comparative advantage in supporting social accountability work by promoting constructive engagement with government. These design features distinguish the GPSA from other donor programs that support CSO social accountability work. The GPSA has already begun to demonstrate its wider value for the Bank's citizen engagement agenda as a potential source of evidence and tools for enhancing beneficiary feedback. Among those interviewed for the evaluation, there is an emerging consensus on the value added of the GPSA and the need for the World Bank to continue leading its implementation.

4. Program Results. The GPSA is currently at an early stage of implementation and it would be premature to expect evidence of outcomes and impact in grant making or in knowledge and learning. The majority of stakeholders are positive about the GPSA and the progress achieved to date. Some notable results have been achieved at the program level, including the number of opt-in countries, size of grant commitments, number of Global Partners, and roll-out of knowledge and capacity building activities. These results are considerable given that this is the first major Bank grant-making program to civil society in the complex area of social accountability. They provide a solid institutional platform anchored in the GPSA Secretariat for grant-making and knowledge management with the active engagement of Bank country teams.

5. **Grant Making.** An elaborate approach was devised to grant-making to ensure that CSOs would be able to tender proposals in response to calls for proposals tailored to country priorities determined through consultations with governments, CSOs, Global Partners and other donors. The grant size was set at \$500,000 - \$1 million range to provide funding at scale over several years and enable CSOs to achieve significant results. A total of 644 applications were submitted in response to two Calls for Proposals (CfPs) which resulted in 23 grants to CSOs collaborating with 56 local partners and 126 mentees through a vetting process conducted by the Secretariat and external experts with a short-list reviewed and endorsed by the SC. The successful grants focus on a number of sectors, notably education, health, water and sanitation, and social protection, many of which complement Bank operations. While the average grant is \$700,000, there is scope for reviewing the grant size and modalities for future CfPs to ensure that scarce funds are used most effectively and the spread of grant funds across types of organization and regions is optimized. While grant making was drawn out by the compliance requirements of the Bank in line with the standard conditions accompanying MDTFs, which all organizations found very demanding, the GPSA Secretariat was able to speed up disbursement in the second CfP round. Of the 23 grants confirmed to date, most have now reached the first disbursement stage but only two are now entering their second year of implementation. In practice all the grant-funded projects are at various stages of inception and have a 3-5 year time frame for implementation. It would therefore be unrealistic to expect to see impacts from the funding component at this point. The adoption of political economy approaches by grantees and Bank Country Management Units (CMUs) and engagement of state accountability institutions are the principal outputs in the GPSA results framework. Some initial results are beginning to emerge from grant making, reflected in evidence of constructive engagement between governments and CSOs, the adoption of innovative social accountability tools, pilot testing and capacity building. But the use of political economy analysis (PEA) and engagement of state accountability institutions is uneven across the 23 projects and this requires systematic attention by the Secretariat to ensure that these outputs are achievable and their continued salience at the heart of the results framework. All the TTLs and CMUs interviewed for the evaluation were enthusiastic about their engagement with the GPSA once some initial communications challenges about roles and responsibilities had been addressed.

6. **Knowledge and Learning.** The second component of the GPSA was the creation of a knowledge and learning component with an emphasis on measuring and documenting the impact of social accountability interventions, and on developing and nurturing broader practitioner networks. Activities and results include the creation of a Knowledge Platform (KP) for knowledge generation, exchange, and dissemination; developing new tools and evidence-based approaches; undertaking rigorous and in-depth research; and strengthening linkages between CSOs, governments, academics, and practitioners. Much has been achieved with significant uptake of GPSA knowledge products by a range of external stakeholders, but with more modest

engagement by grantees. More emphasis should be placed on encouraging grantees and their partners to access the KP and to improve the accessibility of GPSA knowledge products. Bank staff across the Global Practices should be encouraged to use and contribute to GPSA knowledge and learning. However, it is difficult to determine which themes and products are the most relevant to need based on available evidence. The development of indicators to measure the reach and significance of knowledge and learning activities therefore is a priority.

7. *Partnerships and Communications.* Building partnerships between governments and CSOs and a wider constituency of support from a network of 215 Global Partners has emerged as an additional GPSA Secretariat work stream to support grant making and knowledge and learning. While a discrete partnerships component was not envisaged in the Board Paper and original program design, the Global Partners initiative serves as an impressive result in its own right by creating an energizing, convening base that is supportive of the central objectives of the GPSA and the Bank's comparative advantage in promoting constructive engagement between CSOs and governments. The Global Partners network offers considerable scope to strengthen wider buy-in from civil society, the private sector, and aid agencies and to support GPSA resource mobilization, but this latent potential has not yet been fully harnessed. The GPSA produces a wide range of communications products anchored around the website, newsletters, presentations and country updates which enhance the visibility and branding of the GPSA's approach and activities with internal and external stakeholders. Developing metrics on the impact of GPSA communications work will require systematic investment to demonstrate the full value of this work and to demonstrate how this component facilitates engagement with internal Bank stakeholders and partners outside the Bank in pursuit of the wider objectives of the GPSA. There is an opportunity to link GPSA communications more closely into corporate Bank communications on the citizen engagement strategy and to demonstrate the value of GPSA operations and knowledge activities in supporting this agenda. This agenda also offers an opportunity to publicize the emerging results from GPSA projects which in turn can inform the design of beneficiary feedback mechanisms.

8. *Capacity Building.* Capacity building was identified as a priority from the outset with activities primarily focused on the needs of grantees along with CSOs, governments, and the private sector. The Board Paper identified the need to find ways of supporting CSOs which do not yet have strong expertise on social accountability by encouraging on-granting or support for capacity-building and mentoring arrangements on the part of intermediary organizations in receipt of grant support. A capacity development program is currently being implemented and rolled out by the GPSA building on initial training in social accountability and political economy approaches as a priority for grantees. There may be a need to widen capacity building efforts to include government counterparts and oversight institutions to support their own efforts in constructive engagement with CSOs, in conjunction with CMU priorities and linked to Bank operations.

9. *Monitoring and Evaluation.* The GPSA has put in place a comprehensive M&E system for the GPSA program as a whole, including the grants component. Secretariat staff maintain regular oversight of implementation and all aspects of delivery for the funding, capacity building, knowledge and learning, and partnerships components. The Board Paper and Results Framework provide the principal benchmarks for monitoring progress supervision and reporting through periodic meetings with grantees, field visits and reviewing grant documentation. Task Team Leaders (TTLs) are responsible for grant supervision. Most are familiar with grantee M&E arrangements and some TTLs have helped to strengthen these through technical advice. Progress reports have now been produced by all first round grantees. A challenge going forward will be to ensure that the results achieved by the grantees can be aggregated at the GPSA program level in order that the wider significance and cumulative impact of these investments is captured systematically to generate wider lessons and evidence. This will require close scrutiny of the first set of project reports and results frameworks to identify scope for improvements. An impact evaluation should be commissioned towards the end of the initial phase of the program, around 3-4 years after the current exercise, with the aim of capturing the results of GPSA program investments by gathering evidence on project outcomes and the overall impact achieved by different components of the program.

10. *Resource Mobilization.* The Bank has committed \$20 million over four years and solicited contributions from other donors with a view to building a fund of \$75-125 million through a multi-donor trust fund. Three private foundations have since committed \$7.5 million and the governments of Finland and the Dominican Republic have recently committed a further \$1.3 million. But further contributions have not been forthcoming from large bilateral or multilateral donors to date. This financing gap requires systematic efforts by senior management to support the efforts of the GPSA Secretariat to increase the resource base in order to realize the ambitions set out in the Board Paper. Forums such as the Open Government Partnership and the process for deliberating the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) should be harnessed to provide support for these efforts.

11. *Risks and Sustainability.* There are four risks that potentially undermine the sustainability of the GPSA and these require urgent attention and mitigation. Financial risk relates to the difficulty of mobilizing additional financial contributions from governments, donors, and the Bank itself. Failure to mitigate this risk through a series of actions aimed at mobilizing further funding could limit the ambition and potential results achieved by the GPSA and could result in a premature end to a promising venture. Institutional risk concerns a perceived lack of leadership commitment on the part of Bank senior management to the GPSA. There is a widely shared view among some Global Partners and staff that the Bank is not consistently investing high-level leadership commitment in publicly backing the GPSA and mobilizing resources from donors, even though senior management has continued to lend support to the GPSA during the internal

restructuring. The GPSA has been relatively successful in building its grants portfolio by working with GGP and other Global Practices, while management attention focused on more pressing internal reform priorities. Organizational restructuring has led to many changes in leadership and staffing. GPSA had strong ownership prior its move into the GGP with new leadership who were initially unfamiliar with the program and its evolution. Active championing of the GPSA is therefore required on the part of senior management to demonstrate the Bank's commitment to external stakeholders. Administrative risk relates to the weight of compliance requirements placed on grantees by the standard conditions associated with small grants to CSOs supported through an MDTF. Despite some improvements achieved by the Secretariat, existing requirements continue to undermine efficiency in grant processing. Options for reducing and simplifying Bank compliance requirements are urgently needed to maintain the momentum of grant making and to avoid further challenges in implementation while maintaining high standards of fiduciary oversight. Reputational risk stems from the potential for external stakeholders to withdraw from active engagement in the GPSA in response to concerns emanating from the other three risks. Changes in program design served to mitigate some of these concerns though expectations remain high and the legitimacy of the GPSA rests to a considerable extent on demonstrating continued commitment by the Bank to external stakeholders.

12. Future Directions. There are four organizational options for the GPSA going forward: Full Scale-Up; Partial Scale-Up; Scale-Down, and Spin-Off. Some of these options are associated with diminishing levels of funding and reductions in the scope to achieve significant results, generate wider lessons, and produce convincing evidence on the impact of social accountability initiatives. While a Full Scale-Up in line with the original goal of creating a fund of \$75-125 million remains the preferred option for the Secretariat and the Global Partners, this option may not be realistic in view of the difficulty of mobilizing complementary financing from donors and governments. A Partial Scale-Up is the recommended option with the GPSA remaining within the Bank, entailing the doubling of resources and an annual operating budget of \$10 million from donors and Part II countries, as a basis for fresh calls for proposals, the inclusion of new countries and themes, with the prospect of generating enhanced results, fresh learning and better evidence. The growth and sustainability of the GPSA and its ability to realize this ambition will depend on its ability to retain dedicated leadership and maintain a professional staff complement with the continued active support of an external network of Global Partners. This is a feasible option and one that can be achieved with modest additional funding and commitment from the Bank and its shareholders.

I. INTRODUCTION, PURPOSE AND METHODOLOGY

1. **Background.** The Global Partnership for Social Accountability (GPSA) was approved by the Board in June 2012 following an extensive series of consultations with stakeholders from civil society, government and academics in 60 countries.¹ The GPSA had its origins in earlier Bank work on demand-side governance and social accountability dating back over a decade and drew on the experience of earlier grant programs for civil society, notably the Civil Society Fund (CSF). A Multi-Donor Trust Fund (MDTF) was created as the instrument for harnessing financial support for the GPSA from non-Bank sources, centered on knowledge and learning and on grants to support social accountability operations through civil society organizations (CSOs). A proviso was made for governments to opt-in for eligibility for GPSA grants to CSOs in their countries. A Secretariat led by a Program Manager was formed to take forward the process of design and implementation inside the Bank. A Steering Committee comprising representatives from governments, donors and civil society was created to provide strategic direction, oversight and decisions on grant proposals. Two rounds of tailored calls for proposals in all countries that had opted in to the GPSA generated 644 proposals with 23 project grants awarded to CSOs in various sectors, together with a further grant for a Knowledge Platform, with the first disbursements taking place from the end of 2013.

2. **Purpose.** From the initial round of consultations that led to the creation of the GPSA, World Bank senior management recommended that at the beginning of a new initiative such as the GPSA, it was critical for the Program to start small, learn from experience, and make adjustments as necessary. Furthermore, the Board paper mandated the GPSA to “carry out an independent evaluation at the end of the second year of operation”², a commitment that was also highlighted in the Operations Manual and the Results Framework.

3. **Methodology.** The program evaluation was designed as a formative exercise as the GPSA is still in a very early stage of implementation. It was conducted by an external consultant as a time-bound exercise over the period October 2014 to January 2015 based on an evaluation framework agreed with the GPSA Secretariat (Annex 1). Its main aims were to assess the initial phase of implementation and the prospects for successfully achieving project outputs and outcomes, and to generate findings and lessons for improving future design and performance. The evaluation was primarily designed as a qualitative assessment, drawing on information and insights from several sources. This entailed a review of program documentation³ and semi-

¹ World Bank, Board Paper 67581, *Global Partnership for Social Accountability and Establishment of Multi-Donor Trust Fund*, Washington, D.C., June 2012.

² GPSA Board Paper, June 2013, Section 17, Implementation Review.

³ These included the Board paper, Operations Manual, Results Framework, Knowledge and Learning Strategy, Resource Mobilization Strategy, Application Guidelines, M&E documents, the GPSA Knowledge Platform and GPSA website, project documentation, financial data and progress reports.

structured interviews with Bank technical and senior management staff, and interviews with six Executive Directors and advisers in Washington, D.C. Individual interviews and a focus group discussion were held with selected Global Partners. As there was no provision for country visits, five grantees in the Dominican Republic, Ghana, Moldova, the Philippines and Tajikistan were purposively selected for more detailed examination to provide insights from a range of regions, sectors, and types of organization. These drew on a review of project documentation and semi-structured interviews with grantees and relevant World Bank Task Team Leaders (TTLs) and Country Management Units (CMUs). A further six TTLs were interviewed from six additional projects to cover half of the grants awarded to date. Findings reported from one source were triangulated with at least two other sources to ensure these were more widely applicable. Finally, interviews were conducted with Steering Committee members from governments, donors, and CSOs, and with academics associated with the GPSA. Over 80 interviews were held over the course of the evaluation (Annex 2). The interim findings and report were presented to GPSA Secretariat in December and the feedback from staff and senior management was incorporated into the final version of this report.

II. STRATEGY AND PROGRAM DESIGN

4. **Policy Context.** The impetus for the GPSA also derived from the personal commitment of the former World Bank President Robert Zoellick who conceived the instrument as the ‘third arm of the Word Bank’ performing a support function for civil society that was analogous to the IFC’s role with the private sector.⁴ The GPSA Board paper was developed by a technical working group drawn from across the Bank with the active support and engagement of nine Vice Presidents. Social accountability in the Bank had its origins in several interconnected streams of work, centered on the growing recognition that successful governance reforms require the complementary efforts of public sector institutions and civil society organizations. The Social Development Department and the World Bank Institute (WBI) played a key role in developing this agenda with the development of resources and building of internal expertise on social accountability work. The Governance Partnership Facility (GPF) provided an opportunity for the Bank to further experiment with social accountability approaches as an integral element of the ‘demand for good governance’ (DFGG) agenda and sector programs that grew out of the Governance and Anti-Corruption (GAC) Strategy.⁵ This stream of work continues under the Governance Global Practice (GGP) where it underpins a growing focus on trust and institutions

⁴ <http://www.imf.org/external/np/tr/2011/tr092211b.htm>

⁵ The Demand for Good Governance Community of Practice Group (DFGG) was founded as a network across the Bank with academics and civil society to share knowledge, innovation and best practice on demand-side governance.

and is treated as central to the agenda of building citizen trust in government. Social accountability became increasingly embedded in the sectors and reflects the strategic priorities of several regions.⁶ The GPSA offers a very strong fit with the priorities of the GGP and with Bank priorities on social accountability more generally, as well as with the twin goals of reducing absolute poverty and fostering shared growth. Accountability is one of the four pillars of the GGP and it is firmly embedded as a feature of governance work across the Bank as a means of connecting 'demand' and 'supply' side governance reform agendas. It is also important to acknowledge that during the last two and a half years of implementation the conditions that created the need for the GPSA (i.e. the perceived value of constructive engagement with governments and a facility to engage with CSOs directly) have not changed substantially, so the GPSA continues to be a valuable initiative. The new emphasis on citizen engagement in the Bank has furthered strengthened the original rationale and the GPSA offers a potential source of insights and lesson learning for enhancing beneficiary feedback in World Bank projects.

5. **Reform Context.** Since the inception of the GPSA in June 2012 the Bank has been going through a significant internal restructuring process, which included an Expenditure Review and a Strategic Staffing Analysis. Over this period the Bank has moved from four sectors to 14 Global Practices and five Cross-Cutting Solutions Areas. The Expenditure Review was undertaken to identify inefficiencies and cut \$400 million from the Bank's operating budget. The overarching goal of the change process is to break down divisions between the Bank's regional groupings and to promote stronger cross-working between global practices. In addition, new VP units were created coupled with a new internal governance system between sectors and regions.⁷ The new strategic direction of the Bank recognizes the need for partnerships with non-traditional actors. The GPSA was originally incubated in the WBI with the expectation of its move to the Social Development Network. With the initiation of the internal reform process, GPSA was initially preserved within WBI, while other grant making facilities were terminated as part of Bank-wide cost-saving measures. With the creation of the Global Practices in July 2014 the GPSA moved to the newly created Governance Global Practice, as new roles and responsibilities were being filled and developed. The decision to preserve the GPSA was a visible signal of senior management support in a stringent budgetary environment and internal restructuring. Furthermore, senior management stood by the original budgetary commitment of \$20 million. This support for GPSA has endured over the reform period and served as a good basis for mobilizing additional

⁶ In MENA, for example, social accountability is central to its strategic priority of Strengthening Governance. Senior management believes that the social accountability work supported by GPSA provides an important adjunct to the lending portfolio in the MENA region.

⁷ <http://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2014/05/22/kim-lagarde-talk-change-keeping-institutions-relevant>

resources. Consequently the social accountability field continued to evolve in the Bank with increased demand for this type of global facility across the organization.⁸

6. **Comparative Advantage.** The design of the GPSA is widely considered by staff, grantees, governments, and Global Partners to reflect the Bank's comparative advantage in supporting social accountability work. There is strong support for grounding the underlying approach of the GPSA in the sectors rather than as an isolated governance initiative as this builds a wider constituency in the Bank and promotes dialogue and collaboration among specialists across the Global Practices in pursuit of the Bank's two over-arching objectives of reducing absolute poverty and fostering shared prosperity. The Board paper set out a number of areas of comparative advantage in the Bank sponsoring the GPSA and administering the MDTF. These include harnessing the Bank's convening power and leverage to create more space for constructive engagement between government and civil society; contributing to the achievement of development results by strengthening 'demand-side' capacity to complement 'supply-side' interventions; using its analytic, knowledge and advisory capacity to improve the effectiveness of CSOs as providers of development services; drawing on donor coordination and partnership to strengthen and harmonize the funding contributions and impact of development partners in promoting social accountability; and provide fiduciary and administrative capacity to build a common platform and reporting requirements to satisfy donors and stakeholders.⁹ There is strong consensus among stakeholders that the GPSA design reflects this comparative advantage, especially an approach grounded in the sectors; complementing grant support with investment in knowledge and learning; building strategic alliances with civil society partners, governments and the private sector; and a hands-on approach to capacity building. There is no comparable global facility on social accountability where the World Bank can play a critical role in engaging governments to respond constructively to citizen feedback. Despite overwhelming support for the GPSA from those interviewed for the evaluation, some continued concern was expressed by two Executive Directors (EDs) over the need to ensure government buy-in for the selected grants and whether the Bank has comparative advantage in funding CSOs for social accountability work.¹⁰

7. **Constructive Engagement.** Constructive engagement lies at the heart of the GPSA approach to social accountability. Engaging governments as partners in social accountability to jointly solve development problems rather than representing narrow elite interests or acting as a potential source of opposition is recognized to be a distinctive approach that is in marked

⁸ A Social Accountability Flagship Report setting out the Bank's strategic priorities on social accountability is scheduled for publication in May 2015.

⁹ Board Paper, pp. 10-11.

¹⁰ Six EDs and Advisers were interviewed in the course of evaluation, intentionally selected to provide a range of views and who were mostly very supportive of the GPSA.

contrast with more adversarial social accountability approaches promoted by CSOs through voice and collective action. It is also distinct from the conventional principal-agent approach to the public sector that treats government actors as primarily driven by bureaucratic self-interest. Constructive engagement is grounded in the assumption that champions of reform in government will have common interests with advocates of reform in civil society in the pursuit of improved public sector performance and better service delivery. External stakeholders believe this approach speaks to the Bank's comparative advantage in leveraging its engagement and legitimacy with governments. While not a requirement of the original design, the fact that a significant proportion of the grants align closely with large-scale government programs supported by World Bank loans strengthens the rationale for this approach as a way of promoting government engagement and to support governments response based on citizens' feedback. As a consequence, the GPSA is perceived as less threatening to more skeptical government actors who may not be amenable to closer engagement with civil society. There is broad recognition that capacity building for government and civil society is integral to deepening support for constructive engagement and that grant making will only reach a relatively small number of organizations.

8. **Program Design.** The design of the program evolved through several stages over two years through widespread discussion inside the Bank and a series of country consultations with government partners and civil society. There are two overarching design features: the creation of a grant-making instrument to provide significant financial support to civil society organizations in support of strategic social accountability work, and strengthening knowledge and evidence about the wider significance of social accountability approaches for improving development outcomes. As set out in the Board paper, investing in knowledge, learning and capacity building is considered to be a means of potentially widening impact beyond grants, and building wider partnerships grounded in the creation of the Global Partners came to form an integral element in the GPSA program design. The Steering Committee (SC) was established with equal representation from governments, civil society and aid donors as an integral element in the GPSA governance structure and builds on the principles of partnership and constructive engagement, with its main role to advise on strategy and operations, and to make selections on a short-list of grants for final approval by the relevant Director in the Bank. The GPSA Secretariat is responsible for managing the program, currently comprising 3 as permanent Bank employees and 6 on contract, several of whom are recent hires, and all paid through the Bank budget.

9. **Government Opt-In.** The original version of the Board paper proposed an approach in which governments would not formally be part of the grant approval process or able to veto proposals to preserve the independence of a grant making mechanism to support civil society. These initial proposals met with resistance from some Board members who wanted to retain some degree of government oversight on grant approvals. This resulted in two modifications in

the GPSA design: member governments have to opt in to the GPSA for CSOs to be eligible for grants through this mechanism; and governments are consulted but cannot veto grant proposals endorsed by the Steering Committee and approved by Country Directors.¹¹ Initial concerns that these provisions would limit the independence of GPSA and civil society have proved unfounded and have served to build the confidence of Board members in the value of Bank support for civil society social accountability work. Since the GPSA was approved by the Board in June 2012, 43 d have signed up to the GPSA from all regions (one-third of eligible countries), contrary to expectations on the part of many Bank staff and donor partners that the opt-in provision would limit interest and engagement from Part II countries. This is an important achievement in its own right as it demonstrates strong government buy-in to the GPSA and the wider relevance of the program beyond civil society grantees.

10. There has been no reported attempt by governments to veto any proposed GPSA grant. Rather, governments have often proved to be very supportive in their endorsement when signing up to the GPSA which in turn has strengthened the legitimacy of the program.¹² Some Bank Country Directors (CDs) and Country Managers (CMs) have been active in encouraging Part II governments to opt into the GPSA as they perceive the instrument to play a vital role in the range of social accountability mechanisms available to the Bank in the countries under their remit. Formal opt-in provides political cover to reform champions engaged in social accountability work, both elected ministers and officials in relevant line departments. It also provides official sanction for Bank and civil society efforts to work with state oversight institutions as an integral element in GPSA project design. While government support has been forthcoming for the GPSA there are several ongoing risks. A total of 43 governments signed up by the end of 2014, exceeding original expectations and representing a significant increase over 2013 when only 14 governments had opted-in, compared to just 8 in 2012. Governments that have opted-in include both low and middle income countries, and leading BRICS such as Mexico, Indonesia and Brazil, respectively the current and former co-chairs of the Open Government Partnership (OGP). India and South Africa (one of the co-chairs of the OGP), have yet to opt in. While CSOs in countries that have not opted in to date cannot apply for grant funding, opportunities for wider learning from their experience are being factored into GPSA knowledge and learning activities. Such governments are also well placed to serve in a leadership role in the GPSA, provide a source of inspiration and potentially a source of financial support in the future.

¹¹ Pre-selected proposals are sent to government focal points who are given a 10-day period to send comments, which is then followed by a 5-day public consultation period. Final decisions are made by Country Directors taking all comments into account.

¹² For example, in the covering letter confirming his government's opt-in to the GPSA, the Prime Minister of the Republic of Moldova stated that the government "welcomes the new mechanism to support civil society organizations and contribute to constructive engagement with our citizens" (November 28, 2012).

Recommendation 1: The Secretariat and the Governance Global Practice should actively promote the value of GPSA membership among Executive Directors and client countries, drawing on support from existing opt-in countries, senior management and Country Directors/Managers.

11. Stakeholder Perspectives. The signing-up of more than 215 Global Partners drawn from leading civil society organizations, foundations, multilaterals, academic institutions, and the private sector behind the GPSA strategy provides strong validation for the concept of constructive engagement and the Bank's overall approach, constituting an important achievement in its own right. Global Partners and grantee organizations are generally very supportive of the Bank's engagement in the GPSA. They believe it opens up an important source of funding and that it can usefully expose the Bank to innovative social accountability approaches. They also perceive there to be wider complementarity with efforts to provide oversight on Bank compliance on safeguards. But there are residual concerns among some CSOs who believe the Bank is neither well-placed to provide grant support by virtue of its primary role as a lending institution to governments, nor able to support constructive engagement in a manner that preserves the autonomy and independence of CSO grantees. There are also doubts on the part of some GPs and other stakeholders that the Bank is capable of reaching grassroots organizations through the GPSA which is seen to favor large international nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), although GPSA grantees have 56 local partners and 126 mentees, where the majority of grantees are national CSOs. Implementation arrangements are broadly seen as positive and consistent with the Bank's approach to civil society engagement for social accountability. The grant making process finds consistent support across the majority of stakeholders interviewed for this evaluation. The national Calls for Proposals were launched after an extensive process of consultation with governments, donors, and civil society in member countries and are tailored to country context and sector priorities. The GPSA Secretariat is seen as playing a professional and constructive role in screening and ranking proposals for consideration by the SC based on advice and review by independent technical experts who are familiar with the country and sector. The SC is considered to play an impartial and yet effective role in prioritizing grants for funding, based on careful preparation and detailed assessment. The SC members are drawn from governments, donors and civil society who are supportive of the GPSA approach and invest serious time and effort in scrutinizing and evaluating proposals that have been short-listed by the GPSA Secretariat.

12. Social Accountability Funding. CSOs do not consider the GPSA to be the only mechanism to support social accountability through civil society at scale. The Global Partners consulted for this evaluation highlight their own priorities for social accountability which are often not premised on constructive engagement but also draw on adversarial approaches grounded in mobilizing citizen voice. For some of the affiliates of international NGO grantees the grants awarded by the GPSA do not represent a significant share of global resources for social

accountability work. They draw on financial resources from other sources, including both private contributions and donor funding schemes for civil society. Global Partners highlight the existence of other complementary sources of donor funding for civil society social accountability programs, some of which are much larger in scale and scope than the GPSA.¹³ But the focus of these programs is primarily on mobilizing citizen voice and supporting the use of new technology for demand-driven social accountability, while the GPSA focuses on constructive engagement, which is seen by CSOs as a complementary tool that adds value to the existing array of funding mechanisms for promoting social accountability, and is perceived as unique by virtue of this focus and being housed in and managed by the Bank.

13. Internal Stakeholders. The social accountability agenda in the Bank was led by the Social Development Department, Public Sector, Human Development, and Infrastructure groups, and the World Bank Institute over the past decade and it is now located in the Governance Global Practice and the Social, Urban, Rural and Resilience Group (SURR). The GPSA was first incubated within the World Bank Institute under the Collaborative Governance Department and was able to draw on expertise developed through operations in areas such as access to information, budget participation, and procurement monitoring to inform grant making and priorities for knowledge and learning. Over this period, the social accountability group produced a large number of resources for use by a Bank-wide Community of Practice despite limited staff and resources. These include How to Notes on Social Accountability and a forthcoming Flagship Report on Social Accountability. There is good engagement between staff in the GPSA Secretariat and the Community of Practice with scope for further synergy to ensure that the Knowledge Platform makes best use of existing Bank-wide knowledge and research on social accountability. The GPSA also has strong buy-in from Bank staff interviewed in most regions. This is especially marked in MENA where the GPSA complements one strand of the regional strategy on accountability. The main qualification on the outcome of the grant allocation process comes from regions and countries where CSOs have not been successful in applying for GPSA financial support, notably Francophone West Africa. Bank staff in Benin and Togo report that strong government and civil society commitment to the GPSA has been undermined by the failure of local CSOs to secure any grants for social accountability work.

14. Citizen Engagement. There is strong potential synergy between GPSA program objectives and the Bank's corporate agenda on Citizen Engagement and beneficiary feedback. Citizen Engagement is now a high-level corporate priority across the organization, driven by a Presidential commitment to building in 100% beneficiary feedback to all Bank projects, embodied

¹³ For example, the \$200m DFID-funded Governance and Transparency Fund (GTF) provided 38 grants averaging \$5m each to CSO consortia for a large number and range of demand-side governance projects and this has since closed. Making All Voices Count (MAVC), jointly funded by USAID, DFID, SIDA and Omidyar Network provides \$50m for citizen feedback initiatives using new technology solutions with much smaller grants.

in the development of the Bank's *Strategic Framework for Mainstreaming Citizen Engagement* policy document announced in May 2014. This initiative is supported institutionally by two Practice Managers working across the Social, Urban, Rural and Resilience (SURR) and Governance and is located in a wider Community of Practice on citizen engagement that draws on expertise across the Bank. While the emphasis is on participation and feedback within Bank projects, there is potentially significant complementarity with the social accountability agenda through the GPSA which is primarily externally oriented and focused on CSOs. The GPSA has the potential to serve as a powerful instrument in support of the citizen engagement strategy by: (a) fostering coalitions between government, civil society, and the private sector around specific development challenges; (b) building the knowledge base and evidence-based learning around this agenda; (c) contributing to the capacity building of CSOs that engage in Bank operations; and (d) putting together a broad-based platform of external partners that engage with the Bank on these issues. Moreover, the lessons arising from the GPSA grants in the form of development results and innovative approaches to social accountability could provide fruitful insights for beneficiary feedback. The knowledge and learning activities of the GPSA offer an important resource to inform citizen engagement strategies. Hence, there is a need to maximize mutual learning potential and to mitigate the risk of potential confusion between the two agendas, both internally with staff and among external stakeholders, including the experts represented in the External Advisory Council to advise on the Citizen Engagement initiative.

<p><u>Recommendation 2:</u> The secretariat established under the two Global Practice Vice Presidents (GPVPs) should provide periodic coordination between the Citizen Engagement initiative and GPSA, as a basis for joined-up knowledge management, communications and lesson learning. GPSA staff should actively engage in the Technical Support Group for Citizen Engagement and Community of Practice.</p>
--

15. **The “Third Arm” of the WBG.** The GPSA had its origins in extensive consultations with Bank shareholders, civil society, and staff in 2011 and 2012. The President and senior managers highlighted the potential of creating what they called the “third arm” of the World Bank Group (WBG), grounded in knowledge and funding to support civil society through the GPSA. This was intended to create an institutional vehicle supported initially by the GPSA to complement government lending support through IBRD and IDA, and the private sector through the International Finance Corporation (IFC) and MIGA. The ambition set out in the Board paper was for an MDTF with total funding of \$75-125 million over a period of 5-7 years to meet the considerable interest and potential demand exhibited through the consultation process. In practice, this ambitious vision remains far from being realized as the budget remains modest with the Bank budget of \$20 million complemented by contributions from three private foundations (\$8.5 million) and two recent commitments from Finland (approximately \$1.3 million) and the

Dominican Republic (\$25,000).¹⁴ The fact that one Part II country has committed resources to the GPSA shows an unexpected level of ownership and support that is welcome. But the foundations for a more ambitious Bank vehicle to support civil society are being developed through the GPSA and the current state of implementation is consistent with the thrust of the consultations that fed into the Board paper, to “start small and allow learning-by-doing to get the design right”.¹⁵ Many stakeholders interviewed for the evaluation believe the GPSA has the potential to fulfil the original ambition provided there is continued senior management engagement and committed financial resources to facilitate a significant scaling-up beyond the first two years of implementation.

III. IMPLEMENTATION

III.A OVERALL PROGRAM

16. The GPSA is currently at a very early stage of implementation and it would be premature to expect to see evidence of outcomes and impact at this point in grant making or in knowledge and learning. But some notable results have been achieved at the program level as shown in Box 1 below.

Box 1. GPSA program-level results (March 2015)

- 43 countries have opted-in to the GPSA
- 215 Global Partners have signed-up from over 70 countries
- \$8.8m raised in additional finance from private foundations and governments
- Production of Operations Manual and Results Framework
- 2 calls for grant proposals with 644 applications from all regions
- 23 grants approved to date with 57 local partners and 126 mentees
- \$28.8m in contributions, \$16 committed, \$8.3m disbursed (out of a 3-5 year project funding period)
- Creation and launch of a Knowledge Platform with 960 users
- Creation of GPSA website, Global Partners Forum, 16 brown bag lunches, seminars, and regular newsletters
- Initiation of research and capacity building programs

¹⁴ Further Bank contributions are likely to be forthcoming from two internal sources: the Global Water Practice is considering a contribution of \$1-2 million from a Trust Fund, while the Energy and Extractives Global Practice is also considering a similar contribution from another Trust Fund if this proves administratively feasible. The Ford Foundation announced a further \$1 million in 2015 in addition to its original \$3 million commitment.

¹⁵ Board Paper, 2012, p. 12.

These results are considerable given that this is the first major Bank grant-making program to civil society in the complex area of social accountability. They provide a solid institutional platform anchored in the GPSA Secretariat for grant-making and knowledge management with the active engagement of Bank country teams. They also provide a firm foundation for future calls for proposals and grant-making subject to additional financial resources. The GPSA has given social accountability work in the Bank a stronger institutional anchoring and visibility across regions and across sectors and the program has continued to operate successfully in the transition from WBI to the Governance Global Practice. The results achieved by the GPSA to date appear promising when considered alongside similar programs at a comparable stage of implementation.¹⁶

III.B GRANT MAKING

17. **Calls for Proposals.** An important feature of the GPSA grant-making process is that while it is coordinated by the Secretariat, the design of Calls for Proposals (CfPs) and implementation and supervision is carried out by the Country Management Units (CMUs) and the Global Practices. Grants are treated as part of Bank operations linked to sector and country portfolios rather than as stand-alone activities. There have been two rounds of tailored calls for proposals to date covering the countries that have opted in to GPSA under the grant component, reflecting national priorities determined through a process of Bank-led consultation in each country. These calls produced a very large number of proposals which translated into a relatively small number of grants: 216 proposals in 12 countries the first round in 2013 and 428 in the 33 countries that had opted in by the second round.¹⁷ Of the 644 applications approximately one-third were ineligible as they did not meet the minimum requirements. The majority of applications were from CSOs in sub-Saharan Africa. The key criteria for selection were a strategic approach, a sound operational plan and institutional capacity. While 23 grants were awarded in the first two rounds (Annex 4), a total of 56 civil society organizations across all regions are engaged as partners in the successful projects and a further 126 grassroots organizations are engaged in implementation as mentees but do not receive direct financial support from the GPSA. The response was positive in that it demonstrated considerable interest in the GPSA from within civil society, but less than 1 in 20 applicants received funding. This left many organizations disappointed and a residual pool of proposals that were considered by the Secretariat to be potentially fundable, but this requires further analysis to identify the extent of unmet demand. However in reality not all opt-

¹⁶ For example, the findings of the 2011 OECD evaluation of the PRODEV program supported by the Inter-American Development Bank to promote results-based management in the Latin American and Caribbean region, suggest that the GPSA has achieved significant results at a similar stage of implementation. Also see Burge, R, 'Learning from DFID's Governance and Transparency Fund (GTF): Tools, Methods and Approaches', June 2010. https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/66829/GTF-learning-paper-1.pdf

¹⁷ The number of proposals submitted in some countries was very high, such as Bangladesh with over 100 proposals in total for both Calls.

in countries and organizations are well-placed to respond even if the themes are tailored to country priorities. There is a strong perception from some Country Managers that the requirement that applications could only be submitted in English disadvantaged CSOs in the Francophone West Africa, though it should be noted that national NGOs were successful in countries like DRC, Morocco, Paraguay and Tunisia.¹⁸ Some respondents believe that the process favored affiliates of international NGOs as one third of the successful proposals were submitted by national affiliates of such organizations. But in practice most of the grants are to national organizations in close partnership with local CSOs that in turn receive a proportion of grant funds under agreements or through contracts (Annex 5).¹⁹ While the review and approval system employed by the Secretariat and Steering Committee with specialist technical input is considered to be effective, the reality is that a large number of potentially good applications remained unfunded, though unsuccessful applicants are able to access opportunities for capacity building and knowledge and learning through the GPSA.

18. **Grantee Motivations.** The grantees that were successful in their applications to the GPSA were motivated by several factors. The availability of financial resources dedicated to supporting strategic social accountability work at scale through civil society was the primary incentive. Second, the program presented an opportunity to influence both the World Bank and member governments and to shape the design and implementation of large-scale sector programs, often supported by Bank loan finance. Third, the grantees see value in being part of a global network of like-minded organizations, bringing with it the opportunity to learn lessons from elsewhere. In this respect, the knowledge and learning resources available through the Knowledge Platform, among other things, are perceived to be a useful resource for grantees and their partners (see Section III.C below).

19. **Portfolio Mix.** The current geographical and sector mix of projects in the GPSA grant portfolio raises a question about the best approach to adopt for future calls. The Board Paper offers flexibility in this regard and does not limit future CfPs to a singular approach. At least four options exist in this regard, all of which have strengths and limitations, as set out in Table 1 below. This is not comprehensive as there may also be scope for tailoring CfPs to strategic priorities

¹⁸ The guidance and calls for proposals were issued in French, Spanish and Arabic with the requirement that applications had to be in English. TTLs in some countries reported that applicant CSOs hired specialist consultants to help develop the applications. The cost of translating hundreds of applications into English would be prohibitive. With the support of the GPSA Secretariat, each CMU held orientation sessions in the local language that provided guidance on the application and process, organized by the CMU and promoted through ICT and local newspapers.

¹⁹ 15 of the 23 grants to date were for national (non-affiliate) NGOs, with 61% of the funds going to local partners. While GPSA is providing direct funding to 23 CSOs, more than 150 organizations receive funding through on-granting and partnership arrangements and for many the transfers are substantial. For example, in the case of the Philippines, 24% of funds are transferred to two local CSOs (\$194,000 out of \$800,000).

shaped by particular contexts (such as fragile states), combined global and country-specific CfPs, or calls involving the private sector alongside civil society.

Table 1. Options for Future Calls for Proposals

Option	Advantages	Disadvantages
Select next 10-20 best proposals from existing calls	Minimizes additional administrative work	Prevents fresh applications from other CSOs and could serve as a disincentive to new or potential opt-in countries
Adopt a sector focus in future calls for proposals	Ensures sector depth and coverage, enhances incentives for Bank Global Practices	Excludes strong proposals and CSOs in other sectors, not tailored to country context, reduces incentives for government reformers in excluded sectors
Focus calls for proposals on countries or regions where no grant approved to date	Widens pool of GPSA countries	Excludes countries with strong CSOs and a pipeline of strong proposals, and regional applications have been few and relatively weak
No calls for proposals; proactively identify strategic grant making opportunities	Minimizes administration costs and focuses on strong CSOs	Risk of selection bias due to lack of competition and perception that it is too driven by Bank priorities

20. Analysis of the sector mix of existing grants reveals that the majority are in health or education with a balanced geographical spread across all six regions (Annex 4). This provides a good basis for generating cumulative results within the two sectors with strong potential for cross-learning in the Health and the Education Global Practices. Some projects combine several sectors as part of wider efforts to improve budget transparency and local government accountability. There are three water and sanitation projects and two projects focused on conditional cash transfers. Either of these sectors would offer a potential route for more specialized calls for proposals as both address the needs of the poorest and most vulnerable groups who are the focus of public sector service delivery efforts in these areas. They also address two important development priorities in two further Bank Global Practices by respectively focusing on community infrastructure and livelihoods. There is merit in giving consideration to strategic priorities and opportunities that fall outside the current set of sectors as the basis for future grant making while retaining competitive calls for proposals to mitigate the risk of bias or favoritism. The current approach of Bank country offices shaping the design and prioritization of proposal calls in consultation with governments, partners, donors, and CSOs should be retained and potentially further deepened. There will be a continued need to strike a balance between the specificity of prioritized themes and a measure of flexibility to avoid either focusing on issues where other sources of funding are available or where the theme is beyond their core expertise and experience.

Recommendation 3: Future Calls for Proposals should retain the principle of competition but could explore the option of focusing on specific sectors where the GPSA has not achieved a critical mass of investment, such as water and sanitation or social protection, and regions where existing coverage is low but the potential for impact is significant.

21. **Grant Size.** A further consideration raised by one of the foundations and several external stakeholders is whether the existing grant size is too large. A \$500,000-\$1m range with an implementation period of 3-5 years was proposed in the Board paper on the basis of several assumptions: a smaller number of large grants would be easier for the Bank to administer; capable CSOs can manage and benefit from grants of this size; and large grants can have greater impact on government programs. It was also set at this range in order to provide CSOs with larger grants with assured funding in pursuit of larger strategic goals.²⁰ A lower limit of \$400,000 was offered in the second CfP but few organizations applied for grants at the lower threshold. In practice the average grant size for successful applicants was slightly over \$750,000 with no shortage of applications of this size and scale. Criticisms of this approach from a number of organizations are that it excludes smaller CSOs working at the grassroots and that it raises fiduciary risk levels. They argue that smaller grants could further extend the reach of the GPSA and potentially result in a larger number of grants, but the Bank does not have comparative advantage or the administrative capacity for managing a large number of smaller grants. Furthermore, a number of grants in the portfolio already transfer a share of the budget to other CSOs subject to the Bank's fiduciary oversight requirements, with the result that more than 150 local CSOs are benefiting from GPSA funding (Annex 5). Staff in the GPSA Secretariat note that the funding window of the GPSA is not designed to support CSO operations as its primary purpose, but to resolve governance problems in service delivery programs managed by public agencies which in turns justifies a higher level of investment. Smaller grants in the region of \$250,000 would also result in relatively small allocations of \$50-80,000 per year depending on the time frame, which could underscore the strategic imperatives driving the program. A further reservation is that the compliance requirements for grants of this size would be proportionately greater and place a greater burden on organizations with more limited administrative capacity, so any reduction in the grant size would need to be accompanied by a lighter processing framework.

²⁰ It was also recognized in the Board paper that the earlier Civil Society Fund had some limitations in this regard, as grants could only be made for one year at a time they were spread across a large number of countries and sectors, and often lacked a clear linkage to Bank operations.

Recommendation 4: Consideration should be given to the pros and cons of lowering the minimum size of grants to enable the GPSA to include more grants and organizations that are able to manage smaller grants and to bring in a larger number of CSOs into the GPSA. A clearer indication that grant amounts are indicative and that the SC would consider smaller grants could be incorporated in CfPs. This should form the basis for consultation with the Steering Committee and with the Global Partners working group on grant making in time to inform the next Call for Proposals.

22. **Compliance Requirements.** The compliance requirements of the GPSA receive mixed views from civil society and Bank staff. These include standard Bank conditions on legal status, financial management, procurement arrangements, and safeguards. Most grantees and Global Partners believe the current information requirements are far too onerous, especially for smaller and less experienced organizations working at the grassroots and those who do not work in English as their first language. Some CSOs consider the requirements to be appropriate for grants of this size and recognize some of the potential benefits in terms of improving fiduciary oversight and administrative rigor. On balance, the application requirements through the CfP set out in the Operations Manual are consistent with those used in other donor funding schemes for civil society. The problem comes in further down the line once grants are approved and recipient CSOs need to meet the detailed compliance requirements that are required as part of Bank standard policies and operational procedures which apply both to regular loans and grants. The efficiency of the application and selection process in terms of time and resources is reduced by the considerable amount of effort required by the Secretariat to prepare ‘project packages’ for review and approval by Country Directors. Although the experience varies across regions, there have been substantial delays in grant processing as a result. Options for addressing this problem are addressed in Section V below.

23. **Project Inception.** Of the 23 grants confirmed to date, most have now reached the first disbursement stage. Two are entering their second year of implementation, in both cases several months after the grant agreement was signed. In practice all the grants are at various stages of inception. In addition, GPSA funding supports projects with 3 to 5 years for implementation. It would therefore be unrealistic to expect to see results of the grants component at this early stage beyond some progress on the initial set of outputs related to planning and inception. The inception stage invariably accounts for the first six months of project implementation and the 13 six-month progress reports produced to date focus on inception activity. This typically includes the outputs that feature in grantee results frameworks summarized in Box 2.

Box 2. GPSA project inception outputs

- Design of M&E systems, results frameworks, baseline surveys and information gathering tools
- Investing in communications infrastructure, building web sites, information campaigns and media engagement
- Conducting research and analysis
- Capacity building of CSOs, citizen groups and volunteers
- Design and production of social accountability tools (e.g. surveys, report cards, and budget analysis)
- Pilot testing programmatic approaches
- Sensitization meetings and agreements with government counterparts and state accountability institutions

24. **Political Economy Approach.** The adoption of political economy approaches grounded in context analysis by grantees and CMUs are key outputs in the GPSA Results Framework. Political economy factors play a major role in shaping government engagement in social accountability and their willingness to pursue challenging reform agendas. The wider political context is critical for reform implementation as there is no guarantee that a change of government following elections would remain open to constructive engagement with civil society. These perspectives were intended to inform grantee approaches to social accountability work and multi-stakeholder coalitions and shape grant operations. Application forms and guidance include specific provision for PEA and this is taken into consideration in individual proposals during the review process. Training in political economy analysis (PEA) has received early attention in GPSA learning products. Several grantees were among the CSOs that signed up for e-course in PEA. In practice, however, few grantees have produced formal PEA to situate their projects in the wider context and identify potential impediments to successful implementation. Several grantees have informally undertaken context analysis and incorporated the findings in project documentation but this does not always take the form of a published report that is widely available to stakeholders in the country, though there would be evident sensitivities in going down this route.²¹ Some of the best project proposals and results frameworks produced by grantees reflect the adoption of a political economy approach to inform project design and engagement with government partners but this is not undertaken systematically by all grantees and it does not feature centrally in implementation as revealed in progress reports produced to date. While the production of formal PEA is not a requirement of the GPSA, more systematic attention to using political economy approaches to understanding the political context and the incentives shaping

²¹ One important exception is the baseline study produced by Oxfam Tajikistan on the water and sanitation sector. This provides a detailed examination of institutional and regulatory factors in the sector along with an analysis of social accountability, transparency and participation with a focus on marginalized social groups (see Box 3).

the willingness of government partners to engage constructively would strengthen the likelihood of realizing this output.

Recommendation 5: The GPSA Secretariat should continue to highlight to grantees the value of PEA and context analysis to project implementation at the project inception stage; monitor progress through grantee results frameworks and TTLs; emphasize PEA in capacity building and Knowledge Platform products; and encourage TTLs to draw on PEA in project formulation and design.

25. The second output in the GPSA Results Framework is the application of political economy approaches by Task Team Leaders (TTLs) and Country Management Units (CMUs). This translates into the role played by Bank staff in identifying key government actors and brokering relationships with them and drawing on Bank global knowledge to inform the strategies and actions of civil society organizations. None of the CMUs interviewed for the evaluation had commissioned political economy work to inform their understanding of social accountability and constructive engagement in the relevant sectors with the recent exception of the Dominican Republic which supported the publication of an Institutional Governance Review in October 2014 and other PEA analysis in previous years. Most CMUs were unaware that this was an expectation in the GPSA Results Framework or that grantees were expected to undertake such work. Despite the lack of availability of formal PEA most TTLs are keenly aware of the importance of political economy factors and the internal dynamics of government partners and political interests in their respective sectors. There is clearly scope to strengthen cross-fertilization between the political economy perspectives generated from GPSA operations and the diagnostics that inform Country Partnership Strategies, and to maximize the use and dissemination of political economy analysis produced by CMUs.

Recommendation 6: The Secretariat should review the GPSA Results Framework to determine whether the expectations on the outputs concerning the application of political economy analysis by TTLs and CMUs is fundamental to constructive engagement or should be reduced in significance as program results.

26. **CMU engagement.** The GPSA is strongly endorsed by the Bank CMUs interviewed for the evaluation. All the CMUs interviewed see the GPSA as complementing projects supported by World Bank loans and other activities associated with country dialogue,²² helping to promote government accountability commitments, and building consensus between government and civil society. The existence of current Bank operations in the sector also helps the governments respond to civil society voice as support for capacity development is already in place. Views ranged from enthusiastic endorsement to cautious support. CMU engagement involves several elements: encouraging the government to opt-in, supporting the consultation process with civil

²² Alignment with World Bank loans or portfolio activity is not a Board requirement for grants to CSO social accountability projects. In practice, however, most of the grants complement World Bank lending in particular countries and sectors, and analytical work or policy dialogue in others (see Annex 4).

society, identifying the themes for the CfP, issuing the Call, supporting outreach and communications for the Call, screening applications and due diligence. The strongest endorsement comes from CMUs that were involved throughout the process, through Country Directors encouraging initial opt-in by the government, engaging in civil society consultations, framing the call for proposals with governments and CSOs, and shaping the final project document. They exhibit a strong sense of local ownership and see the grants as an integral element in the Bank's portfolio in the country program.²³ CMUs in the Dominican Republic, Moldova and Tunisia/Morocco offer examples of such engagement. Some CMUs initially gave more cautious support. In part this was due to changes in country management and new TTLs being appointed as project leads for supervision later in the process. But it was also due to some uncertainty over the respective roles of CMUs and the GPSA Secretariat in finalizing the project package. In some cases, CMUs were content for the Secretariat to lead on grant compliance requirements. In other cases, notably the Philippines, the CMU felt unsighted on the grant approval process and they had to invest considerable work to produce a final grant document that would meet the standard required for approval by the Country Director and not be at odds with existing loans or potentially undermine relationships with the government. There was also some uncertainty in one or two CMUs over responsibility for ensuring that financial management and procurement procedures were complete in the final project document as a basis for the sector authorizing the release of the first disbursement.

27. These initial problems have been largely resolved and there is evident support for the GPSA grant mechanism and the projects are believed to add value to Bank country operations by the majority of CMUs interviewed for the evaluation. In the early phase of implementation, communications with the grantee and CMU came from several Secretariat staff and this was a source of potential confusion, although the roles of individual Secretariat staff were broadly understood and appreciated. In two cases the approved grant was perceived to be slightly at odds with some of the priorities set out in the Country Partnership Strategy (CPS) when new sector TTLs were appointed but was broadly welcomed once initial problems were addressed and resolved. Internal coordination is being further strengthened through a primary focal point in the GPSA Secretariat for all grantees. Within the Bank, all parties are now routinely copied into GPSA correspondence and this makes for effective communications.

28. **Role of TTLs.** The TTLs appointed to supervise the individual grants come from a range of sectors and Global Practices. All the TTLs interviewed for the evaluation were enthusiastic about their engagement with the GPSA. During project preparation the GPSA Secretariat serves as the TTL and this responsibility is transferred to the CMU with the signing of the grant agreement. Most of the TTLs were designated by the CMU in consultation with regional sector team to

²³ For example, the new World Bank Country Partnership Strategy in Paraguay makes explicit reference both to the GPSA project and to the OGP.

undertake this responsibility while some actively volunteered their services. For some grants the initial TTLs were governance specialists working with the GPSA Secretariat and this role was then later transferred to sector specialists in the relevant Global Practice. This has the advantage of locating responsibility for supervision within the sector and of linking the GPSA operation with existing sector operations. In many cases, TTLs overseeing sector loans and analytical work are also supervising GPSA projects. TTLs are supported by technical advice from the GPSA capacity building team.²⁴ Advisory support from the GPSA is available for all projects and this appears to be working well. Some TTLs share the responsibility for supervision involving collaboration between specialists in the governance and sector practices. In practice the TTL supervision role is quite demanding for a relatively small investment but there is evidence of strong and continuous engagement by TTLs in countries where the grants are in place, anchored by effective communications from the Secretariat.

29. **Government Engagement.** One of the most important early outputs from all the grantees interviewed for this evaluation has been the building of foundations for constructive engagement with governments at national, provincial and local levels. This engagement also takes place directly with sector ministries and public service providers. In some cases this builds on prior engagement and evidence of results achieved through this process. This is best illustrated by the impressive savings generated from using social accountability to improve medical procurement in the Dominican Republic summarized in Box 3 which in turn provided a strong foundation for the GPSA project that followed and confirmed the willingness of the government to engage.

²⁴ The GPSA Secretariat has appointed a team of advisors as part of its Capacity Building theme. Advisors are social accountability experts in the country and region of the GPSA project, and provide implementation support to both TTLs and grantee CSOs on technical aspects, particularly the design of social accountability mechanisms and political economy issues.

Box 3. Lessons from Social accountability and Health Procurement, Oxfam Intermón, Dominican Republic

The Government of the Dominican Republic has made significant strides in embedding principles of social accountability into service delivery and demonstrating the results that can flow from active partnerships with civil society. It was the first country to opt in to the GPSA. Openness to reform and constructive engagement with civil society emanated from top level commitment in the Ministry of Economy, Planning and Development and relevant social sector line ministries. Most notably, procurement reforms in the health sector resulting from greater public oversight yielded savings of \$25 million to the health budget in one year, highlighting the very significant results that can be achieved from social accountability work when government and civil society are committed to joint goals. Moreover, the Ministry of Education pioneered social accountability reforms in schools by geo-referencing classroom construction contracts to enable citizens to pick and choose which ones to monitor in their communities. The Presidency and the Ministry of Economy are committed to improved coordination and supporting agreements between CSOs and sector line ministries to develop social monitoring tools for improving information and feedback on service quality through the creation of civil society oversight commissions to monitor public contracts in education, health, agriculture, public works and in other agencies. The government is planning to open an Observatory for Public Procurement working with the Public Procurement Office to institutionalize social monitoring approaches through civil society. It has requested the Bank to support integration of social accountability approaches into M&E, improve open government and reduce discretionary spending. An Institutional Governance Review designed to inform the Bank's new country partnership strategy contains a political economy analysis of the current development model. The report was released by the Bank in October 2014 and widely disseminated in the country. All these are features of the openness of the government to constructive engagement with civil society and to addressing the political challenges that inhibit successful reforms.

This earlier experience has strengthened the foundations of a GPSA project managed by Oxfam Intermón in collaboration with five national civil society organizations. The project seeks to build a fairer, more participative and quality fiscal policy as a basis for building good governance. The project aims to provide citizens with access to information on budget resources, enable CSOs to contribute to policy and program development, and enhance collaboration between government and civil society in pursuit of improved performance and quality of public spending. Priority sectors include public education, housing, water and sanitation, and small-scale agriculture. Oxfam has successfully engaged with government counterparts in the Ministry of Education to build on earlier work on community monitoring of schools contracts. Building on prior engagement with Oxfam, representatives from the Ministry of Economy, Planning and Development helped to arrange meetings with officials from the area of budgeting and planning of the central government responsible for policy in the areas of housing, environment, agriculture and education to initiate the project.

Source: Oxfam Intermón Grant Application and Progress Report, World Bank documents

30. The opt-in to the GPSA by government lends strong legitimacy to the process of constructive engagement. In some cases this entails sensitization of government officials to social accountability issues and in others discussion of concrete opportunities for collaboration

with sympathetic counterparts. In some cases government authorities and civil society have signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) to formalize working level agreements on social accountability work and third party monitoring of government programs. This central aspect of the program appears to be working well in all the grants reviewed for the evaluation.²⁵ Box 4 presents a summary of the progress made in Moldova in the education sector to date to illustrate early results from this approach. World Bank TTLs have invariably played a positive role in helping to broker relationships with government counterparts, especially where there is ongoing Bank lending in the sector, in the process allaying potential sources of distrust and highlighting the positive benefits that can result from collaboration. This also operates at a higher level within the CMU through dialogue with senior policy makers and ministerial counterparts on the part of Country Directors and Country Managers where they are strongly committed to social accountability and citizen engagement.

Box 4. Constructive engagement in the Education Sector, Expert Grup, Moldova

The strategic goal of the Expert Grup project is to empower Moldovan citizens to engage local, regional and national authorities in evidence-based policy and budget dialogue regarding in the education sector. The focus is on educational reform, quality of services, and development priorities of primary and secondary schools and to create an enabling environment for social accountability initiatives. The aim is to empower citizens to apply and use social accountability tools – public hearings, community cards, independent budget analyses – in the education sector. The project will put in place data quality assurance processes to support policy dialogue at national level. The project is designed to be implemented over a 5-year period to encompass 100 of the 1397 schools at the primary and secondary levels. The results of applying social accountability tools will help to map out the situation of individual schools and feed into reforms promoted by the Ministry of Education.

Specific activities focus on improving budget transparency by providing up-to-date budgetary and economic analysis and strengthening oversight through better information of the citizens regarding budgetary policies and use of public resources. Expert Grup have built a dedicated website (<http://www.budgetstories.md/bugetul-scolii-2014/>) to foster better access and understanding of the use of the education budget for all schools in the country through simple infographics and data visualization. In partnership with the Ministry of Education the Expert Grup organized an event for over 50 directors of schools from one region in April 2014 where they presented the analysis and the infographic as a model to be applied to all 20 schools in the first year of project implementation.

Sources: Expert Grup Grant Application and Progress Report

31. **Oversight Institutions.** Independent oversight institutions such as ombudsmen and supreme audit institutions (SAIs) responsible for ensuring government accountability in service delivery are expected to be users of information generated by civil society. SAIs perform an

²⁵ It was not possible to arrange meetings with government representatives other than for the Dominican Republic due to the logistical constraints of the desk study so this conclusion primarily derives from secondary interviews with grantees and Bank staff.

important role in providing oversight on the process of public expenditure management and providing an objective assessment of the performance of public sector policies and programs. Since the majority of the GPSA projects have this as part of their focus the potential contribution of SAIs to improved budget implementation and service delivery outcomes is critical. State accountability institutions can benefit from the provision of information and feedback from social accountability tools deployed by CSOs which include report cards, participatory budgeting and public hearings which in turn can be used to hold government officials to account and apply sanctions. But while there are some excellent examples from applied budget work in the Dominican Republic and the water and sanitation project in Tajikistan, in practice this is not happening consistently across GPSA projects, in part due to grantee reticence based on past experience or simply lack of understanding of the purpose and significance of these institutions.²⁶ Representatives of these bodies periodically attend and contribute to bilateral meetings between government and civil society but not always in a regular or systematic fashion. This is an important consideration in the success of the Program as Outcome 2 in the Results Framework is predicated on ‘Collaboration between social accountability initiatives and state accountability institutions in overseeing service delivery by the executive branch.’

Recommendation 7: State accountability institutions should be closely involved in project inception and implementation as integral actors in constructive engagement between civil society and government in all GPSA projects. TTLs and the GPSA advisors will need to monitor this closely and offer constructive advice and share good practice from grantee projects where this works well and from global knowledge sources in the Bank.

32. Intermediate Results. Several grantees have generated some intermediate results in the course of early implementation but most have not yet reached this stage. A promising example from the water and sanitation sector in Tajikistan is presented in Box 5 below.

²⁶ The role of state accountability institutions did not emerge consistently in interviews with grantees and staff or in grantee progress reports. This observation would need to be tested more systematically across the full range of grantees to confirm its validity and as a basis for exploring further work in this area.

Box 5. Improving social accountability in municipal drinking water supply in Muminabad, Oxfam Tajikistan

The water service provider in Muminabad municipality in Tajikistan has used improved dialogue with consumers to increase citizen feedback, improve service reliability and increase the percentage of consumers paying their bills. An advisory board to the service provider was set up under an initiative of the Consumers' Union of Tajikistan in July 2014 as part of the GPSA grant. The Advisory Board comprises the director and bookkeeper of the water service provider, a representative of local NGOs, and 7 mahalla (neighborhood) leaders. Four out of eleven permanent members of the Advisory Board, including the chair, are women who actively take part in the regular meetings and decision making processes. Since women and girls are the main consumers of drinking water in rural households they are more concerned with and disproportionately affected by problems related to water.

Through a series of seminars mahalla committee and sub-committee members were informed about the capacity of the service provider, the network assets and basic structure, consumer numbers, schedules, complaints procedures, the basis for the tariffs and power supply issues being faced. Brochures were provided for their reference to help them spread the information. The number of complaints registered with the water service provider increased as more of the major issues were reported. This helped the water service provider to identify and fix the problems, improving the service, including the re-establishment of supply to a branch line that had been without water for some time due to a blockage. The increased transparency and improved service resulted in consumers' increased trust in the service provider, as evidenced by a progressive increase in the water user fee collection rate from 70% to 85% from July to September 2014. The water service provider, with support from the Advisory Board, has also introduced proper valve chambers connection points for new service lines to facilitate faster maintenance and meter installation. Leaking public tap stands have been repaired and consumers have been encouraged to take better care of them, following sensitization on the cost of providing water.

Source: Adapted from TWISA Baseline Study and Progress Report April–September 2014, Oxfam Tajikistan

III.C KNOWLEDGE AND LEARNING

33. **Knowledge and Learning.** Knowledge generation and learning is one of the two main focus areas for the GPSA as set out in the Board Paper. The objective was to create a global platform for knowledge and research with a particular emphasis on measuring and documenting the impact of social accountability interventions and on developing and nurturing broader practitioner networks.²⁷ The following priorities were proposed for the knowledge component: the creation of a knowledge platform for knowledge generation, exchange, and dissemination; developing new tools and evidence-based approaches; undertaking rigorous and in-depth research; and strengthening linkages between CSOs, governments, academics and practitioners. The GPSA was charged with commissioning analysis and generating evidence on the sustainability and impact of social accountability work and how beneficiary engagement can improve development outcomes. An important element of the proposed knowledge platform was to

²⁷ GPSA Board Paper, 2014, p. 13.

promote collaboration, learning and adaptation by sharing results and lessons from GPSA grant recipients. Key indicators in the Results Framework for capturing progress against this output includes the number of publications, capturing comparative lessons, and the quality of the comparative analyses about the implementation of the GPSA model of social accountability in these publications. Further indicators include the perceptions of grantees, TTLs, and CMUs for participating countries of the usefulness of GPSA knowledge products and activities to inform their decision making and actions.

34. **Strategic Priorities.** A Knowledge and Learning Strategy was produced in early 2014 to guide GPSA priorities under this component.²⁸ It identified a range of priority stakeholders and audiences including: GPSA grantees, development CSOs, governments, World Bank staff, academic institutions, donors, media and accountability institutions. The primary clients are GPSA grantees and their government partners with a broader group of Global Partners and donor agencies as secondary users. The substantive priorities set out in this strategy are as follows: the wider political context of transparency and accountability reforms; constructive engagement between citizens and the state; and collaboration between social accountability initiatives and state horizontal accountability mechanisms. The initial set of learning priorities were based on grantee knowledge and learning plans and feedback from Global Partners. These aimed to deepen understanding of social accountability and constructive engagement, social accountability tools, and country-based accountability systems. A range of knowledge products were identified and launched, which included: the creation of a Knowledge Platform (KP) featuring e-courses, e-forums and webinars; peer-to-peer learning; a 'brown-bag' lunch seminar series; a published working paper series; and a Dissemination Notes series (see Annex 6 for a comprehensive listing). A GPSA Global Partners Forum was held at the Bank headquarters in May 2014 to bring together all the grantees, government partners, Bank staff and a range of external stakeholders from Global Partners and academia to promote networking and sharing of experience. Learning activities remain the principal focus for the initial phase, through online courses, forums and webinars, and brown bag lunches with experts in the social accountability field. GPSA Secretariat staff are responsible for organizing and delivering learning events and organizing training opportunities. While the KP is intended for use by grantees and Global Partners it also has a wider purpose in providing a documenting the impact and significance of social accountability interventions and supporting practitioner networks. There are currently 960 signed-up members from wider civil society and academia who are encouraged to share materials on the site. The KP is managed by Fundar, a leading civil society organization working on social accountability that is based in Mexico City. Fundar was awarded the \$150,000 grant to manage the KP at arms-length from the Bank through a competitive process with the proposals

²⁸ GPSA, *Knowledge and Learning for Social Accountability Strategy*, February 2014.

reviewed and approved by the GPSA Steering Committee.²⁹ The KP focuses on four areas: a knowledge repository; learning; networking; and knowledge exchange. The KP was designed over a four month period and launched in April 2014 following a consultation with GPSA staff and potential users.

35. **Grantee Uptake.** Some grantees are very active users of the KP and GPSA learning activities. They download KP materials on a regular basis, attend webinars, and have signed up to the e-learning course. They encourage their staff and project partners to access and use these resources. But in practice only a minority of grantees interviewed for the evaluation had accessed the resources available on the site to date despite a regular flow of communications from Fundar and the GPSA Secretariat, including regular bi-monthly newsletters that carry updates on resources and events. In part the low level of usage by grantees is due to the fact that most grants are still at the early inception stage. Most grantees that have accessed the KP report that they find the existing suite of products useful to inform organizational learning. Access to online materials and the experience of other organizations is especially appreciated. But some grantees report an excessive supply of material available on the KP and would welcome a road-map to help them navigate resources that are most suitable to meet their needs.

<p>Recommendation 8: The GPSA Secretariat and TTLs should actively promote the Knowledge Platform as a learning resource among grantees to maximize uptake and dissemination of innovation and lesson learning. Simple navigation tools should be introduced to maximize usage of the resources available through the KP.</p>
--

36. Some grantees and Global Partners state that some of the materials on the KP appear to be influenced by World Bank priorities with a perceived bias towards academic products which renders them less user-friendly to civil society practitioners. A number of those interviewed report constraints on access, including poor internet connections, electricity blackouts, and the timing of webinars and training events in the US. These constraints are especially significant for grantees and CSOs in more remote locations. There is interest on the part of some CSOs in receiving hard copies of learning materials to reach grassroots organizations that do not have internet access. This may be desirable in principle but it would be a very costly exercise and grantees and Global Partners have access to PDF documents which they can copy and distribute in hard copy form to their networks. Language is a further constraint reported by some Francophone users and Spanish-speaking grantees which impedes access and usability.

²⁹ Fundar, *Proposal for the Knowledge Platform of the Global Partnership for Social Accountability*, July 2013.

Recommendation 9: Improve the accessibility and usage of the Knowledge Platform through selective translation of key knowledge products into Spanish, Arabic and French. Offer selected webinars in Spanish or French, by selecting either bilingual experts to deliver sessions twice a day, or specialists from the relevant region, timed to maximize access. Additional resources will be required for this purpose and should be pursued through a small matching grant from a donor or private foundation.

37. **Wider Uptake.** An indication of the demand for the knowledge and learning activities offered by the GPSA is evident from the 250 organizations that applied for the e-learning course on social accountability, from which 159 places were allocated. In practice only 133 started the course and further places were opened up to applicants, though engagement tailed off with only 25 participants completing all the three modules and assignments. Of the 15 grantees that registered for the course 5 completed all the modules. This is not unusual for modular online training courses though participation rates merit closer attention to ensure value for money. The average attendance for the 16 brown bag lunch (BBL) seminars conducted to date is 40-60 participants with a total of 800 participants while others access the podcasts and download these online. There is considerable interest among grantees and Global Partners in webinars and brown bag lunches and there is value in running another e-learning course on social accountability to realize latent demand. While an ongoing user survey will help to identify and prioritize future knowledge and learning activities, there should be greater emphasis on mobilising and disseminating evidence and lessons from ongoing grantee projects. In practice, the KP attracts a wider range of users in civil society with 960 participants joined, many from CSOs who form a natural constituency for wider dissemination. The private sector would welcome tailored learning events. There is also interest among CSOs in engaging with the private sector through roundtables and learning materials produced for this constituency. Bank staff interviewed for the evaluation are familiar with the KP and a small number also report using the KP on a regular basis, but in practice most are too busy to access the site and read the available materials. Several TTLs report that they promote the use of the Platform with grantees. They also report interest in learning from each other and in sharing social accountability approaches across sectors and Global Practices. Linkages to existing Bank learning resources on governance and social accountability are uneven and could be strengthened to minimize the risk of duplication and information overload. Similarly, there may be opportunities to access training courses and resources produced by the Global Practices as part of their mandate for knowledge generation and uptake.

38. The emerging Community of Practice on Citizen Engagement potentially offers an important opportunity for enhancing staff awareness and the use of GPSA knowledge and learning resources. In addition, the GPSA Secretariat was able to organize knowledge seminars in a number of Part I and Part II countries and has successfully established a partnership with other initiatives in this field like Make All Voices Count (MAVC) and the Transparency and

Accountability Initiative (T/AI). The Bank is beginning to influence the wider donor community through its knowledge and learning activities and the generation of research evidence on the impact of social accountability initiatives. The constructive engagement approach promoted by the Bank is gaining adherents from donors and CSOs previously skeptical of the Bank's role in funding social accountability work through civil society.

Recommendation 10: The Secretariat should reach out more intensively to Bank staff to register to use the KP through relevant Global Practices in order to promote understanding of social accountability issues within the World Bank, especially among TTLs and practice specialists in governance, social development and the social sectors, and the Community of Practice on Citizen Engagement. Secretariat staff should draw more systematically on Bank technical expertise in cross-regional and cross-sector learning events to deepen interest and commitment.

39. **Impact.** The central aim of the GPSA knowledge and learning component is to promote opportunities for learning and dissemination. However, it is difficult to determine which themes and products are the most relevant to need based on available evidence. This highlights the potential value of the KP needs survey being conducted by Fundar but also of drawing on the advice of the Knowledge and Learning working group of Global Partners in relation to the wider range of GPSA knowledge products and activities. There is considerable interest from among grantees in learning from good practice and social accountability approaches that have worked elsewhere. Grantee progress reports and results frameworks suggest that many GPSA projects have the potential to generate robust evidence and insights to inform wider learning. Several grantees have posted summaries of their projects on the KP but as yet little systematic information is available from grantees on innovation, tools and results as most of the projects are still in the early stages of implementation and operational research projects are still under design.³⁰ These activities and products would increase the attractiveness of knowledge and learning activities to those organizations signed up to the KP and serve to distinguish the KP from other knowledge platforms concerned with accountability and transparency issues as well as minimizing the scope for overlap and duplication.³¹ The GPSA Results Framework sets out a series of broad indicators for capturing the impact and significance of knowledge and learning activities but these have yet to be applied in a systematic manner for monitoring and evaluation purposes.

Recommendation 11: The GPSA Secretariat should devise a clear set of indicators for measuring the reach and significance of knowledge and learning activities in order to document the results from this GPSA component more systematically.

³⁰ A forthcoming GPSA Working Paper on the evidence generated on procurement reform from Oxfam Intermon in the Dominican Republic will be an important contribution.

³¹ These include the Transparency and Accountability Initiative (TAI) and Making All Voice Count (MAVC).

40. **Research.** Research commissioned by the GPSA potentially has a vital role to play in building the evidence base on what works in social accountability by generating more systematic evidence from longitudinal studies and impact evaluation. This evidence is not only important for demonstrating the contribution of social accountability to improved development outcomes but also for strengthening the case for enhanced funding for the GPSA. GPSA research has two elements: secondary research published on substantive themes and grantee learning priorities, and primary research in the form of longitudinal research and impact evaluation conducted with individual grantees. The first GPSA Working Paper by Jonathan Fox that reviews existing research evidence on social accountability has been widely used and cited outside the Bank as shown by a recent user survey.³² The results show that the respondents valued the Paper's review and reframing of evidence and the focus on strategic social accountability. Some respondents have drawn on it to inform organizational policies and practices in a wide variety of ways. This provides a good foundation for prioritizing future commissioned studies which include a detailed assessment of the impact of social accountability initiatives in the Dominican Republic. Collaborative research projects are currently being scoped out by the Governance Lab at MIT with a contract from the GPSA focused on designing research that is grantee-driven with potential impact evaluation work where feasible using mixed methods approaches. As noted in the Terms of Reference for this work, GPSA-funded projects offer a unique opportunity for applied research of the implementation of social accountability interventions: tools, conditions for success, and impact measurement. The proposed research is intended to be useful to the GPSA's grantees by helping them evaluate their impact and/or theories of change, while generating generalizable knowledge that is useful to a broader community of practice on social accountability. Three grantees are currently engaged with MIT in this process: Care Malawi, CARE Bangladesh, and Concerned Citizens of Abra for Good Government in the Philippines. But the operational research being scoped out with these three grantees currently has low visibility as the initial stages will only be completed by June 2015; at present it is only familiar to the GPSA Secretariat and grantees in those countries where it is taking place or planned. Once the research plans are solidified they should be shared more widely through the Knowledge Platform and with Global Partners to communicate the potential value and wider significance of this work. In addition, the GPSA is increasingly coordinating efforts with other initiatives in this field such as MAVC and T/AI on a common research agenda for the sector which is to be welcomed.³³ Finally, the Secretariat produced a research paper on capacity needs for CSOs working in this field based on a comprehensive capacity needs assessment conducted on over 600 proposals to the GPSA.

41. **Future Priorities.** An ongoing stakeholder survey led by Fundar is designed to produce more consistent feedback on the KP and knowledge and learning activities. This will enable the

³² Jonathan Fox, 'Social Accountability: What Does the Evidence Really Say?', *GPSA Working Paper No. 1*, 2014.

³³ A joint research workshop was held in Washington, D.C. in January 2015 to begin scoping common priorities.

KP and GPSA Secretariat to identify potential gaps and determine which knowledge products require more concerted investment. GPSA staff envisage the Knowledge Platform, complemented with offline activities, to become an important tool for supporting the learning, networking and knowledge exchange of the GPSA's grantees and of other CSOs working on social accountability more widely. In practice while this is worthwhile objective it may be premature as the KP has only been operational for nine months. But the plan to create a small number of thematic learning groups around common issues of interest is likely to appeal to users with specific sector interests around the social accountability agenda, for example women and children or water, health and education, drawing directly from grantee and wider civil society experience. This would be an effective way of structuring learning priorities for the planned GPSA Global Partners Forum in May 2015.

III.D PARTNERSHIPS AND COMMUNICATIONS

42. **Partnerships.** The GPSA is premised on the principle of partnerships between civil society and governments with the aim of cultivating a distinct field of practice in social accountability work that extends beyond grant funding as envisaged in the 'Global Partnership'. The GPSA Board Paper program set out the following principles to guide the overall approach: involve a wide group of stakeholders; a coordinated approach to funding; programmatic coordination; efficient operation of the MDTF and Secretariat; and support from governments, CSOs and other stakeholders for country activities.³⁴ These partnership principles initially found expression in a number of institutional mechanisms in the form of the Steering Committee, GPSA Secretariat and the roster of technical experts, and subsequently through the creation of the Global Partners and the Global Forum. The MDTF was envisaged as a partnership vehicle for mobilizing and coordinating financial contributions from bilateral donors, NGOs and foundations. These elements of the GPSA have been reviewed under previous sections of the report on design and implementation, while Section IV on Resource Mobilization below considers the progress on financial contributions and wider donor partnerships. In practice, the most significant and innovative elements in forging partnerships have taken two forms in the GPSA to date: the creation of a vibrant network of Global Partners and project level grantee partnerships.

43. **Global Partners.** The creation of the Global Partners component stemmed from the early recognition that many stakeholders had a keen interest in seeing the Bank adopt social accountability approaches and that constructive engagement with government was potentially an area of comparative advantage for the Bank that could potentially strengthen this agenda. For this reason, the GPSA Secretariat took an early decision to forge a more active base outside the Bank in support of the central objectives of the GPSA. Partners join the GPSA committing in

³⁴ GPSA Board Paper, 2012, p. 16.

principle to support the program and to explore concrete opportunities for engagement. The ‘Global Partner’ status is an informal affiliation that does not imply a contractual obligation between Partners and the Bank. The GPSA Secretariat engages with partners at multiple levels to activate and lend support to this commitment. The 215 CSOs signed up to date come from a range of sectors and networks, universities and think tanks, bilateral and multilateral organizations, and corporates have now signed up as a Global Partners for a number of reasons: lending support to the GPSA; the scope for engaging in Bank oversight; the potential to access funding; and as a learning opportunity. Organizations signed up as Global Partners help to build a constituency of support for social accountability outside the Bank and can strengthen the case for mobilizing funding from other donors by demonstrating support for the approach within civil society.

Table 2. GPSA Global Partners

GPSA Global Partners	2012	2013	2014
<i>CSOs</i>	12	79	165
<i>Foundations</i>	2	6	18
<i>Multilaterals/Bilaterals</i>	0	2	8
<i>Academia/Research</i>	3	3	17
<i>Private Sector</i>	0	1	9
TOTAL	16	93	215
<i>Countries</i>	10	39	63

44. A notable milestone was the May 2014 Global Partners Forum that brought together grantees and GPSA stakeholders. Spurred by the Forum increasing numbers of CSOs and private sector actors along with several donor organizations joined the GPSA as Global Partners with numbers increasing rapidly thereafter. With 215 members, the Global Partners initiative serves as an impressive result in its own right by creating an energizing, convening base that is supportive of the central objectives of the GPSA and the Bank’s comparative advantage in promoting constructive engagement between CSOs and governments, while providing the Secretariat with ongoing feedback. This partnership offers considerable scope to strengthen wider buy-in from civil society, the private sector, and aid agencies and to support GPSA resource mobilization but this latent potential has not yet been fully harnessed. A dedicated post in the GPSA Secretariat was created in September 2014 to support partnerships, with the initial focus on developing thematic groups that can promote understanding and experience of social accountability approaches within particular sectors and issues and provide an outlet for evidence being generated by grantee projects. The Partnership component works closely with the Knowledge and Learning and Capacity Building components, drawing on the major GPSA communications vehicles to support engagement and outreach. Four thematic working groups have been created to date to work with the Secretariat on program implementation: Knowledge, Grants, Partnerships and Resource Mobilization. The May 2015 GPSA Global Partners Forum has

the potential to articulate a clearer thematic focus for knowledge and learning purposes, grounded in the principal sectors for the GPSA grants facility and relevant Bank Practices (e.g. health, education, social protection, water and sanitation) and on strategic priorities for knowledge, capacity building, and partnerships. Some leading Global Partners are keen to play a more active role in resource mobilization by promoting the value of the GPSA with aid donors and governments and this willingness to engage should be harnessed as an integral element in the resource mobilization strategy set out below. At the same time, some Global Partners are wary of being organized under Bank auspices and favor proactive identification of priorities to determine how they can best engage as committed GPSA advocates.

45. **Communications.** Effective communications are integral to the success of knowledge and learning activities and the wider legitimacy of the GPSA. A Communications Strategy was produced in May 2013 and updated in January 2014 which outlines key strategies and tools for enhancing the visibility and branding of the GPSA, advertising and promotion of Calls for Proposals, and the dissemination of knowledge and learning sharing activities.³⁵ It also set out a series of priorities and a work plan which is the responsibility of a dedicated staff post in the GPSA. The GPSA public website and a bi-monthly newsletter with 2,000 subscribers are the main external communication products, as well as print materials (brochures, fliers, annual reports) meant for dissemination.³⁶ The publication of the GPSA's first and second Calls for Proposals was led from the Secretariat in close coordination with Country Office communications teams. Communications activities directly linked to knowledge and learning activities include advance notice for and reports from events such as roundtables and brown-bag lunches within the Bank and to external stakeholders. Periodic press releases on knowledge products and grant activities are produced for the media. Specific outreach is undertaken to create opportunities for tailored presentations on the GPSA's approach and activities to internal and external audiences. Future communications priorities include compilations of stories on results achieved by grantee projects, publicity for a GPSA Awards campaign and the process for planning the May 2015 GPSA Global Forum, continued updating and upgrading of the GPSA website and Twitter channel, and press releases to accompany new working papers and other knowledge activities GPSA communications are also coordinated with and fed into communications products from other parts of the WBG, including those produced by the GGP and newsletters from other Bank units. This provides an opportunity to feed further into corporate communications on the citizen engagement strategy and to demonstrate the value of GPSA operations and knowledge activities in supporting this agenda. It also offers an opportunity to publicize the emerging results from GPSA projects which in turn can inform the design of beneficiary feedback mechanisms. Metrics

³⁵ *GPSA Communications Strategy*, updated version, January 2014.

³⁶ According to data collected by the GPSA Secretariat, the GPSA website attracted 1190 unique visitors in October and 885 in November, with 5,328 and 3,990 page views respectively.

are being refined to monitor the impact of communications activities, focused on gathering statistics on website visits, online discussion, the number of Twitter followers, email enquiries, audience feedback, and media coverage. These will require systematic investment to demonstrate the full value of GPSA communications work and how this component facilitates engagement with internal Bank stakeholders and partners outside the Bank in pursuit of the wider objectives of the GPSA.

46. **Internal Engagement.** Senior management has continued to lend support the GPSA during the internal restructuring. The GPSA has been relatively successful in building its grants portfolio by working with GGP and other Global Practices, while management attention focused on more pressing internal reform priorities. Organizational restructuring has led to many changes in leadership and staffing. GPSA had strong ownership prior to its move into the GGP with new leadership who were initially unfamiliar with the program and its evolution. Despite the change process in the Bank, senior leaders continued to support GPSA through contributions to a number of GPSA activities. One salient example following the launch of GPSA was a Roundtable in December 2012 on Social Accountability and Science of Delivery with contributions from President Kim with former Managing Director Caroline Anstey. After nearly two years of implementation President Kim hosted a Dialogue with Global Partners at the GPSA Global Partners Forum in May 2014. Other senior managers have also played prominent roles in engaging in GPSA events inside the Bank. In March 2014, Managing Director Sri Mulyani Indrawati held a roundtable on Knowledge and Social Accountability. Prior to the change process, former WBI Vice President Sanjay Pradhan contributed to several GPSA events and activities, ranging from presiding over three Steering Committee meetings to interactions with potential donor country representatives during the WB Annual Meetings. During the Global Forum, fifteen Executive Directors and their Advisors attended a luncheon with Global Partners. After the formation of the GGP, the Senior Director met with CEOs of Global Partners, developed the foreword to a key knowledge product shaping the field, and presented the GPSA to President Kim during a Senior Management review meeting in December 2014.

III.E CAPACITY BUILDING

47. Capacity development was identified as a priority from the outset with activities primarily focused on the needs of grantees along with CSOs, governments, and the private sector. The Board Paper highlights the risk of limiting funding to CSOs that meet high capacity, operational and governance standards which could discourage smaller and newer CSOs. To mitigate this risk the Board paper identified the need to find ways of supporting CSOs which do not yet have strong expertise on social accountability, for example by encouraging on-granting or support for capacity-building and mentoring arrangements on the part of intermediary organizations in

receipt of grant support. The Knowledge Platform was seen as another means of reaching smaller CSOs with lower capacity by facilitating multi-stakeholder dialogues and peer learning at the country level.³⁷ The initial priority was to ensure that the grantee organizations and their partners had a good knowledge of GPSA goals and the concepts of strategic social accountability and constructive engagement. This formed the basis for setting up a dedicated program component focused on capacity-building. At the request of the Steering Committee, an early capacity needs assessment identified social accountability and political economy approaches as a priority for grantees and for unsuccessful applicants to be reached through knowledge and learning activities and resources available through the Knowledge Platform. A series of Dissemination Notes analyzed applicants' capacity gaps vis-à-vis the program's focus on 'strategic social accountability' and its main elements. Grantee workshops in July 2013 and in May 2014 had these issues at their core. Training sessions focused on providing an introduction to political economy analysis and on understanding the role and contribution of state oversight institutions, along with sessions on Bank reporting requirements over the course of implementation.

48. While there are a wider set of capacity-building activities focused on a broader community of practice – like an intensive capacity building initiative to the Caribbean Business Council to monitor the implementation of government commitments to pro-growth reform – the primary emphasis of GPSA capacity-building work is to provide implementation support to both TTLs and grantee CSOs through high-quality advice on technical aspects related to operationalizing strategic social accountability and political economy. Several TTLs and grantees underscored the need for such support to be continued during the course of implementation. Technical assistance is already underway for both first and second round grantees using web-based resources and training events. A fresh needs assessment was completed in December 2014 jointly with grantee CSOs and TTLs to prioritize capacity needs and a series of follow-up site visits is planned for the first half of 2015 to determine needs on the ground. Selected grantees will also receive mentoring and coaching on strategic media work as part of an agreement with the Aga Khan Foundation's Development Network and the Aga Khan University in Nairobi. This component is also tasked with providing technical assistance to governments and private sector actors who are interested in integrating social accountability into their work. A dedicated staff member was assigned to lead capacity building activities with support from eight GPSA advisors covering all the grantee projects. The component has also been designed to leverage the Bank's internal knowledge and expertise, as well as on peer exchanges among grantees and the experience available through the network of Global Partners. In due course there may well be a need to widen capacity building efforts to include government counterparts and oversight

³⁷ An example of such an approach was to showcase experience in the Dominican Republic to CSOs and government officials in Bolivia, Guatemala and Honduras in early 2014. Further south-south exchanges along these lines are planned.

institutions to support their own efforts in constructive engagement with CSOs, in conjunction with CMU priorities and linked to Bank operations.

III.F MONITORING AND EVALUATION

49. **M&E Framework.** The GPSA has put in place a comprehensive M&E system for the program as a whole and for the grants component in particular. At the program level, Secretariat staff are responsible for maintaining regular oversight of implementation and all aspects of delivery for the funding, capacity building, knowledge and partnerships components. The Board Paper and Results Framework provide the principal benchmarks for monitoring progress.

50. **Results Framework.** The original Results Framework was reworked to capture the political context and institutional outputs in the form of political economy analysis and the role of oversight institutions, and to give greater prominence to knowledge and learning and partnerships.³⁸ The Results Framework is a living document that contains the potential for revision and adjustment over the course of program implementation. High level results are expected in four areas of governance: transparency; representation and voice; accountability; and learning for improved results. Four main outputs are identified at the program level which would result from activities undertaken by the GPSA. The first is the integration of a comprehensive political economy approach into the operational strategies of the GPSA's grantees borne out of direct engagement with government actors that have authority over service delivery or the governance of service delivery. The second is the application of strategic problem-driven political economy analyses by the Bank's TTLs, CMUs and the GPSA Advisors working with the grantees. The third is the knowledge and learning that the GPSA will produce through analysis and sharing of grantee activities and experiences among grantees, Global Partners, and other key actors working on social accountability initiatives. The fourth is the outreach and collaboration with the GPSA's Global Partners. However, as noted in Section III.A, the results framework may need to be revisited to ensure it comprehensively captures results at the program level and that the emphasis on political economy analysis by grantees and TTLs as key outputs is proportionate. A challenge going forward will be to ensure that the results achieved by the grantees are amenable to aggregation and reporting at the Program level so that the wider significance and cumulative impact of this work is captured systematically and to distill lessons and change course in due time. This will entail close scrutiny of the first set of project reports and results frameworks to identify scope for improvements

51. **Grant Operations.** Secretariat staff that lead on grant operations and M&E maintain an active spreadsheet on all dimensions of project implementation and liaise closely with TTLs who

³⁸ *GPSA Results Framework*, Updated June 2014.

are primarily responsible for supervision and the production of Grant Reporting and Monitoring Reports (GRMs). At the grantee level, all recipient organizations have produced results frameworks against which they report progress on a half-yearly basis. These frameworks contain milestones against which progress is reviewed by TTLs and GPSA staff as the basis for grant disbursement. Grantees have appointed staff to lead on M&E, created results frameworks, and devised M&E systems to report on the results and progress achieved. All thirteen progress reports have been produced to date from the first round as most second round grants have not yet reached their first six-month deadline for reporting purposes. A review of grantee progress reports produced to date points to unevenness in coverage and the detail of information conveyed. The best of these report comprehensively against agreed milestones and project indicators, mostly at the inception stage. They also contain case qualitative studies and stories that bring to life the content and significance of constructive engagement with government counterparts and service providers in schools and health facilities. Some report on pilot exercises and consultations with the wider public and civil society in their respective countries which they use as material in newsletters and blogs which in turn are posted on the Knowledge Platform. Others provide more minimal coverage of progress and do not complete the pro-forma template, usually on account of disbursement delays which in turn have affected implementation, but also because they are unused to such close supervision and reporting requirements which is a positive feature of GPSA M&E arrangements. As a consequence it might prove difficult to capture progress against intermediate outcomes and assess aggregate results for grantee project. The MIT Collaborative Research program embeds impact assessments in three grantee projects and is intended to produce more systematic evidence of impact with wider implications for the GPSA portfolio.

Recommendation 12: Secretariat staff responsible for M&E should closely review progress reports to ensure they are of adequate quality and report comprehensively against agreed milestones. Where improvements are required these should be made at this early stage of implementation to ensure that quality is ensured from the outset and that best practice from grantees is shared widely. Reporting formats used in GRMs should also be reviewed to ensure these capture intermediate results and progress towards outcomes.

52. **Supervision.** Global Practices across the Bank are responsible for the supervision of the grants which in turn ensures complete mainstreaming of GPSA into operations. There is regular coordination between Secretariat staff and TTLs in M&E activities for GPSA grantees. The GPSA Secretariat relies on GRMs from TTLs for measuring progress along with the progress reports submitted by grantees at six-monthly intervals. There is a perception on the part of Secretariat staff that standard Bank GRMs are not conducive to effective M&E as the indicators used are wide ranging and not easily amenable to comparison and need to be revised. Most TTLs are sector or practice specialists in health, education, water and sanitation, while others are from governance or social development. A Bank budget allocation of \$20,000 per year is provided

from CMUs to cover the costs of supervising grantee projects. All the TTLs interviewed for the evaluation are very actively involved in supervision and monitoring of GPSA grant activities in their respective countries, often going well beyond what the relatively small size of the grant would normally require. There is strong interest and commitment among the TTLs in the social accountability approach and the objectives of the GPSA. Some receive operational and technical support and peer advice from GPSA advisers with the support of the Secretariat. This commitment provides a solid grounding for close involvement by TTLs in grantee projects and for fostering engagement with partner governments. None appears to be carrying the responsibility unwillingly though some TTLs find the level of compliance and reporting onerous. They are all assiduous in supervision and reporting, through periodic meetings with grantees, field visits and reviewing documentation produced by grantees. The majority of those interviewed for the evaluation appear to be familiar with grantee M&E arrangements and some TTLs have helped to strengthen these through technical advice. This is a positive dimension of the relationship and testament to the success of the GPSA in attracting interest and commitments from specialists across the GPs.

53. **Knowledge and Learning.** The Knowledge Platform is putting in place a system using Google Analytics to monitor and use and uptake of knowledge products and metrics will be required to capture the cumulative impact of this component. More generally, GPSA knowledge and learning activities report on numbers of people attending seminars and events and could focus more in future on how these activities translate into durable changes in working practices and operations. An impressive range of activities are now underway (see Annex 6) and these could benefit from clearer metrics to establish the results being achieved and as a basis for reporting on progress.

54. **Sustainability of M&E.** Overall the M&E arrangements that have been put in place at the program and project levels appear to be appropriate and robust. Dedicated staffing is in place at the program and grantee levels and there is close supervision by TTLs, all of which augurs well for the reporting of results and longer-term sustainability. Review of the first complete round of grantee reports against their results frameworks will provide a more complete picture of how effectively the M&E arrangements are operating in practice.

55. **Future Evaluation.** An impact evaluation should be conducted towards the end of the initial phase of the program, around 3-4 years after the current exercise. The aim of this evaluation should be to focus on capturing the results of GPSA program investments by gathering evidence on project outcomes and the overall impact achieved by different elements of the program, including the knowledge and learning components. The evaluation should entail selected field visits to grantees across a range of sectors, organizations and country contexts using data collected over the course of the grantee projects. Baseline data collected at the outset

of the program would constitute the point of comparison for observed results but in the absence of randomly selected control groups for comparative purposes a fully randomized approach will not be possible. The program evaluation will be complemented by evidence from MIT's longitudinal studies using this approach linked to three GPSA grants. The results of the evaluation will help to build a more solid evidence base on the impact of GPSA projects, inform lesson-learning and provide a firmer basis for guiding future rounds of grant making and knowledge and learning activities.

Recommendation 13: Conduct an independent impact evaluation after 3-4 years of grant implementation to determine how far project outcomes have been realized and the overall impact of the program, both grant making and the knowledge and learning components.

IV. RESOURCE MOBILIZATION

56. **Strategy and Budget.** The GPSA was designed with the expectation that it would complement financial resources raised from Bank budget for the Trust Fund with contributions from donors, principally bilateral and multilateral aid agencies, international NGO, and private foundations. The MDTF was envisaged as a fund that would pool Bank and donor contributions and would be managed by the Bank. Provision was made for flexible funding arrangements in a variety of ways at global, regional or country levels and to enable donors to offer externally managed parallel funding available on the basis of agreed GPSA criteria. The aim was to create a Fund of sufficient size to provide predictable grant funding to support CSO operations at scale, with expected growth from a small base to total funding of \$75-125 million over a 5-7 year period. The Bank's contribution in FY13 was initially set at \$5 million, comprising \$2.8 annual million repurposed from the Civil Society Fund and a further \$2.2 million allocated from below-the-line grant programs. The proposal in the Board paper was to maintain this level of funding through FY16 with a total commitment of \$20 million in the first four years of operation. Management committed to reviewing with the Board the Bank's funding to the GPSA as part of subsequent annual and business planning processes.

57. **The Multi-Donor Trust Fund.** The MDTF model is broadly appropriate for a self-contained civil society funding mechanism inside the Bank. It provides a readily available funding mechanism and compliance arrangements that are familiar to Bank staff and donors.³⁹ It is not apparent that other alternative institutional arrangements currently exist within the Bank for this purpose. A lighter touch approach to fund management was adopted for the Civil Society Fund and the former Development Grant Facility (DGF) where grant approval arrangements were faster and the compliance requirements leaner. The original expectation was that a simplified

³⁹ World Bank, *Guidance Note on Bank Multi-Stakeholder Engagement*, 2009.

version of Small Grants procedures would serve as the model for GPSA compliance requirements.⁴⁰ The MDTF entails higher standards of compliance and due diligence as it includes contributions from other donors. However, the majority of grantees and Bank staff interviewed for the evaluation believe that the compliance requirements associated with an MDTF mechanism are too onerous and need to be reviewed and further simplified (see Recommendation 18 below). These cause delays, between SC recommendation and issuing the grant agreement, and then between the grant agreement and disbursement of the first financial tranche. In some cases nine months elapsed between SC approval and first disbursement. By comparison, the first OSF grant on the basis of parallel funding was signed off and disbursed more quickly than all the Bank administered grants, within three months compared to more than six months for many Bank grants. There may well be lessons for the GPSA from the foundations on how they approach compliance issues for similar types of grants which are more streamlined and yet include many of the same criteria for due diligence purposes. This change may require the elaboration of a different policy environment for the GPSA with simplified conditions and compliance requirements.

58. Donor Contributions. Three private foundations, a bilateral agency and a Part II government have signed up to the GPSA and to date have provided \$8.8 million to the GPSA. The Ford Foundation and the OSF are providing \$4 million and \$3 million respectively, while the Aga Khan Development Network is providing \$500,000, divided between a contribution of \$250,000 to the MDTF and a further \$250,000 for a media capacity building initiative for GPSA grantees. All three foundations report similar expectations of working with the World Bank: the scope to scale up social accountability work; the potential to achieve greater impact; and the prospect of harnessing the leverage of the Bank to engage constructively with governments. The Ford Foundation contribution of \$4 million was directly approved by the Foundation President and is managed as part of the MDTF. The OSF \$3 million contribution operates in parallel with the GPSA, largely using the review and selection mechanism as established by the GPSA but separate compliance procedures and parallel implementation, but with grantees having access to the GPSA capacity building and knowledge elements. The three foundations are firmly committed to the GPSA concept and design principles, they are broadly content with modalities for project review and approval, and believe the grantee projects supported by GPSA are of consistently high quality, but they share several concerns. The three foundations would be reluctant to consider further financial contributions without financial commitments from governments and aid donors and strongly support further contributions from the Bank. They are also concerned that the due diligence requirements of the MDTF are too onerous and result in high transaction costs, slow

⁴⁰ *Procedures for Small Recipient-Executed Trust Fund Grants: Guidance to Staff*, Updated July 28, 2014. This guidance applies to small Bank grants under \$5 million and to micro-grants under \$500,000 to recipients outside the Bank and is currently being further refined and simplified.

disbursements and implementation delays. Two fresh contributions were announced as this report was being compiled. Finland (Part I country) has committed \$1.3 million while the Dominican Republic (Part II) has committed \$25,000. While modest as a share of the overall resources required, they provide an indication that further contributions from other donors and governments could be mobilized in future. This is an important development as it may open the door for additional contributions from bilateral donors and shows high levels of commitment and demand by recipient countries over this program. These additional contributions will enable the GPSA to issue a further Call for Proposals in 2015.

59. **Funding Prospects.** Current financial support for the GPSA rests heavily on the Bank's \$20 million commitment over four years together with \$8.8 million in contributions from three private foundations and two bilateral contributions. There is no assurance that additional resources will be forthcoming from donor sources without significant financial commitments from Bank shareholders, especially from bilateral agencies and the governments that have opted in to the GPSA. The GPSA produced a Resource Mobilization Strategy in February 2014 to guide efforts to mobilize additional financial resources from aid donors and member governments but this has not generated a significant level of financial contribution from the large bilateral donors or governments to date.⁴¹ For such efforts to be successful they need to be strongly backed by Bank senior management and the Board to ensure a fund of a size that can generate significant cumulative impact. Dedicated support at this level has yet to be confirmed and would need to be explored as part of the follow-up to the findings and recommendations of the evaluation. The wider context regarding prospective financial contributions from official donors has changed over the past two years and is now less favorable. Other donors already support civil society governance and social accountability work through bilateral arrangements and various funds managed directly or through independent consortia and managing agents, often at significant scale.⁴² For some donors this remains their preferred route as they remain skeptical of the Bank's comparative advantage in managing grants for civil society organizations. Other bilateral agencies have experienced significant budget cuts and seek to preserve their bilateral program at the cost of multilateral contributions. Another reason for the reluctance of bilateral agencies to make financial contributions to the GPSA stems from a preference for limiting the number of Trust Funds and channeling resources centrally through IDA contributions. There are also institutional constraints within the bilateral agencies in that several have been incorporated into foreign policy establishments and the resources available to departments for multilateral affairs are more limited. In practice the bulk of the funds available to most bilateral agencies lie with country and regional programs rather than central policy or international departments. All these

⁴¹ GPSA, *Resource Mobilization Strategy*, February 2014.

⁴² DFID's Governance and Transparency Fund (GPF) was \$200 million over five years, while Making All Voices Count has a budget of \$50 million over four years.

factors have a critical bearing on the prospects for raising bilateral contributions for the GPSA in future which will require creative solutions, for instance centered on matching contributions for specific projects in particular countries, although there are limits to how much flexibility can be accommodated in funding arrangements at the risk of creating excessive complexity and administrative overload. It should also be noted that even if larger bilateral contributions are forthcoming, it could take up to one year for these to be realized for GPSA budget purposes, which may leave a funding gap in the interim. This underscores the need to consider additional WBG contributions to the GPSA in the interim.

60. **Financial Sustainability.** As will be further elaborated in Section V, the absence of guaranteed future financial commitments on any significant scale is the greatest risk facing the GPSA as it currently lacks resources to fund future calls for proposals. In short, current financial resources are inadequate to ensure the future sustainability of the program. There is uncertainty over the financial sustainability of the program as it has been difficult to mobilize resources over and above those provided by the \$20 million contribution over four years from Bank budget together with foundation commitments totaling \$8.8 million and recent contributions of \$1.3 million from two governments. While this equates to nearly 45% of the Bank budget contribution over four years, the \$29 million marshaled to date in support of the GPSA remains well short of the target of \$75-125 million to meet the ambition set out in the Board paper.

Recommendation 14: Five sources of potential financial contributions to the GPSA should be vigorously pursued with active senior management support over the 2015 calendar year. **First**, GPSA member states should be encouraged to make financial contributions through their Executive Directors, both from the OECD and the MICs. **Second**, aid donors that prioritize social accountability should be a focus for bilateral contributions to the GPSA, informed by the findings of this evaluation through a donor pledging meeting convened for this purpose, potentially through the OECD-DAC. As well as making contributions to the GPSA program budget, bilateral donors could serve as joint funders of future calls for proposals focused on specific sectors, countries or regions. **Third**, potential interest from other private foundations engaged in international work needs to be pursued more intensively, potentially through a special meeting of foundation Presidents convened by Bank senior management. **Fourth**, national philanthropies that have an interest in accountability and transparency work could be approached to join the GPSA as funding partners, for example through matching contributions for grants in the countries where they operate. **Fifth**, the scope for additional contributions from the WBG should be explored to provide assurance of the Bank's ongoing commitment to other potential contributors.

61. Two forums that are of particular significance for social accountability work could be used to promote the case for enhanced donor and government support for the GPSA in 2015. First, the Sustainable Development Goals will be deliberated in the UN General Assembly from January and there is good prospect that accountability will feature strongly as a component of a broader governance goal. Events to publicize this goal during the SDG deliberation process could be used to publicize the value of the GPSA as a vehicle for pursuing constructive engagement between

government and civil society through social accountability. Second, the Open Government Partnership now has 65 members who are committed to transparency and accountability reforms in their action plans. The GPSA should be strongly linked to the OGP (which is a Global Partner of GPSA), and opportunities pursued to publicize the grants and funding mechanism to OGP members at the October global summit through the governments of Mexico and South Africa that serve as the current co-chairs.⁴³ Finally, the Global Partners are a potential resource for the GPSA and some could be more actively engaged in mobilizing interest and financial support from member governments and aid donors. Most global CSOs and coalitions engaged in social accountability work are signed up as Global Partners and appreciate the comparative advantage and potential significance of the Bank's engagement in this field. Mobilizing Global Partners as GPSA advocates at the May 2015 Global Partners forum would provide a powerful impetus from civil society to encourage donor and government contributions to a World Bank-led funding mechanism.

Recommendation 15: International forums such as the SDG process and OGP should be used to mobilize financial contributions for the GPSA, and the Secretariat should work with Global Partners to maximize visibility and support for the GPSA in these forums.

62. **Commitments and Deliverables.** The total GPSA budget now stands at \$28.8 million. As shown in Annex 8, \$16 million has been committed to date with disbursements of \$8.3 million to date. Secretariat staffing costs are currently met from Bank budget. The current resource envelope is sufficient to meet grant commitments to FY20. The GPSA MDTF budget commitments have been front loaded to support two rounds of proposals following a proposal that was endorsed by the Steering Committee. This means any future calls will have to be supported by additional contributions from the Bank and partners. With the fresh commitments from Finland and Dominican Republic there is a strong prospect of a third call for proposals in FY15 with an envelope of about \$5 million which will be important for sustaining the momentum of GPSA funding and prospectively widen the range of countries and grantees receiving financial support.

63. **Value for money.** A fixed proportion of the budget is used to cover the core staffing, program and administrative costs of the Secretariat, which includes technical assistance, monitoring and evaluation, and communications. The staffing requirements for knowledge and learning and grant operations performed by the Secretariat are broadly appropriate and have largely drawn on consultancy inputs. Staffing levels have expanded to include provision for partnerships and capacity-building as these two components have grown in significance. A proportion of the staffing costs can be considered as core program costs where they deliver

⁴³ Some of these linkages already exist. For example, the Bank's Paraguay Country Partnership Strategy makes explicit reference to the linkages between the OGP and the GPSA grant, while the GPSA government official for the Jordan CfP is also the OGP focal point.

components that directly form part of the total costs of delivery, notably knowledge and learning, partnerships, and capacity building. The own-managed activities costs (i.e. knowledge products, learning activities, partnership forums, capacity building activities, M&E, core funding, etc.) of \$1.7 million were initially covered as part of MDFT expenditure during the inception period and future administrative spend will be covered by Bank budget. This spending might appear to account for a disproportionate share of program spend while current disbursements remain relatively modest at \$8.3 million. However, this amount includes activities and with total contributions standing at \$28.8 million, their share will diminish over time. Cost-effectiveness and efficiency are harder to determine at this points as activities are at the inception stage and most of the outputs have yet to come on stream. An increase in program spend with additional grant making is unlikely to require a proportionate increase in core costs so efficiency and cost effectiveness should improve as additional budget resources become available for the GPSA.

V. RISKS AND SUSTAINABILITY

64. **Risks and Assumptions.** A number of potential challenges were identified in the Board paper concerning the legitimacy of the GPSA. These were that it should: (a) be regarded as a genuine partnership among CSOs, donors, and governments; (b) have an inclusive partnership structure for these actors; have transparent grant-making processes; (c) allow for external feedback on compliance with GPSA procedures and operating terms; and (d) incorporate independent evaluation of the development effectiveness of its operations. Another risk identified in the Board paper concerned the possibility that the GPSA would end up supporting larger and more established CSOs.⁴⁴ The Results Framework rests on a number of assumptions concerning country context, the capacity and operations of grantees, and the resources and operations of the GPSA and the World Bank.⁴⁵ These risks and assumptions were addressed through various elements in GPSA design and incorporated into the Operations Manual. Capacity building and on-granting arrangements were put in place to ensure that CSOs that were newly formed or have lower capacity in social accountability work would not be disadvantaged. Most of the prospective challenges identified in the Board paper have been satisfactorily addressed in the design of the GPSA and the governance and institutional structures that support implementation (see Section III). The partnership principles underlying the GPSA work well and are considered legitimate by all those interviewed for the evaluation. Openness to feedback on compliance was repeatedly confirmed by respondents during the course of the evaluation and current compliance procedures remain a significant operational risk that needs to be addressed. Three other risks were less evident at the approval and design stage and are addressed in this

⁴⁴ Board Paper, 2012, pp. 21-22.

⁴⁵ *GPSA Results Framework*, pp. 92-95.

section with recommendations on mitigation. In addition to compliance risk, these are financial, institutional, and reputational risks; each one of these could fundamentally affect the sustainability and impact of the GPSA. Some of these risks were anticipated in the Board Paper, Operations Manual and Results Framework but the depth and significance of the risks identified here goes well beyond what was set out in these documents.

65. **Financial Risk.** Financial risk is the most significant risk facing the GPSA and this is keenly appreciated by the GPSA Secretariat. Failure to marshal additional resources from outside the Bank on a significant scale would have detrimental effects on the future of the program as there is no assured financial commitment from Bank budget beyond FY16. The lack of additional finance would limit the scope for additional calls for proposals and grants. In such a scenario, the GPSA could end up as a small but worthwhile portfolio of social accountability grants. It would be difficult to justify the current level of staffing and management in the Secretariat if the GPSA failed to grow and cost-effectiveness could not be assured on account of the fixed share of administrative costs irrespective of program size. As discussed in Section V, GPSA program management is actively seeking to mitigate this risk by identifying potential new sources of finance from among bilateral donors and mobilizing support from Global Partners.

<p><u>Recommendation 16:</u> Financial risk mitigation should be a high priority and needs to be pursued with Board and Steering Committee support to complement the senior management actions proposed in Recommendation 14. To this end, the Board needs to affirm the value and opportunity presented by the GPSA to shareholders and clients by drawing on the commitments from Executive Directors representing countries that have opted in. In addition, Steering Committee members should be encouraged to actively solicit additional financial contributions as part of their expected role.</p>
--

66. **Institutional Risk.** The main institutional risk concerns a perceived lack of leadership commitment on the part of Bank senior management to the GPSA. There is a widely shared view among some Global Partners and staff that the Bank is not consistently investing high-level leadership commitment in publicly backing the GPSA and mobilizing resources from donors. This contrasts with the period leading up to the launch of the GPSA when senior management was actively involved in promoting the program in the Board and external stakeholders through coordinated engagement by a number of Vice Presidents. In part this perception relates to a change in leadership roles and priorities following the Bank restructuring process from mid-2014. The GPSA Secretariat is formally located in the Public Integrity and Openness Directorate of the Governance Global Practice and would benefit from strong and visible ownership at the most senior levels of the Practice to build on existing engagement. Committed leadership from the Global Practice Vice Presidents (GPVPs) would further strengthen the perceived value of the GPSA across the Global Practices and demonstrate its contribution to the corporate agenda around citizen engagement. But the real strength of the GPSA lies in the momentum it has

achieved across the sectors and in certain regions.⁴⁶ Country Directors and Managers in countries with GPSA grants are generally enthusiastic and committed and would be keen to raise the visibility and significance of the GPSA across the Bank. These institutional resources should be harnessed as part of a risk mitigation strategy to provide the GPSA with strong support and leadership by Bank senior management.

Recommendation 17: Senior management needs to identify champions in the Global Practices at the VP level and in the President's Office who would be accountable for promoting the value of the GPSA to staff and external stakeholders and for leading the GPSA resource mobilization effort.

67. **Administrative Risk.** Administrative risk relates to the upstream and downstream procedural and due diligence requirements associated with standard grant conditions. As detailed in Section II, the GPSA uses the Bank's compliance framework for managing the program and grants in line with MDTF guidance and the small grants mechanism. Some element of upstream simplification was introduced at the design stage and during early implementation resulting from the GPSA Secretariat's own efforts to simplify grant-making procedures.⁴⁷ However, in practice the full compliance package places very onerous demands on CSOs who are not familiar with Bank legal compliance requirements and due diligence procedures relating to procurement, contracting, and financial management. In all cases this has led to considerable delay in implementation between the time that elapses once grants are announced and grant agreements are signed, and between issuing of the grant agreement and the financial disbursement. Efforts to tackle these problems by the Secretariat improved processing times for the second round of grants by 20% from an average of 13.3 to 10.6 months since the Call for Proposals, but the compliance requirements continue to remain very demanding (Annex 7).⁴⁸ Grantees understand the requirements and potential benefits in terms greater administrative rigor, but most have spent very considerable time and resources accommodating to Bank compliance requirements, especially where there is a further layer of due diligence for re-granting to local CSO partners. These could potentially have several adverse effects: increasing supervision time and administrative effort on the part of Bank staff; diverting grantee attention from the primacy of results; and serving as a potential disincentive to future grantee applications.

68. **Reputational risk.** Reputational risk refers to the external face of the GPSA in the eyes of key stakeholders. Many CSOs, governments, donors, and private sector companies are following the GPSA with keen interest, among them leading CSOs that are also Global Partners, stimulated

⁴⁶ The MENA region, for example, views the GPSA as a critical instrument for helping to embed social accountability in lending operations as an integral element of regional strategy.

⁴⁷ While GPSA grants are subject to all Bank safeguards, reporting against the full set of Bank safeguards is not realistic as these are rarely triggered in practice. The one safeguard that is consistently applied across GPSA projects concerns projects operating in areas populated by indigenous people.

⁴⁸ Specialist legal advice was sought by the Secretariat to support compliance requirements for GPSA grants along with dedicated technical input on procurement and financial management.

by the extensive consultations with civil society and external stakeholders leading up to the GPSA launch in 2012. Prior to this there was considerable skepticism among CSOs and some aid donors over the Bank's engagement in social accountability work using a grant mechanism to support CSOs. There was concern that Bank engagement would undermine CSO autonomy and that governments would blunt the efficacy of CSO social accountability initiatives. These concerns were mitigated by senior management actions prior to the Board approval stage by dispensing with a country veto which many feared would stifle independent initiative. Countries opt in voluntarily which conveys legitimacy on GPSA grants and governments are consulted on but cannot block GPSA grants selected by the Steering Committee. These mitigating actions served to defuse some of the concern among CSOs and increasing numbers joined as Global Partners in recognition of the value of the Bank's leverage with client governments in signing up to the social accountability agenda through constructive engagement with civil society. Yet reputational risk remains significant and it is linked to the other three risks identified here since failure to mitigate would damage the reputation of GPSA with civil society stakeholders.

Recommendation 18: The 2015 GPSA Forum presents a major opportunity for Bank senior management and the Governance Global Practice leadership to reaffirm the value and significance of Bank commitment to the GPSA and its relevance for the Bank's citizen engagement agenda.

69. **Risk Mitigation.** Simplification of current procedures is urgently required to mitigate the problems generated by onerous compliance procedures, either by drawing on lessons from simplified grant compliance procedures used for the Development Grant Facility (DGF) or building on the approach currently being developed by OPCS for Small Grants standardization and simplification.⁴⁹ The first approach would require a policy environment for the GPSA where the SC endorses a set of grant proposals for approval by Bank senior management as an umbrella project. The existing compliance regime would need to be adapted in the following ways: allow recipients to use their own procurement systems which would need to be acceptable to the Bank and MDTF contributors and light touch due diligence by Bank specialists; allow the GGP to sign Grant Agreements at the end of the process following approval from Country Directors (which would make the process more efficient internally while keeping the CMU engaged in the process); and consider having one accepted model for a Legal Agreement and a model Disbursement Letter for GPSA grants and sub-grants through a dedicated Bank lawyer to reduce the need for a separate Legal Agreement for each new grant. This would allow the Secretariat to have a single "template" for the Legal Agreement and a template for the Disbursement Letter to be filled with details of the individual grants. This approach would require donors to take a higher risk approach than in the mainstreamed Bank policy environment. Higher risk could mean lighter

⁴⁹ The modified guidance applies to Small Recipient-Executed Trust Fund Grants under \$5 million. The simplification proposals in the draft instructions could be adapted for the GPSA MDTF provided there is agreement from contributing partners.

touch FM and other standards. Building a lighter business model based on a higher risk profile will require dialogue with donors who may be prepared to adopt such an approach for small civil society grants. The alternative option would be to follow the simplification of the Small Grants Guidance for Recipient Executed Trust Funds (RETFs) led by OPCS. The main features of this model would be the adoption of simplified legal conditions; modified safeguards requirements; simplified procurement requirements; and a simplified version of the anti-corruption guidance. While this approach may not address all the concerns highlighted with regard to the existing compliance regime through a mainstreamed approach to RETFs it presents an alternative to seeking a policy environment specifically tailored to the needs of the GPSA. The GPSA Team has been working closely with OPCS and other central units to make current grant-making procedures more efficient. Drawing on the new Small Grants Guidance for RETFs and advice from OPCS has resulted in much shorter grant processing times while maintaining effective fiduciary oversight.

Recommendation 19: Options for further simplification of Bank administrative and due diligence procedures should be explored as a high priority while adhering to strong fiduciary controls. One option for mitigating administrative risk would entail lightening of Bank compliance requirements for GPSA grants, drawing on the simplification of the Small Grants procedure for RETFs led by OPCS. An alternative option is for the GPSA Secretariat to develop detailed proposals for a revised policy environment for consideration by the Bank's legal and financial teams and for review and approval by senior management. This would require the Bank and donors to accept a higher level of risk for GPSA grants as it would set a precedent for future Bank support to CSOs through MDTFs but with potential gains in administrative efficiency.

VI. FUTURE DIRECTIONS

70. **Organizational Options.** The GPSA could evolve in several directions in the next five fiscal years depending on the size of and significance of future financial commitments and the prospective opt-in of additional governments.

- **Full Scale-Up.** Creation of a \$75-125 million GPSA fund with an annual operating budget of up to \$10-25 million to realize the ambitious goal of creating a substantial institutional resource for CSO funding, generating substantial results and evidence.
- **Partial 'Scale-Up'.** Mobilization of \$40-50 million in total contributions and an annual operating budget of \$10 million, with opt-in to the GPSA of leading MICs, fresh calls for proposals, new countries and themes, with enhanced results, fresh learning and better evidence.
- **'Scale-Down'.** The GPSA remains a catalytic pilot within the existing resource envelope of \$28 million to support grantees up to FY20, with limited results and opportunities for knowledge-sharing and learning.

- 'Spin-Off'. No additional finance, GPSA closes after FY20, moves out of the Bank or merges with another donor-funded social accountability initiative, with limited scope for results, lesson learning and evidence generation.

71. The ambitious 'Full Scale-Up' option – as reflected in the GPSA Board Paper – remains the aspiration of many stakeholders, including both Global Partners and Bank staff who see the GPSA as an innovative instrument to address development challenges, civil society stakeholders and governments. This option would require full support from senior management and an active participation of bilateral donors committed to this agenda. Another option is 'Partial Scale-Up' with the aim of doubling the existing resource envelope in the next three fiscal years and maximizing the potential for generating results and evidence from the strategic social accountability and constructive engagement model of the GPSA. Both the 'Scale-Down' and the 'Spin-Off' options would entail diminished operations and effective closure within a foreseeable time frame, with the potential consequence that the GPSA would not be perceived as realizing the ambition set out in the Board paper.

72. A Partial Scale-Up is therefore the recommended option with the GPSA remaining within the Bank, entailing the doubling of existing resources and an annual operating budget of \$10 million from donors and Part II countries, as a basis for fresh calls for proposals and the inclusion of new countries and themes. The growth and sustainability of the GPSA and its ability to realize this ambition will depend on its ability to retain dedicated leadership and maintain a professional staff complement with the continued active support of an external network of Global Partners. This is both desirable and feasible as it is consistent with the evaluation recommendations on risk mitigation and one that can be achieved with modest additional funding and commitment from the Bank and its partners.

73. **Staffing Capacity.** The GPSA Secretariat operates very effectively as a team and their role and contributions are appreciated by all stakeholders interviewed for the evaluation. Continuous engagement in grantee projects through country consultations, proposal framing and evaluation, compliance, guidance and mentoring, capacity building and monitoring are consistently highlighted by CSOs and TTLs as valuable contributions. The composition of the Secretariat with a small number of permanent staff and consultants introduces a degree of vulnerability but also confers a significant element of flexibility which can be addressed through continuous review of staffing needs and succession planning. The Project Manager has been in post for over two years since the approval and inception of the GPSA. This post is critical for the future success of the program as it performs critical management and representational roles. It is inward-facing in representing the program internally to Board Executive Directors, Bank senior management, Governance Practice leadership and ensuring wider buy-in and support from the Global Practices. The Project Manager also has responsibility for line management of team members. The outward

facing roles are equally important: identifying opportunities for mobilizing additional finance; building and maintaining relationships with funding partners and Steering Committee members; engaging with Global Partners; and overseeing external communications. It is therefore a hard role to replace and succession planning should be put in place by FY16 by Governance Practice directors.

Recommendation 20: A review of Secretariat staffing by the GGP management would be advisable to ensure that the current spread of responsibilities is fit for purpose beyond the early implementation stage. This would address the current roles and responsibilities and succession planning for permanent staff and consultants.

74. Institutional Considerations. While it has not been advanced as a serious option, it would not be realistic to out-source the GPSA Secretariat functions at this early stage of implementation. Moreover, it would be premature to consider a range of management and institutional options for the GPSA at this juncture. The Secretariat is able to ensure compliance with Bank procedures and maintain contact with a wide range of Bank staff in headquarters and CMUs by virtue of its identity as part of the WBG. Grantees are content with the arrangement and Global Partners appreciate the value of the Secretariat being housed in the Bank. However, the GPSA Secretariat would benefit from a firmer institutional foundation within the Governance Global Practice with active line management responsibility exercised by senior Practice leads. There are related considerations of sustainability with the rotating membership of the Steering Committee. The Board paper sets out the expectation that rotation of SC members would be staggered in years 3 and 4 which is a sensible way of ensuring a reasonable level of continuity. A more immediate consideration is the regularity of SC meetings and exchanges. The SC has met three times since 2012 to approve project documents and two rounds of proposals and the next meeting is scheduled for May 2015. There is scope to draw on SC member inputs in a more strategic manner at this early stage of implementation, to mobilize support for financial contributions and advise on knowledge and learning priorities.

Recommendation 21: The Steering Committee should be engaged more consistently in providing advice and oversight to the GPSA. SC members should continue to receive periodic implementation updates to keep them informed of progress and have an opportunity to advise on the Bank's response to the recommendations of the independent evaluation. SC members should continue to be consulted by the Secretariat on strategic options for future calls for proposals. They should also play a more proactive role in fundraising for the GPSA. Consideration should be given to SC representation based on a minimum financial contribution of \$3m, equivalent to the amount contributed by Ford and OSF. Consideration should be given to widen membership of the SC on the basis of financial contributions while preserving the current organizational balance.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

75. **Achievements.** The direction of travel for the GPSA at this early stage of implementation is positive. More than 40 countries have opted-in to the GPSA to date, thus exceeding expectations and demonstrating a significant level of government commitment to the initiative. The original Bank budget of \$20 million has been enhanced by nearly 40% through contributions from private foundations and governments. Two rounds of calls for proposals generated a high level of interest and a considerable number of applications. To date 23 grants have been awarded to CSOs across all regions, 60% of which are managed by national organizations, involving 56 local partners and 126 mentees. All the grantee projects are grounded in strategic social accountability approaches and are using a range of innovative tools as a basis to empower communities to engage constructively with government agencies. There is strong alignment of interests between government reformers, civil society grantees, and Bank staff in line with the underlying premise of the GPSA program. Progress in the initial set of grants to date is strongly aligned with the intended program results, grounded in constructive engagement between government and civil society to improve service delivery for the poor. The knowledge and learning component is making good progress in delivering outputs and generating wider evidence, partnerships with a range of external stakeholders are broadening and deepening, a communications platform has been established, and a range of capacity building activities are underway. The Global Partners, numbering more than 215 organizations representing civil society, academia and international development agencies, are an asset to the GPSA and provide strong support for the Bank's engagement in social accountability work.

76. **Challenges.** Some aspects of the GPSA have yet to progress and require attention. Significant financial contributions from the major bilateral donors and emerging economies have not been forthcoming, limiting the size and ambition of the GPSA. Progress with grant implementation has been slow, largely on account of delays caused by demanding Bank compliance requirements. In addition, GPSA support multi-year projects for 3-5 years of implementation. Consequently, most projects are still in the early stages of implementation and few concrete results have been generated to date. Formal political economy perspectives have not been systematically adopted by grantees and CMUs, and state accountability institutions are not yet fully engaged in supporting grant activities across all the projects. Metrics for measuring the impact of knowledge, learning and capacity building need to be further refined. A clear locus for Bank ownership of the GPSA is presently lacking following the creation of the GPs and senior management champions have yet to come forward to build on strong leadership at the Presidential and VP levels during program inception.

77. **Opportunities.** The GPSA has a number of assets and opportunities it can harness in pursuit of the vision first set out in the GPSA Board paper and subsequently endorsed by a

significant number of opt-in countries and Global Partners, including academia and the private sector. Global Partners should be encouraged to help mobilize financial contributions from aid donors and governments. Future calls for proposals could be tailored to particular sectors or regions and designed to attract matching contributions from donors. Improvements on the current compliance regime are urgently required to improve the efficiency of grant making. The Bank's citizen engagement agenda provides an opportunity for the GPSA to demonstrate the wider corporate value it offers from its experience of social accountability work in the field. Given the multi-year nature of GPSA-supported projects there is a case for more robust and tailored capacity building processes. The Knowledge Platform could strengthen its reach to Bank staff in the Global Practices and devise innovative ways of enhancing grantee engagement. The Bank is beginning to influence the wider donor community through its knowledge and learning activities and the generation of research evidence on the impact of social accountability initiatives. The constructive engagement approach promoted by the Bank is gaining adherents from donors and CSOs who were previously skeptical of the Bank's role in funding social accountability work through civil society. There is scope to strengthen complementarity with the OGP and other donor-funded transparency and accountability programs. These opportunities could be realized with more visible senior management engagement and by mobilizing support from the Global Partners.

78. **Risks.** A series of risks pose significant challenges to future sustainability and need to be addressed with some urgency to mitigate their significance and impact and to enable the GPSA to realize its ambitious goals. The biggest risk is financial sustainability as the failure to mobilize significant additional resources from governments and aid donors will limit the size, scope and ambition of the GPSA. Administrative risk also poses a challenge unless compliance requirements can be adapted and more closely aligned with the GPSA business model and a higher level of fiduciary risk accepted on the part of the Bank and donors. There are also institutional and reputational risks arising from the high expectations created among CSOs and other external stakeholders if the Bank if the GPSA fails to deliver and to become sustainable.

79. **Future Directions.** The Board Paper set out a compelling vision for the GPSA as a vehicle to 'reflect the voice of beneficiaries, promote greater transparency and accountability, and achieve stronger development results'. The GPSA embodies many of these features and it is well positioned both to produce meaningful results and contribute to the broader evolution of the social accountability field through investments in funding and knowledge. The Board paper envisaged that the GPSA 'would start small, learn from experience, and expand on the basis of lessons learned and rigorous demonstration of positive impact'. Building on the results achieved over the first two years and addressing areas of potential improvement would enable the GPSA to pursue a strategy of going to scale and becoming an integral element in the Bank's evolving

agenda of placing social accountability and citizen engagement at the heart of its efforts to reduce absolute poverty and foster shared growth.

ANNEX 1 TERMS OF REFERENCE

Global Partnership for Social Accountability⁵⁰

Program Evaluation

October 15, 2014—January 30, 2015

CONTEXT AND INTRODUCTION

On June 12, 2012, the World Bank’s Board of Directors approved the GPSA. The Partnership is designed to contribute to country-level governance reforms and development results by supporting civil society organizations’ (CSOs) capacity-building, and knowledge generation efforts to engage in evidence-based social accountability.

Mission and strategy

The GPSA supports civil society and governments to work together to solve critical governance challenges in developing countries. To achieve this objective, the GPSA provides strategic and sustained support to CSOs’ social accountability initiatives aimed at strengthening transparency and accountability. It builds on the World Bank’s direct and ongoing engagement with public sector actors, as well as a network of Global Partner organizations, to create an enabling environment in which citizen feedback is used to solve fundamental problems in service delivery and to strengthen the performance public institutions. Through a country-tailored approach, GPSA-supported activities are implemented in sectors where the World Bank has a strong involvement and can help governments respond to citizen feedback. The GPSA works to “close the loop” by supporting citizens to have a more articulated voice, helping governments to listen, and assisting government agencies act upon the feedback they receive. Ultimately, this helps the countries to improve development results and to reach the goals of ending extreme poverty and fostering shared prosperity.

Background

The creation of the GPSA Program builds on several factors and events that have taken place both within and outside the World Bank:

- Recent decades have seen growing civil society engagement in monitoring government performance and accountability as well as in providing feedback for improving governance and development reforms. This kind of engagement—also referred to as *social accountability* (or SAcc)—enables CSOs to engage with policymakers and service providers to bring about greater accountability for and responsiveness to citizens’ needs.
- Global research has shown that, under the right conditions, effective feedback mechanisms can help close the loop of information around service provision, which in turn can help make adjustments to public interventions in real time.
- New information and communication technologies (ICTs) are also changing the ways in which citizens engage with governments and are showing a great potential for closing the feedback loop.

⁵⁰ www.worldbank.org/gpsa

- The recent launch of the multilateral Open Government Partnership, in which 51 countries have committed to the principles of transparency and openness, is further evidence of many countries' willingness to bring greater transparency and accountability into their governing process.

Bank support to CSOs has increased steadily throughout the years, becoming a part of its policies and operational procedures. In recent years, the Bank has scaled up its efforts to understand the political economy of governance reforms that lead to better development effectiveness:

- The 2007 Governance and Anticorruption (GAC) Strategy called for an increased integration of transparency, accountability and participation measures in Bank Projects; GAC's second implementation phase emphasized the importance of building the capacity of non-state actors, such as CSOs, parliaments and the media, to engage productively with the state.
- The 2009 Guidance Note on Bank Multi-Stakeholder Engagement notes that the Bank's work with CSOs has often been a source of innovative solutions to country needs and development challenges.

Other development actors' role in supporting SAcc, including multilateral and bilateral organizations, private foundations and corporations, has been instrumental in contributing to build CSOs' capacities for social accountability. Moreover, consultations held with over 1,300 stakeholders in preparation for the GPSA proposal, which included CSOs, governments and donors emphasized the need to structure the Program as a legitimate partnership across the spectrum of actors involved in advancing social accountability.

Feedback from these multi-stakeholder consultations, as well as from research on the impact and effectiveness of social accountability, coincides on the need for more enhanced and fine-tuned support to fill critical knowledge gaps. There are large knowledge and evidence gaps on what works and why, under what conditions SAcc initiatives are effective, whether successful tools and approaches can be replicated, and how successful SAcc projects can be sustained. Furthermore, knowledge is also limited about innovative ways of incorporating learning into practice and on how to demonstrate and document results. This situation explains the increasing demand from practitioners and stakeholders to create innovative mechanisms for generating and managing knowledge on the how to of SAcc, advancing peer learning and exchanges, and strengthening CSOs networks.

In this context, the GPSA's creation comes to complement ongoing work to increase the effectiveness and impact of country-led governance and development reforms, supported by a wide range of actors. As pointed out in the GPSA's Board Paper, its creation "is expected to improve harmonization of support for social accountability as other development partners and civil society groups contribute to GPSA goals. The GPSA would seek to build on these efforts and avoid replacing or duplicating what others, both within and outside the Bank, are already doing."

How does it work?⁵¹

The GPSA provides support in two components. The *Funding Component* makes grants available to CSOs for specific social accountability programs and initiatives, for the institutional development of CSOs working on social accountability, and for knowledge generation and dissemination activities. Through a competitive application process (Global Calls for Proposals); CSOs can apply for grants for periods of 3-5 years, with disbursement tranches linked to agreed project milestones. Indicatively, grant amounts are

⁵¹ [GPSA Operations Manual, January 2013](#)

between \$500,000 and \$1 million.⁵² The GPSA *Knowledge Component* supports a global platform for knowledge exchange and research, especially in measuring and documenting the impact of social accountability interventions; this includes developing and nurturing practitioner networks for South-South exchange.⁵³

How is the GPSA funded?

GPSA is funded by a Multidonor Trust Fund (MDTF) to which the World Bank has committed US\$ 20 million. Among the Global Partners, the Ford Foundation and the Aga Khan Foundation contributed \$3 million and \$0.5 million respectively. Additionally, the Open Society Foundations contributed \$3 million in parallel funding to the GPSA. The GPSA has recently completed the preparation of a resource mobilization strategy with the objective of increasing the availability of resources – monetary or other – to support social accountability initiatives for development outcomes in the field as a whole, assisting the achievement of the overall goals of the GPSA.

Global Partners

Partnership is a key element of the GPSA, which helps to optimize its reach and impact. To date, almost 200 ‘Global Partners’ have endorsed the GPSA’s goals and strategy. Global Partners contribute their expertise, networking and funding. The coalition continues to grow and includes organizations from civil society, CSO networks, foundations, academia and international organizations ([see GPSA website for full list](#)).

Governance structure

The GPSA’s decision-making body is the Steering Committee (SC), which sets strategic directions for the Partnership and decides on grant allocations. It is chaired by the World Bank and comprises a broad and balanced constituency of development partners. The ten members of the committee include 3 donor partners, represented by Riina-Riika Heikka (*Finland*), Martin Abregu (*Ford Foundation*) and Annabel Gerry (*DfID*); 3 members from CSOs, represented by Lindsay Coates (*InterAction*), Said Issa (*ANSA-Arab World*), and Akwasi Aidoo (*TrustAfrica*); and 3 members from developing country governments, represented by Newby Kumwembe (*Malawi*), Magdalena Lizardo (*Dominican Republic*) and Monzur Hossain (*Bangladesh*). Sanjay Pradhan, Vice President of World Bank Institute, is the Bank’s representative. The SC is supported by a small Secretariat in the World Bank Institute.⁵⁴

What is the relationship with governments?

The GPSA’s Funding component only operates in countries where the government agrees to “opt in” to the GPSA. To date, 36 countries have “opted in” to the GPSA (see list on website). In opted-in countries, a consultative process with stakeholders is organized to identify priority governance issues (thematic areas) per country that CSO proposals should address. This country-tailored, ‘problem-solving’ approach maximizes the alignment of GPSA activities with the development strategies of countries. While CSOs in participating countries responded to country-tailored calls, all proposals compete at the global level. Knowledge component can be implemented in all countries, and activities under this component are embedded in the country program in close coordination with Country Teams.

⁵² [Application Guidelines \(CfP2\)](#)

⁵³ [Knowledge Component- Concept Note and Strategy \(2012\)](#)

⁵⁴ [GPSA Operations Manual \(2013\)](#)

The GPSA Funding Component

First Call for Proposals

The GPSA launched its first Call for Proposals in February 2013 in 12 countries that had ‘opted-in’ to the program by that time. Response was high, with 216 civil society organizations that submitted proposals for social accountability projects. Based on a technical review by a global Roster of Experts, the GPSA Steering Committee pre-selected proposals for the first grants. On October 2, 2013 GPSA [announced](#) the 12 final grant winners from 10 countries.

Second Call for Proposals

The GPSA launched its second Call for Proposals in November 2013 in 33 countries that had ‘opted-in’ to the program by that time. Response was high, with 428 civil society organizations that submitted proposals for social accountability projects. Based on a technical review by a global Roster of Experts, the GPSA Steering Committee [pre-selected](#) 8 proposals for the second round.

The GPSA Knowledge Component

A wide variety of activities are underway as part of the GPSA's Knowledge component to link the knowledge harnessed by the GPSA's activities under the Funding Component, the Global Partners network and the Knowledge Component. The GPSA Knowledge Component will prioritize content around the following cross cutting issues: 1) how to think and act politically when advancing transparency and accountability reforms; 2) citizen-state constructive engagement; and 3) collaboration between social accountability initiatives and state horizontal accountability mechanisms.

The GPSA Knowledge Component held a capacity building workshop for 12 pre-selected CSO finalists in June 2013. The CSOs worked with coaches to refine their proposals in terms of coalition building, leadership and engaging with government counterparts. Additionally, each project has a Knowledge and Learning component that was strengthened further at the workshop. In May 2014, the GPSA held its Second Finalists Workshop and launch the Knowledge Platform, which hosts, shares, and disseminates relevant knowledge products, and facilitates networking around social accountability.

Results Framework⁵⁵

Each activity funded by the GPSA is intended to yield measurable and realistic results in one or more of the following “pillars of governance”: transparency; representation and voice; accountability; and learning for improved results. The GPSA's Results Framework, which has been thoroughly revised and will be finalized in 2014, is a tool that will be used to monitor and manage progress and report on delivery of outputs through the program.

Through its grant making and its knowledge and learning activities, the GPSA seeks to (1) increase constructive engagement between civil society actors and government decision makers in the executive responsible for improved service delivery; and (2) facilitate collaboration between the social accountability initiatives of civil society actors and state institutions of accountability (sometimes also referred to as “horizontal” or “independent” institutions of accountability) for overseeing actors in the executive responsible for service delivery.

⁵⁵ [GPSA Results Framework, December 2012](#)

The first output is the integration of a political economy approach into the operational strategies of the GPSA's grantees. The second is the application of strategic political economy analyses by the World Bank's Task Team Leaders (TTLs) and the Country Management Units (CMUs) working with the GPSA grantees. The third output in the Results Framework is the knowledge and learning that the GPSA will produce through comparative analysis and sharing of grantee activities and experiences. The analysis and sharing will not only be encouraged among grantees, but also with Global Partners and other key players from the Social Accountability field. The channel for the third activity will be the Knowledge Portal's webinars, e-forums, as well as BBLs, GPSA grantees workshop.

These three outputs will then work jointly and in interaction with one another to effect change in the theory's two main outcomes. In addition, the GPSA's theory of change also expects these three outputs to provide feedback to the GPSA during the course of the GPSA's lifetime to inform improvements in the design of both the grant making and knowledge and learning activities.⁵⁶

PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

Based on the first round of consultations, Bank Management directed the new initiative of GPSA to start small, learn from experience, and make adjustments as necessary. Further, the World Bank's Board mandated the GPSA to "carry out an independent evaluation at the end of the second year of operation."⁵⁷

The Program became fully operational 20 months ago with the approval of the Operations Manual by the GPSA Steering Committee (December 17, 2012), and the launchings of the First Global Call for Proposals (February 2012) and Second Global Call for Proposals (November 2012). GPSA Management has provided updates regularly to Executive Directors, including an update delivered to the Board in March 2013.

The purpose of the evaluation will be to:

- Examine methodically and in great detail the structure of the program's operations and implementation process to learn whether the processes and activities are aligned with the Program's intended results and consistent with the new WB organizational structure
- Assess the role and impact of key stakeholders, management and governance of the Program through high-level senior management discussions, interviews with senior representatives of government and heads of large, influential civil society organizations, including GPSA Global Partners and desk review of academic literature and operational documentation.
- Evaluate the role of the program in the evolving, complex World Bank institutional framework

⁵⁶ Annex 2: Revised Results Framework presented to Steering Committee on March 10, 2014

⁵⁷ [GPSA Board Paper, Section C.17.](#)

- Consolidate the evaluation findings and develop recommendations, including high-level advice about the program's institutional design and operational procedures.
- Provide overall strategic guidance and recommendations to the GPSA Senior Management and GPSA Steering Committee based on the findings of the Evaluation in a format presentable to the WB's Board of Directors.

This will assist the Secretariat in identifying critical improvements and adjustments to the program's overall design and implementation process. The key questions addressed (see Annex 1) must be accompanied with recommendations and viable options for strengthening, improving and adjusting the GPSA's overall design and implementation.

METHODOLOGY

The consultant will be required to develop an innovative evaluation framework guided by the main evaluation dimensions and key questions included in Annex 1. The consultant will need to independently identify and utilize a cutting edge method in evaluation with the purpose of conveying the findings to the GPSA Senior Management, during an organizational restructure. The consultant will submit a draft evaluation framework to be discussed and refined together with the GPSA Senior Management and Secretariat.

Information gathering will comprise a desk review of Program documents and records (Board Paper, Operations Manual, Knowledge Platform Concept Note and Strategy, Revised Results Framework, Communications documents, Resource Mobilization Strategy, Grant Projects, Application Guidelines, M&E documents, etc.) and interviews with key informants (internal and external stakeholders, purposively sampled).

Information related to key evaluation questions will have to be collected from at least three informants, or assessed by both desk research and interview data, to ensure a robust assessment through triangulation.

PROCESS AND TIMELINE

The evaluation will take place from October 15 to January 30, 2015 with periodic written updates.

Task	Main Deliverable	Due dates
Evaluation Framework	Draft Final document and PowerPoint Presentation	Nov 5 Nov 15
Data collection, analysis and draft report writing	Draft Evaluation Report	Dec 18
Final report writing	Final Report including Executive Summary	Jan 30

MAIN DELIVERABLES

In addition to the deliverables indicated in the table above, the consultant will be available for the following face-to-face events:

- Presentation of Evaluation Framework to GPSA Secretariat and WB Senior Management
- Presentation of interim findings to GPSA Secretariat
- Presentation of final evaluation report to key stakeholders as agreed with GPSA Secretariat (e.g. GPSA Steering Committee, WB Senior Management)

Both the Final Evaluation Report and the PowerPoint Presentation will be of publishable quality, and conform to WB publication standards.

Selection Criteria

The candidates will be assessed against the following skills and competencies:

- Clear, realistic and robust methodology for this proposed evaluation
- Expert knowledge of social accountability and governance issues in developing countries
- Expert knowledge about working with World Bank departments, programs, and processes
- Ability to conduct high-quality evaluation work, especially in the areas of program design and process
- Excellent interpersonal skills in English
- Ability to interact with high-level officials/representatives in government and civil society sector
- Ability to write concise and sharp analytical reports in English

For further information, please contact: Josef (Stig) Trommer (email: jtrommer@worldbank.org) and Seema Thomas (stthomas4@worldbank.org)

Funding for this assignment is covered by the GPSA Program Budget. The consultant will be supervised by Mr. Stig Trommer, the GPSA Senior Operations Officer. For more information about the program, please visit <http://www.worldbank.org/gpsa>

ANNEX 1 - SUGGESTED ISSUES AND QUESTIONS FOR EVALUATION

Overall Program: Fit with WB's structure and processes

- Do the current Program design and implementation processes provide a good fit with the WB's priorities and services under its Governance practice?
- What is the GPSA's relationship with other efforts/groups within the Bank?
- Is the GPSA an effective tool to support country teams in addressing governance challenges at the country level?
- Is the GPSA the "seed" for the "third arm" of the WBG?
- To what extent has the GPSA Secretariat developed its long-term institutional capacity?

Program Element: Resource Mobilization

- Is the Program's Multi-Donor Trust Fund (MDTF) model -and related Donor Agreements/Arrangements (AAs) - appropriate to accomplish its goals?
- What are the benefits or limitations of the GPSA Trust Fund model approach?
- Is the Program's resource mobilization strategy adequate to address its resource needs?
- Is there still sufficient interest among major donors to sustain the Program financially?
- How is the Bank contributing to the sustainability efforts of the program?
- What are the internal to GPSA and external elements which could support or hamper the longer-term impact and sustainability of these activities?

Program Element: Funding Component - Call for Proposals

- Specifically, is there strategic added value of having "Calls for Proposals" instead of other, more strategic and targeted interventions?
- Besides funding, what are the Applicant CSOs seeking from the Program?

Program Element: M&E System

- Does the Program have adequate resources to deliver its planned outputs as defined in its Results Framework at the Program and Grant Levels?

- Has the Program being able to put in place an M&E system that will enable it to satisfy its data collection, analysis and reporting needs at the Program and Grant Levels?
- Is the GPSA M&E system sustainable?
- Is there adequate coordination with TTLs?

Suggested Questions Relevant to All Elements of the GPSA Program

Key Elements of the GPSA Program	Funding Component and Operational Procedures	Knowledge Component and Activities	Partnerships and Communications	Resource Mobilization	Monitoring & Evaluation
Program Design <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is this Element's operational design aligned with the mandates and guidance provided by the GPSA Board Paper? • Are there any design features of this Element that should be strengthened, improved or revised? 					
Programmatic Approach <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the programmatic approach/model for this Element as defined in the Program's Operations Manual offer the best design for achieving the GPSA's goals? • What are the opportunities and bottlenecks/constraints of this approach/model with respect to the Element's objectives? 					
Program Implementation <u>Program Management</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the management structure and resources adequate to fulfill the Element's delivery needs? • Is this Element operating efficiently and effectively? • Are the internal WB procedures appropriate for this Element? Are there notable bottlenecks that need to be remedied for greater efficiency? • Has concurrent 'learning-in-action' been built within this Element's processes for continued improvement of operational efficiency? • Is the financial management for this Element of good quality? 					

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does this Element have adequate resources to deliver its planned outputs as defined in its Results Framework? Is it sustainable? <p><u>Involved Stakeholders</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the Program's primary beneficiaries, Country Governments and Grantee CSOs, engaged effectively to advance the each Element's agenda? Is the Program leveraging the opportunities created by the coalition of Global Partners for each Element? Are they purposeful/strategic partnerships? Are the Applicant CSOs, particularly those that do not win, engaged effectively with alternative offerings? For each Element, does the Program coordinate effectively with internal WB stakeholders that perform a prominent role in the Program's ability to deliver its outputs? Key stakeholders include sector task team leaders (TTLs) responsible for grants' supervision, country management units (CMUs), operations units (Legal, Fiduciary and Disbursement units), as well as other units or teams involved in processing grants or implementing related governance and social accountability programs and activities. <p><u>Program Governance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the governance structure, particularly the Steering Committee, adequate to fulfill this Element's multi-stakeholder approach? From each Element's vantage, is the selection, composition, and function appropriate? 					
<p>Program Sustainability</p> <p>80. <u>Fit with WB's structure and processes</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do the current Element's design and implementation processes provide a good fit with the WB's priorities and services under its Governance practice? For this Element, what is the GPSA's relationship with other efforts/groups within the Bank? To what extent has the GPSA Secretariat developed its long-term institutional capacity for each Element? 					

ANNEX 2 LIST OF PEOPLE INTERVIEWED

Acronyms

D	Donor
SC	Steering Committee
G	Grantee
GP	Global Partner

Name	Title	Organization
Mirza Jahani	Chief Executive Officer	Aga Khan Foundation U.S.A. (D, GP)
Jonathan Fox	Professor, School of International Service	American University (GP)
Pura Sumangil	President/CEO of CCAGG	Concerned Citizens of Abra for Good Government (G)
Izabella Toth	Senior Corporate Strategist	Cordaid (GP)
Magdalena Lizardo	Ministry of Economy, Planning and Development	Dominican Republic (D, SC)
Victoria Vlad	Economist	Expert Grup (G)
Martin Abregu	VP, Democracy, Rights and Justice	Ford Foundation (D, SC, GP)
Marine Perron	Founding Researcher, Center for Analysis and Research	FUNDAR (G, Knowledge Platform)
Jean-Jacques Schul	President	IDAY (GP)
Florencia Guertzovich	GPSA Technical Expert	Independent Consultant
Lindsay Coates	Acting President, InterAction	InterAction (SC, GP)
Lily Tsai	Professor	MIT (GP)
Jonas Rolett	Regional Manager for Advocacy	Open Society Foundation (D, GP)
Carmen Torres	Oxfam DR, Project Manager, Grantee	Oxfam DR (G)
Madina Aliberdieva	Deputy Country Director, Tajikistan	Oxfam Tajikistan (G)
Vinay Bhargava	Adviser	Partnership for Transparency Fund (GP)
Jan-Willem Scheijgrond	Senior Director Environment, Health and Safety; Corporate Sustainability Office	Philips (GP)
George Osei-Bimpeh	Country Director	SEND-Ghana (G)
Lester Salamon	Professor	The Johns Hopkins University (GP)
Stephen Commins	Lecturer in Urban Planning	The University of California, Los Angeles
Ali Winoto Subandoro	Health Specialist, Indonesia, TTL	The World Bank Group
Andrea Gallina	Senior Governance Specialist, Dominican Republic, TTL	The World Bank Group
Andrea Stumpf	Legal Counsel, LEGCF	The World Bank Group
Andrew Clark	Senior Advisor to Executive Director, Canada	The World Bank Group

Anna Olefir	Operations Officer, Human Dev, Moldova, TTL	The World Bank Group
Carolina Vaira	Operations Officer and GPSA Advisor	The World Bank Group
Caroline D. Anstey	Former Managing Director	The World Bank Group
Chiyo Kanda	Country Manager Portfolio and Operations, The Philippines	The World Bank Group
Christina Wright	Operations Officer, GEDDR - Education - GP, Morocco, TTL,	The World Bank Group
Colin Bruce	Director, Africa Regional Integration	The World Bank Group
Coralie Gevers	Country Manager, Madagascar	The World Bank Group
Deepa Sankar	Senior Education Economist, Malawi, TTL	The World Bank Group
Dionisio Nombora	Public Sector Specialist, Mozambique, TTL	The World Bank Group
Edith Jibunoh	Adviser, Global Engagement	The World Bank Group
Franck Bessette	Sr Financial Management Specialist, Tunisia TTL	The World Bank Group
Francoise Clottes	Country Director, Sri Lanka	The World Bank Group
Gerard Byam	Director, Strategy and Operations, Middle East and North Africa Region	The World Bank Group
Gwen Hines	Executive Director, United Kingdom	The World Bank Group
Hassane Cisse	Director, Governance and Inclusive Institutions, Governance Global Practice	The World Bank Group
Helene Grandvoinnet	Lead Social Development Specialist	The World Bank Group
Jaime Alvarez	Advisor to Executive Director, Dominican Republic	The World Bank Group
Jan Weetjens	Lead Social Development Specialist, GSURR	The World Bank Group
Jeffrey Thindwa	Practice Manager, Governance Global Practice	The World Bank Group
Jeffrey Baker	Senior Advisor to Executive Director, United States	The World Bank Group
Joel Hellman	Chief Institutional Economist, GGODR	The World Bank Group
Jorg Frieden	Executive Director for Switzerland/Azerbaijan/Poland	The World Bank Group
Keith Hansen	Vice President, GPSVP-GP-CCSA	The World Bank Group
Khalid Alkhudairy	Executive Director, Saudia Arabia	The World Bank Group
Laura Kullenberg	Country Manager, Malawi	The World Bank Group
Linda Van Gelder	Director, Operations Policy and Quality Department (OPSPQ)	The World Bank Group
Luis Esquivel	Operations Officer, GGODR and GPSA Advisor	The World Bank Group
Luiza Nora	Social Development Specialist, Bangladesh, TTL	The World Bank Group
Maria Loreto Padua	Senior Social Development Specialist, GSURR, Philippines, TTL	The World Bank Group
Mariam Sherman	Director for Openness, Results and Effectiveness	The World Bank Group
Mario Marcel	Senior Director, Governance Global Practice	The World Bank Group

Mary McNeil	Former Senior Operations Officer, Team Lead, GGP	The World Bank Group
Million Fikre	Advisor to Executive Director, United States	The World Bank Group
Neil Simon M. Gray	Country Director, Maroc, Tunisia, Algeria, and Libya	The World Bank Group
Nicholas David York (Nick)	Director, Corporate, Country, and Global Evaluation (IEG)	The World Bank Group
Nicolas Peltier-Thiberge	Assistant to the President	The World Bank Group
Olivier Fremond	Country Manager, Benin	The World Bank Group
Paolo Belli	Program Leader, ECA	The World Bank Group
Penelope Lewis	Senior Communications Officer, Global Engagement	The World Bank Group
Pier Francesco Mantovani	Lead Water and Sanitation Specialist	The World Bank Group
Rachel Kyte	Vice President, Climate Change	The World Bank Group
Rajashree Paralkar	Senior Operations Officer, OPSPQ	The World Bank Group
Randi Ryterman	Director, Collaborative Leadership	The World Bank Group
Robert Hunja	Director, Public Integrity and Openness, Governance Global Practice	The World Bank Group
Sakuntala Akmeemana	Senior Public Sector Specialist, GGODR	The World Bank Group
Sanjay Pradhan	Vice President, Leadership, Learning and Innovation	The World Bank Group
Seth Ayers	Senior Partnership Specialist, LLIOF	The World Bank Group
Shomikho Raha	Social Development Specialist, GGODR - Governance - GP	The World Bank Group
Stefan G. Koeberle	Director, Operations Risk Management	The World Bank Group
William (Bill) Dorotinsky	Adviser, GGODR - Governance - GP	The World Bank Group
Satu Leena Elina Santala	Executive Director, Denmark/Finland/Iceland	The World Bank Group (D)
Andres Falconer	Partnerships	The World Bank Group GPSA
Emilie Fokkelman	Communications	The World Bank Group GPSA
Josef (Stig) Trommer	Senior Operations Officer	The World Bank Group GPSA
Marcos Mendiburu	Senior Social Development Specialist, Knowledge Platform	The World Bank Group GPSA
Maria Poli	Senior Social Accountability Advisor Capacity Building Coordinator	The World Bank Group GPSA
Marielle Wessin	Program Assistant	The World Bank Group GPSA
Miguel Ceara Asuad	Operations	The World Bank Group GPSA
Olive Moore	Knowledge & Learning	The World Bank Group GPSA
Roby Senderowitsch	Program Manager	The World Bank Group GPSA
Seema Thomas	Monitoring & Evaluation and GPSA Advisor	The World Bank Group GPSA
Akwasi Aidoo	Former Executive Director	Trust Africa (SC, GP)

Susana Sottoli	Associate Director Gender, Rights and Civic Engagement, Global Partner	UNICEF (GP)
Masrawati (Acha) Sinaga	Project Manager	World Vision Indonesia (G)
Jeffrey Hall	Former Local Advocacy Director	World Vision International (GP)
Randall Tift	Senior Policy Advisor	World Vision International (GP)

ANNEX 3 GPSA GRANTEE PROJECTS OVERVIEW

2013
Bangladesh

Manusher Jonno Foundation (MJF)

Social Engagement for Budgetary Accountability (SEBA)

GPSA Contribution: \$ 848,968

The GPSA is supporting MJF to make use of formal and informal participatory mechanisms, like open budget sessions and neighborhood meetings, to prioritize public investments and assess service delivery in municipalities. Citizen feedback will be used by Union Parishad (municipal) and Upazilla (district) public officials to improve budgetary processes with 5 local civil society organizations selected through a competitive call. At the national level, MJF will systematize the lessons from these experiences and share them with a wide constituency of government, CSOs and donors, working to achieve transparent, effective and accountable local governance in Bangladesh's 4,480 Union Parishads.

2013
Bangladesh

CARE Bangladesh

Journey for Advancement in Transparency, Representation and Accountability (JATRA)

GPSA contribution: \$644,138

The GPSA is supporting CARE Bangladesh to develop a social accountability model in Bangladesh's Northwest region, taking into consideration CARE Bangladesh's and its partners' past experiences. This social accountability model aims at institutionalizing a participatory budget process mandated by law, by combining the use of formal and informal participatory mechanisms with community radio information campaigns and training of journalists. Union Parishad and Upazilla (district) public officials and citizen representatives will use the information generated to inform resource allocations and to improve service delivery.

Partners include: Institute of Governance Studies at BRAC, Bangladesh NGOs Network for Radio and Communication (BNNRC), Mass-line Media Center (MMC)

2013
Dominican Republic

Fundación Intermón Oxfam

Good Governance Practices for the Dominican Republic

GPSA contribution: \$727,984

The GPSA is supporting Fundación Intermón Oxfam to establish a national consortium of thematic observatories to strengthen and expand social accountability processes, aimed at improving sector budget accountability and service delivery through a local-national network of CSOs and community-based organizations.

Using social audits, community scorecards and budget analyses, feedback will be systematized and shared with national and local decision-makers to introduce corrective measures and reforms as needed.

Partners include: FEDECARES, Ciudad Alternativa (CA, Alternative City), Articulación Nacional Campesina (ANC, National Farmers Network), Coalición Educación Digna (CED, Dignified Education Coalition), Movimiento Justicia Fiscal (MJF, Fiscal Justice Movement)

2013
Indonesia

Yayasan Wahana Visi Indonesia (YWV – Indonesia)

Citizen Voice and Action for Government Accountability and Improved Services

GPSA contribution: \$950,000

The GPSA is supporting YWV – Indonesia to monitor the national Maternal Health Program (Jampersal) by using SMS-based feedback mechanisms and systematizing data through an open, web-based, database to identify service delivery bottlenecks. The project will benefit 52,011 Indonesians, across 36 villages in the 3 Districts of Timor Tengah Utara, Sikka, and Alor. The information generated will help the Ministry of Health to improve the Jampersal Program, and institutionalize social accountability mechanisms for more effective services.

Partners include: PATTIRO, SEKNAS FITRA, Yabiku (YayasanAmnautBifeKuan), Plan Indonesia, (YayasanMitraTaniMandiri), Bengkel APPEK, Apendikkumi, LPA, LakmasCendana Wangi, Yaspem, Yakkestra, Sanres, Dian Desadan TRUK-F, JPIC, Yayasan Lendola

2013
Kyrgyz Republic

Development Policy Institute (DPI)

Voice of Village Health Committees and Social Accountability of Local Self-Government Bodies in Kyrgyz Republic

GPSA contribution: \$598,833

The GPSA is supporting DPI to strengthen Village Health Committees (VHC) by providing training and information to better engage with local government officials and budget processes. By enabling citizen's feedback through the VHCs, the project aims to generate information on rural health priorities that will be used by the Ministry of Health and other key decision-makers to effectively allocate and monitor health determinants in the public budget. Emphasis is placed on health determinants such as: clean water, safe housing, sanitation, hygiene, epidemiological situation and protection from infections.

Partners include: Association of Village Health Committees, Community Development and Investment Agency (ARIS)

2013
Malawi

CARE Malawi

Strengthening Social Accountability in the Education Sector in Malawi

GPSA contribution: \$950,000

The GPSA is supporting CARE Malawi to improve education services by developing feedback tools for students and parents to monitor teachers' absenteeism in 125 schools, and to monitor procurement of teaching and learning materials (TLMs). Information generated from this project will be used by the Ministry of Education and by the Office of National Procurement to inform decision-making regarding teachers' absenteeism and ways to reduce it, and to procure TLMs in a more transparent and effective manner.

Partners include: Civil Society Education Coalition (CSEC), Souktel

2013
Malawi

Malawi Economic Justice Network (MEJN)

Social Accountability Strengthens Education

GPSA contribution: \$705,000

The GPSA is supporting MEJN to make more transparent and efficient the procurement and delivery of teaching and learning materials (TLMs), by monitoring TLMs contracts and their execution, and by strengthening accountability in the sector. Project implementation is coordinated with CARE Malawi to ensure coverage in the country's six education districts. Information generated from this project will be used by the Ministry of Education and by the Office of National Procurement to inform decision-making in the sector and to improve procurement of TLMs.

Partners include: Civil Society Education Coalition (CSEC), Centre for Human Rights and Rehabilitation (CHRR), and Centre for Governance and Public Participation (CeGPP), Keystone Accountability

2013
Moldova

EXPERT GRUP

Empowered citizens enhancing accountability of reform and quality in education

GPSA contribution: \$696,955

The GPSA is supporting the EXPERT GRUP to monitor education services in 100 Moldovan schools by facilitating the engagement of students and parents with school authorities to address budget allocation of primary, secondary, general and upper secondary schools. The service quality data will be shared with local and national authorities, including the Ministry of Education, to monitor the impact of recent reforms and to inform policy-making in the sector.

Partners include: Center in Cahul, Center in Balti and “Dacia” Center from Soroca, Regional CSOs in the towns of Ungheni, Hancesti

2013
Mozambique

Concern Universal Mozambique

Social Accountability Knowledge, Skills, Action and Networking (SAKSAN)

GPSA contribution: \$700,000

The GPSA is supporting Concern Mozambique to build the capacity of local community-based organizations to monitor the quality of health services in extreme poor and poor communities in Niassa and Zambezia provinces. In partnership with two large CSO networks, the Ministry of Health and other relevant ministers, the project will engage with local, provincial and national-level decision-makers to address locally identified performance issues regarding the delivery of critical health services. The project pays special attention to vulnerable groups such as women, persons with disabilities, and HIV infected persons.

Partners include: NAFEZA (comprising 65 associations from Zambézia Province) and FONAGNI (comprising 80 associations from Niassa Province); Community radio Ruruana - Maúá, Community radio Luvila - Muembe, Community radio - Marrupa, Radio Esperança – Lichinga, Local newspaper Faísca – Niassa, Community radio - Mocuba, Radio Paz, Radio Quelimane FM, Radio Zambeze FM, Radio of Mozambique

2013

Concerned Citizens of Abra for Good Government (CCAGG)*Guarding the integrity of the Conditional Cash Transfer Program*

GPSA contribution: \$800,000

The GPSA is supporting CCAGG to improve existing feedback mechanisms of the Conditional Cash Transfer (CCT) Program to improve its targeting and assess the experience of the beneficiaries in terms of health and education services in the Northern Luzon region. The project engages the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD), national government departments for health and education, and local governments at the municipal and barangay levels, in order to trigger government response.

Partners include: PTF, Recite

2013

Tajikistan

Oxfam Tajikistan*Improving social accountability in the water sector*

GPSA contribution: \$850,000

The GPSA is supporting Oxfam Tajikistan to strengthen the capacity of water associations to monitor the quality of water and sanitation. The information resulting from this mechanism will be made public and shared with the Water Regulator to ensure the adequate provision of water services. It is expected that by 2017, more than 84,000 people will have access to and will participate in the monitoring systems.

Partners include: Consumers Union - TJK, TajWSS Network of Stakeholders

2013

Mexico

Knowledge Grant

FUNDAR*GPSA Knowledge Platform*

GPSA Contribution: US\$150,000

FUNDAR has received a GPSA grant to develop and manage the GPSA Knowledge Platform, a web-based interactive space for the GPSA community of 800+ members, mainly social accountability practitioners and researchers.

2014

Democratic Republic of Congo

CORDAID (The Catholic Organization for Relief and Development Aid)

Reinforcing social accountability of health services by supporting health committees and the community diagnosis in Bas Congo and South Kivu

GPSA contribution: \$800,000

The GPSA supports CORDAID to strengthen the social accountability mechanisms of health centers in the provinces of South Kivu and Bas Congo, by combining service assessment tools with formal agreements between health service providers and users to monitor the quality of health services. With 48 CSOs, the information produced will be used by the District and Province health authorities to improve the quality of the services and to strengthen the role of the Health Committees.

2014

Ghana

SEND-GHANA

Making the Budget Work for Ghana

GPSA contribution: \$850,000

The GPSA supports SEND-GHANA to expand the use of SEND's participatory monitoring and evaluation (PM&E) methodology to combine the monitoring of health and education services with sector budget monitoring, at local, district, regional and national levels. Feedback generated from this three-level monitoring system will be systematized and channeled to the planning, monitoring and evaluation units of the Ministries of Finance, Education and Health to inform budget planning and execution.

Partners include: VOTO mobiles, SEND-West Africa, Social Work Department at University of Ghana

2014

Moldova

Center for Health Policies and Studies (PAS Center)

Implement participatory social accountability for better health

GPSA contribution: \$730,000

The GPSA supports PAS Center to monitor hospital and healthcare centers' performance by implementing a set of social accountability tools that combine both service providers' and users' feedback on healthcare quality, to ensure that the planned health reforms, specifically in the hospital sector, and performance-based financing will become more transparent and patient-centered. The obtained results will be shared with the Ministry of Health, Parliamentary Committee on Social Protection and National Council for Evaluation and Accreditation in Health and other key stakeholders.

Partners include: Institute of Public Policies (IPP)

2014
Mongolia

Globe International Center (GIC)

Transparency and Accountability in Mongolian Education (TAME)

GPSA contribution: \$650,000

The GPSA supports GIC to develop a social accountability process combining the use of community scorecards and the "Good School Assessment" tools, to assess education quality at school level and assess education expenditures through budget analysis. Building on the prior analysis of feedback gaps undertaken jointly with the Ministry of Education, GIC, in partnership with Education For All (EFA) and the Partnership for Transparency Fund (PTF) will work in 8 provinces to compile information from parent-teacher associations, school and administrative staff. This feedback will be shared with the Ministries of Education and Finances to inform implementation of the goals set out in the Education Master Plan 2006-2015.

Partners include: Education for All, PTF

2014
Morocco

CARE International Maroc

LEAD Project Linking Education and Accountability for Development

GPSA contribution: \$720,000

The GPSA is supporting CARE International Maroc to identify areas for improvement in primary education, while strengthening collaboration between Parents Associations and education authorities in 80 primary schools located in vulnerable communities of the regions of Grand Casablanca and Marrakech. The information generated will be used by the Ministry of Education and by regional education delegations charged with defining and allocating education budgets at the district and school levels.

Partners include: Near East Foundation (NEF)

2014
Paraguay

Fundación Comunitaria Centro de Información y Recursos para el Desarrollo (CIRD)

TEKOPORÃ Beneficiaries Empowered to Ensure Social Accountability

GPSA contribution: \$600,000

The GPSA is supporting CIRD to strengthen the social accountability mechanisms of the Cash Conditional Transfer Program (TEKOPORÃ) to improve its targeting and the quality of health and education services linked to the program. This project will work with citizen-led municipal roundtables and with beneficiary families to gather and systematize feedback on the CCT's performance, including supply gaps in health and education. The information produced will be shared with the Secretaría de Acción Social (the Social Action Secretariat) and with the Ministries of Education, Health and Finance, to strengthen the targeting, transparency and performance of TEKOPORÃ.

Partners include: DECIDAMOS, CADEP, Instituto Desarrollo, GEAM, DENDE

2014
Tunisia

Union Générale Tunisienne du Travail (UGTT)

The National Network of Social Accountability

GPSA contribution: \$800,000

The GPSA is supporting UGTT to monitor health and education services, and infrastructure investments in a sample of hospitals, health clinics, and schools by developing a short message service (SMS) system to gather information and by developing other social accountability mechanisms to assess service quality at the facility level. In addition, UGTT will set up a web-based platform to systematize, share and channel the feedback generated to decision-makers with 24 local CSOs and will create a national network for social accountability to strengthen citizen engagement around critical reforms and to promote government responsiveness.

2014
Uganda

Africa Freedom of Information Centre (AFIC)

Enhancing Accountability and Performance of Social Service Contracts in Uganda

GPSA contribution: \$650,000

The GPSA is supporting AFIC to strengthen accountability and performance of education, health and agriculture services, by combining tools to monitor contracts, political economy analyses of procurement, and the institutional strengthening of Uganda Contracts Monitoring Coalition (UCMC). With support of the Ministry of Finance and Office of the Prime Minister, the information generated will be used by the Ministries of Education, Agriculture, Health, Finance, National Procurement Office, Office of the Prime Minister and Local Governments of Lira, Oyam, Arua, Kabale and Ntungamo to increase procurement transparency and to improve the quality and effectiveness of services and infrastructure delivered through third-party contracting. This four-year project is closely aligned with the World Bank agenda in Uganda (as reflected in the Bank's Public Expenditure Review: Service Delivery with More Districts in Uganda Fiscal Challenges and Opportunities for Reforms, June 2013) to help promote transparency and accountability of public contracting.

Partners include: TI Uganda, INFOC, Uganda Contracts Monitoring Coalition

2013
The Philippines

ANSA-EAP

CheckMySchool

Open Society Contribution: US\$750,000

Open Society is supporting ANSA-EAP to establish local partnerships between government, parents and students at 46,000 schools in The Philippines to help students and parents access accurate information and give feedback about educational services to the Ministry of Education through a web-based platform.

2014
Ghana

Center for Democracy and Development OSIWA- GHANA

Building transparency, participation and feedback around local government budgeting and planning systems

Open Society Foundations Parallel grant: \$ 898,050

The GPSA supports CDD-Ghana to build on its prior social accountability work by focusing on a citizen's education programme that will build the capacity of citizens to monitor budgetary allocations and track expenses, and build citizen networks to enhance participation in the budgeting and planning processes of District Assemblies. Special attention shall be given to marginalized and vulnerable groups such as women, the youth, and people living with disabilities (PWDs). The information generated by the project will be

used by the Local Government Secretariat, Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning; the sector ministries and the DACF Secretariat for improving fiscal discipline at the district level.

2014
Tunisia

Article 19 Tunisia

Improving the effectiveness of public health and education investments through Social Accountability Open Society Foundations Parallel grant: US\$200,000

The project will strengthen and develop mechanisms and tools of Social Accountability in several governorates of Tunisia and build capacity for citizen's participation in the identification, implementation and evaluation of public health and education investment process to improve the effectiveness of these investments and ensure better local governance. The project seeks to establish public consultation mechanisms; with a particular focus on citizens far from health and education infrastructure, particularly women, who need protection of their reproductive health, the disabled and children with special needs, suffering or at risk of being affected by epidemics. The information generated will benefit the relevant ministries, namely of Finance, Education, Health, Interior, including the general direction of Local Authorities.

ANNEX 4 GPSA GRANTS AND WORLD BANK PROGRAMS

Round	Country	Project Title	Organization	Grant	Alignment with Bank Projects
1	Bangladesh	Social Engagement for Budgetary Accountability (SEBA)	Manusher Jonno Foundation	848,968	(P133653) Municipal Governance and Services Project (US\$266.6 million)
1	Bangladesh	Journey for Advancement in Transparency, Representation and Accountability (JATRA)	CARE Bangladesh	644,138	(P133653) Municipal Governance and Services Project (US\$266.6 million)
1	DR	Encouraging changes in the culture of citizen participation and government management	Fundacion Intermon Oxfam	727,984	(P130208) - Caribbean Growth Forum (Non-lending TA)
1	Indonesia	Citizen Voice and Action for Government Accountability and Improved Services	Yayasan Wahana Visi Indonesia (World Vision Indonesia)	950,000	Aligned to Open Government Partnership
1	Kyrgyz Republic	Voice of Village Health Committees and Social Accountability of Local Self-Government Bodies	Development Policy Institute	598,833	(P126278) Second Health and Social Protection Project (US\$16.5 million)
1	Malawi	Strengthening Social Accountability in the Education	CARE Malawi	950,000	(P114847) Project to Improve Education Quality in Malawi (US\$140 million)

1	Malawi	Malawi Social Accountability Strengthening Project	Malawi Economic Justice Network	705,000	(P114847) Project to Improve Education Quality in Malawi (US\$140 million)
1	Moldova	Empowered citizens enhancing accountability of reform and quality in education	EXPERT GRUP	696,955	(P127388) Education Reform Project for Moldova (US\$40 million)
1	Mozambique	Social Accountability Knowledge, Skills, Action and Networking	Concern Universal Mozambique	700,000	(P125477) Mozambique Nutrition Additional Financing (US\$37 million)
1	Tajikistan	Improving social accountability in the water sector	Oxfam Tajikistan	850,000	(P133327) Second Public Employment for Sustainable Agriculture and Water Resources Management Project (US\$18 million).
1	The Philippines	Guarding the integrity of the Conditional Cash Transfer Program	Concerned Citizens of Abra for Good Government	800,000	(P082144) AF Social Welfare and Development Project (US\$100 million)
1	The Philippines	Check My School	ANSA-EAP	700,000	<i>Funded by Open Society Foundations</i>
2	Ghana	SEND - GHANA	Making the Budget work for Ghana	850,000	(P122692) Ghana Local Government Capacity Support Project (US\$175 million)

2	DR of Congo	CORDAID	Reinforcing Social Accountability of health services by supporting health committees in the community in Bas Congo and South Kivu.	800,000	(P126088) DRC Additional Financing Primary Health Care (US\$75 million)
2	Moldova	Center for Health Policies and Studies	Implement participatory social accountability for better health in Moldova	730,000	(P144892) Moldova Health Transformation Project (US\$30.8 million)
2	Mongolia	Globe International Center	Transparency and Accountability in Mongolian Education (TAME)	650,000	(P148110) Education Quality Reform Project (US\$26 million)
2	Morocco	Care International Maroc	LEAD Project Linking Education and Accountability for Development	720,000	(P130903) MA Accountability and Transparency DPL. (US\$200,000)
2	Paraguay	Centro de Informacion y Recursos para el Desarrollo	TEKEPORA Beneficiaries Empowered to Ensure Social Accountability	600,000	Paraguay Policy Notes “Citizens as Partners in Paraguay’s road towards Good Governance and Share Prosperity” (draft)
2	Tunisia	Tunisian General Labor Union	The National Network of Social Accountability	800,000	N/A
2	Uganda	Africa Freedom of Information Center	Enhancing Accountability and Performance of Social Service Contracts in Uganda	650,000	(Report No. ACS4421) - Public Expenditure Review: Service Delivery with More Districts in Uganda Fiscal Challenges and Opportunities for Reforms, June 2013

2	Tunisia	Article 19	Improving the Effectiveness of Public Health Investments through Social Accountability	200,000	<i>Funded by Open Society Foundations</i>
2	Ghana	Center for Democracy and Development in Ghana	Building Transparency Participation and Feedback Around Local Government Budgeting and Planning Systems	898,050	<i>Funded by Open Society Foundations</i>

ANNEX 5 GPSA GRANTEE FUNDING

TOTAL	Amount	No. of National CSOs	No. of Affiliate CSOs	Funds to National CSOs	Funds to Affiliates of INGOs	No. Partners	No. Mentees
World Bank Portfolio of GPSA Projects	\$ 14,421,878	15	8	\$ 9,877,806	\$ 6,342,122	57	126
		65%	35%	61%	39%		
Total GPSA Projects including OSF	\$ 16,219,928						

Country	Grant Number	Project ID	Project Title	Organization	Amount	National	Affiliate	Funds to National CSOs	Funds to Affiliates of INGOs	No. Partners	No. Mentees	Names of Partners	Name of Mentees
Bangladesh	TF015843	P147682	Journey for Advancement in Transparency, Representation and Accountability (JATRA)	CARE Bangladesh	\$ 644,138		●	\$ -	\$ 644,138	3	0	Institute of Governance Studies at BRAC, Bangladesh NGOs Network for Radio and Communication (BNRRC), Mass-line Media Center (MMC)	
Bangladesh	TF015844	P147836	Social Engagement for Budgetary Accountability (SEBA)	Manusher Jonno Foundation	\$ 848,968	●		\$ 848,968	\$ -	0	5		5 mentee CSOs to be identified through Call for Proposals
DR	TF015862	P147853	Encouraging changes in the culture of citizen participation and government management	Fundacion Intermon Oxfam	\$ 727,984		●	\$ -	\$ 727,984	2	3	FEDECARES, Ciudad Alternativa (CA, Alternative City)	Articulación Nacional Campesina (ANC, National Farmers Network), Coalición Educación Digna (CED, Dignified Education Coalition) and Movimiento Justicia Fiscal (MJF, Fiscal Justice Movement),
DRC	TF018164	P150874	Reinforcing social accountability of health services by supporting health committees and the community diagnosis in Bas Congo and South Kivu	CORDAID (The Catholic Organization for Relief and Development Aid)	\$ 800,000		●	\$ -	\$ 800,000	0	48		48 CSO partners that carry out services in health care in about 150 health centers in the country
Ghana	TF018055	P150856	Making the Budget Work for Ghana	SEND-GHANA	\$ 850,000	●		\$ 850,000	\$ -	15	30	Eight community radio stations, VOTO mobiles, SEND-West Africa, Social Work Department at Univ of Ghana, and Four national media agencies	30 local CBOs
Indonesia	TF015861	P147834	Citizen Voice and Action for Government Accountability and Improved Services	Yayasan Wahana Visi Indonesia (World Vision Indonesia)	\$ 950,000		●	\$ -	\$ 950,000	3	16	ANSA-EAP, PATTIRO, SEKNAS FITRA	Yabiku (YayasanAmnautBifeKuan), Plan Indonesia, YMTM (YayasanMitraTaniMandiri), Bengkel APPEK, Apendikkumi, LPA, LakmasCendana Wangi, Sikka District, Yaspem, Yakkestra, Sanres, Dian Desadan TRUK-F, JPIC, Alor District, Yayasan, Lendola
Kyrgyz Republic	TF015846	P147876	Voice of Village Health Committees and Social Accountability of Local Self-Government Bodies	Development Policy Institute	\$ 598,833	●		\$ 598,833	\$ -	2	0	Association of Village Health Committees, Community Development and Investment Agency (ARIS)	
Malawi	TF015841	P147837	Strengthening Social Accountability in the Education	CARE Malawi	\$ 950,000		●	\$ -	\$ 950,000	2	0	CSEC, Souktele	
Malawi	TF015842	P147819	Malawi Social Accountability Strengthening Project	Malawi Economic Justice Network	\$ 705,000	●		\$ 705,000	\$ -	4	0	Civil Society Education Coalition (CSEC), Centre for Human Rights and Rehabilitation (CHRR), Centre for Governance and Public Participation (CeGPP), Keystone	
Moldova	TF018162	P150873	Implement participatory social accountability for better health in Moldova	Center for Health Policies and Studies (PAS Center)	\$ 730,000	●		\$ 730,000	\$ -	1	0	Institute of Public Policies (IPP)	
Moldova	TF015859	P147607	Empowered citizens enhancing accountability of reform and quality in education	EXPERT GRUP	\$ 696,955	●		\$ 696,955	\$ -	5	0	Center in Cahul, Center in Balti and "Dacia" Center from Soroca, Regional CSOs in the towns of Ungheni, Hancesti	
Mongolia	TF018163	P150842	Transparency and Accountability in Mongolian Education (TAME)	Globe International Center	\$ 650,000	●		\$ 650,000	\$ -	3	0	Education for All, PTF, community radio	
Morocco	TF018056	P150875	LEAD Project Linking Education and Accountability for Development	CARE International Maroc	\$ 720,000		●	\$ -	\$ 720,000	1	0	Near East Foundation (NEF)	
Mozambique	TF015860	P147835	Social Accountability Knowledge, Skills, Action and Networking	Concern Universal Mozambique	\$ 700,000		●	\$ -	\$ 700,000	2	0	NAFEZA (comprising 65 associations from Zambezia Province) and FONAGNI (comprising 80 associations from Niassa Province)	

Paraguay	TF018137	P150876	TEKOPORÁ Beneficiaries Empowered to Ensure Social Accountability	Fundación Comunitaria Centro de Información y Recursos para el Desarrollo, CIRD	\$ 600,000	●		\$ 600,000	\$ -	5	0	DECIDAMOS, CADEP, Instituto Desarrollo, GEAM, DENDE	
Tajikistan	TF015840	P147860	Improving social accountability in the water sector	Oxfam Tajikistan	\$ 850,000		●	\$ -	\$ 850,000	3	0	Consumers Union - TJK, TajWSS Network of Stakeholders, local media	
The Philippines	TF015863	P147890	Guarding the integrity of the Conditional Cash Transfer Program	Concerned Citizens of Abra for Good Government	\$ 800,000	●		\$ 800,000	\$ -	2	0	PTF, Recite	
Tunisia	TF018057	P150877	The National Network of Social Accountability	Tunisian General Labour Union (UGTT)	\$ 800,000	●		\$ 800,000	\$ -	0	24		24 local CSOs
Uganda	TF018160	P150872	Enhancing Accountability and Performance of Social Service Contracts in Uganda	Africa Freedom of Information Centre (AFIC)	\$ 650,000	●		\$ 650,000	\$ -	4	0	TI Uganda, INFOC, Uganda Contracts Monitoring Coalition	

Knowledge Platform Grant

Mexico	TF015833	P147891	Proposal for the Knowledge Platform of the GPSA	FUNDAR	\$ 150,000	●		\$ 150,000	\$ -				
--------	----------	---------	---	--------	------------	---	--	------------	------	--	--	--	--

OSF Supported Projects

Ghana			Building Transparency Participation and Feedback Around Local Government Budgeting and Planning Systems	Center for Democracy and Development in Ghana	\$ 898,050	●		\$ 898,050	\$ -				
The Philippines			CheckMySchool	ANSA-EAP	\$ 700,000	●		\$ 700,000	\$ -				
Tunisia			Improving the Effectiveness of Public Health Investments through Social Accountability	Article 19	\$ 200,000	●		\$ 200,000	\$ -				

ANNEX 6 GPSA KNOWLEDGE & LEARNING PRODUCTS AND TOOLS

Product	Description	Purpose	Progress Update
Knowledge Platform	<p>An Online Platform: A space to connect, collaborate, exchange and learn about the latest debates and practice on Social Accountability.</p> <p><i>Complemented with offline activities, the Platform is the main tool for supporting the learning, networking and knowledge exchange of the GPSA's Grantees and of other CSOs .</i></p>	An online networking sharing and learning space for an active, engaged community to generate and collaborate on knowledge and learning initiatives.	<p>The Platform was launched in May 2014 with 4 modules:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge Repository • Knowledge Exchange (webinars and e-forums) • E-Learning (e-learning course) • Networking (networking board, blogs, directory, roster of experts) <p><u>Platform Statistics</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Over 960 participants registered • 9 GPSA KP monthly webinars conducted (http://gpsaknowledge.org/event-type/webinars/#.VJIZWtLXZzs) • 4 GPSA KP e-forums delivered (http://gpsaknowledge.org/forums/forum/expert-forums/#.VJlaa9LXZzs) • 9 blog posts published in the GPSA KP • 1 e-learning course of 3 modules and 7 weeks duration. 133 participated in E-course (15 of whom were Grantees). 25 fully completed course, including submitting blog report (of whom 5 were Grantees).
GPSA Working Papers Series	Academic research papers published by GPSA through GPSA Working Paper Series	Contribute to Social Accountability research agenda, addressing strategic gaps.	<p>Two GPSA Working Papers published. One further publication planned for March 2015, and one currently under development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GPSA Working Paper #1 'What does the Evidence Really Say' by Prof. Jonathan Fox, American University, Washington DC • GPSA Working paper #2, 'Navigating the Future: Making Headway on Sustainability for Social Accountability Organizations,' by Prof. Lester Salamon, John Hopkins University

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GPSA Working Paper #3, 'A Collective Action Approach Against Corruption: the Case of the Dominican Republic' by Daniel Kaufmann, Andrea Gallina and Roby Senderowitsch (Forthcoming) • GPSA Working Paper #4. Case Study on the Dominican Republic IPAC Public Health Committee Reform for Unified Procurement System for Drugs and Medical Equipment (Forthcoming – in progress - title and date TBC) <p><u>Working Paper #1 Statistics</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 890 views on GPSA Platform • Sample Citations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 'Power, Violence, Citizenship and Agency', Rosemary McGee IDS Buttetin - 'Reading the Local Context: A Causal Chain Approach to Social Accountability', Anuradha Joshi IDS Bulletin - 'Bridging and Bonding Links between Accountability Actors' , MAVC • Sample Blog References: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> UNICEF, From Poverty To Power, Accountability Lab Blog, Civic Studies, Beads.
Grantee Collaborative Research Projects	Collaborative research project jointly undertaken by Grantee and University/Research Institute.	Controlled comparisons to help specific Grantees answer operationally useful evaluation questions, and assist with the impact assessment of Grantee projects at the end of each project (3-5 years).	<p>Three projects currently underway with MIT, of which two are at finalization of proposed research stage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CARE Bangladesh, Bangladesh, <i>Journey for Advancement in Transparency, Representation and Accountability (JATRA)</i>, 4 years – Focus on women participation, women's decision-making in the household and the community, and the barriers women face in participating in local governance, local labor markets, and barriers to mobility in and around their Union Parishads. • Concerned Citizens of Abra for Good Government (CCAGG) , The Philippines, <i>Guarding the integrity of the Conditional Cash Transfer Program</i>, 4 years - What makes a Parent Leader effective at holding government accountable? Are political "insiders" or political

			<p>“outsiders” more effective at holding government accountable for the delivery of services?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Care Malawi, <i>Strengthening Social Accountability in the Education Sector</i>, 4 years – Focus to work with schools, teachers, students, and parents to better understand the sources of teacher absenteeism
GPSA Dissemination Notes	Casual, short (6-8 pages) reflective notes, documenting <u>GPSA</u> approach and learning.	Document and share GPSA approach and learning.	<p>Eight GPSA Dissemination Notes produced to date, two further currently under development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GPSA Note 1 Creating Space for Social Accountability GPSA Note 2 Strategies that Harness the Context to generate Social Accountability GPSA Note 3 Responsive and Multi-Pronged Strategies GPSA Note Picking Partners and Allies That Bolster Your Social Accountability Efforts GPSA Note 5 Adaptive Learning GPSA Note 6 What Next for Strategic Social Accountability GPSA Note 7 Supporting Politically Smart Social Accountability GPSA Note 8 How Are GPSA Partners Thinking About Scale Knowledge and Learning Best Practice & Knowledge and Learning GPSA Grantee Practice and Approach (Forthcoming) <p>81.</p> <p>Viewing statistics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Blog with links to the Notes : 974 Page Views since page launch (August). Note 2 (947 clicks), Note 5 (230 clicks) and Note 6 (220 clicks). Source: Bitly
GPSA Practice Notes	Casual, short (6-8 pages) reflective notes, documenting <u>Grantee</u> key	Document and share Grantee learning. Contribute to emerging	<p>2 Notes currently under development and more planned.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Social Accountability in Education: Grantee Challenges (Forthcoming) Thinking and Acting politically - Tajikistan case Study (Forthcoming)

	challenges and learning. Co-developed in participation with Grantees.	GPSA Grantee evidence/impact documentation. Provide space for GPSA Grantee reflection.	
BBLs	Lunch time events held at World Bank HQ showcasing research and practice. Events are webcast and documented.	<p>Opportunity for Grantee, Partners and World Bank to share learning and practice.</p> <p>Opportunity for Grantees and partner to engage engage World Bank staff.</p>	<p>16 BBLs in total, two in 2013 and 14 in 2014. 3 organized for early 2015, more in planning.</p> <p>Regular BBL attendance is between 40 and 60 attendees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • November 12, 2013: <i>Dealing with Complexity. The Added Value of Knowledge Sharing, Partnership and Accountability</i> (w/ Helvetas InterCooperation) • December 16, 2013: <i>Building Coalitions against Corruption. Evidence from the Participatory Anti-Corruption Initiative</i> in Dominican Republic (IPAC) • January 08, 2014: <i>Reconceptualising Accountability in the Developing World through Accountapreneurship</i> (w/ Accountability Lab) • January 23, 2014: <i>Citizen Feedback on NGO Work</i> (w/ GreatNonProfits.Org) • February 25, 2014 <i>How can Citizen Participation Enhance Value for Money? Lessons from the Philippines</i> Social Development Network 2014 Forum Hard Talk • April 1. 2014 <i>Social Accountability: What Does the Evidence Really Say?</i> GPSA Working Paper (w/ Prof Jonathan Fox) • April 14, 2014: <i>Social Participation in Policymaking: Does it Make a Difference? Analysing the Evolution and Effectiveness of Participatory Institutions in Brazil</i>, (w/ IPEA & co-sponsored with ODTA) • May 19, 2014: <i>Voicing the Voice: How Does Community Voice Enhance Social Accountability and Improved Results on the Ground?</i> (w/ CORDAID)

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • June 04, 2014: <i>Measuring the Real Values: People Power and Accountability through Social Return on Investment</i> (w/ SROI Network) • June 10, 2014 <i>The UK experience: Supporting NGO effectiveness</i> (w/ Bond UK) • June 18, 2014: <i>Citizens Monitoring Mayors: Promoting multi-stakeholder engagement in the sustainable governance of Brazilian cities</i> (w/ Nossa Sao Paulo & co-sponsored with InterAmerican Development Bank, and OSF) • September 23, 2014: <i>Making Local Government Work for the Poor in Mexico</i> (w/ CIESAS) • October 22, 2014: <i>Power, Participation and Political Economy in The Health Sector. The Social Accountability Angle</i> (w/ Results for Development Institute, & co-sponsored with WB Governance and Health Global Practices) • November 20, 2014: <i>Trust, Incentives and Citizen Engagement: Drivers for Improving Health & Education Service Delivery in MENA</i> (co-sponsored by GGP, Health GP and Education GP) Presentation of Flagship preliminary report • December 17, 2014: <i>Money for Development: Financially Sustainable Social Accountability Models</i> GPSA Working Paper #2 (w/ Prof. Lester Salamon) • January 22, 2015 Presenting Research (title TBC) with Care International and World Vision • February 2015: <i>Social accountability in India</i> (w/ Simon O' Meally and to be co-sponsored with Citizen Engagement Team) (Forthcoming) • March 2015: <i>Veedurias Visibles in Colombia</i> (Forthcoming)
Annual Global Forum	Annual two day networking and knowledge sharing	Provide networking space for CSOs,	

	Conference for GPSA Partners and opt-in Governments	academics, donors, government and businesses. Promote and further Strategic SAcc approach.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May 14, and 15 2014, GPSA First Global Partners Forum (170 Registered Participants) • May 12, and 13 2015, GPSA Global Partners Forum (Forthcoming)
Events	Ah- hoc Workshops, Roundtables, Think-In sessions etc.	Advance knowledge and learning with a particular group or on a chosen theme.	<p>14 Events in total, one in 2012, six in 2013 and seven in 2014.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • December 17, 2012 Roundtable on Social Accountability and Science of Delivery • April 17, 2013, Update on GPSA at World Bank CSO Forum • May 1, 2013 Workshop at Interaction Forum • June 11, 2013 Book Launch with Partners for Transparency ‘Citizen Against Corruption’ • September 12, 2013 Launch of ODI Report ‘Re-thinking Accountability’ • October 10, 2013 Update on GPSA at World Bank CSO Forum • December 5, 2013 Global Partners GPSA Update Meeting • February 25, 2014, How can Citizen Participation Enhance Value for Money? Lessons from the Philippines (with Social Development Network). • March 11, 2014, Round Table on Knowledge, Solutions and Social Accountability (with GPSA Steering Committee and WB MD) • March 25, 2014, Roundtable: The Role of Ombudsman Offices in Promoting Good Governance and Effective Service Delivery (co-sponsored with WBISG, NTF, and International Ombudsman Institute-IOI) • April 10, 2014 Panel at CSO Forum - Spring meetings • October 9, 2014, Building Citizen Trust in Public Institutions [Session during WB-IMF Annual Meetings) • October 10- 2014, Think In Session on Social Accountability and Fiscal Reform (w/ Gates Foundation)

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> December 2, 2014, Roundtable Re-imagining Social Accountability for Results (w/ DFATD and Agha Khan Foundation Canada) January 23 2015, Research Workshop, co-hosted with MAVC and TAI.
Partners Creative Dialogue	A reflection virtual meeting where Partners to informally share and discuss topical SAcc themes and issues.	Informal space for dialogue and sharing on emerging and topical SAcc issues.	To commence in 2015 (Forthcoming)
Partner Snap Surveys	Rapid online questionnaire survey to generate insights and collective knowledge	Informal quick methods for Partners engagement.	To commence in 2015 (Forthcoming)
Grantee Workshops	Grantees meetings define approach, check progress, and share and learn.	Provide space for Grantee to engage directly with GPSA Secretariat, and other Grantees. Review progress on projects, share and learn on implementation.	Two Grantee workshops delivered, one currently planned for 2015. 1 st Grantee Workshop: June 24, 25 and 26 2104 (France) 2 nd Grantee Workshop, May 12 and 13 2014 (Washington DC) 3 rd Grantee Workshop May 15 and 16 2015 (Washington DC, Forthcoming)
Grantee Problem Solving Clinics	A problem solving space for Grantee, hour long virtual session where Grantees present issues/challenge for expert and/or partners feedback.	Provide real-time feedback to Grantee on project challenges. Engage Partners in Grants, utilizing their partner experience and expertise.	To commence in January 2015 (Forthcoming)
Grantee Learning Groups	Informal Grantee thematic working groups - virtual ad-hoc facilitated meetings, aligned with other product	Space for sharing and learning between grantees on specific mutual themes/challenges.	Education Learning Group First Virtual Meeting in January 2015 (Survey sent to Grantees in Nov 2014, summary of Survey finding on key challenges developed in Dec, to be posted as blog on platform in January and for discussion at virtual meeting in January, then development of Practice Note in February) Further groups on SAcc Ecosystems and Health under discussion.

	development (for example GPSA Practice Note)		
Grantee K&L Mentoring (K&L Plans)	One to one mentoring on specific SAcc strategy and themes. K&L planning and review sessions.	Establish common shared vision for Knowledge and learning	Grantee K&L plan developed by 17 Grantees. Follow up discussions held with all, and where applicable revision of plan. A number of sessions held with Grantee,

ANNEX 7 EFFICIENCY GAINS IN THE GPSA GRANT-MAKING PROCESS

(Comparison of average time of First Round and Second Round)

MONTHS (30 days)

Round	Competition Period	Technical Review	Average Processing Period		Average Time between SC approval and signing GA		Average Time between GFRs and Signing GA Agreement	Average Time between GA signing and Disbursement
			REAL Time	Parallel Scenario (2 months reduction)	REAL time	Parallel Scenario (2 months reduction)		
First Round	2.9	0.8	13.3	13.3	8.8	8.8	3.0	4.4
Second Round	3.9	0.5	10.4	8.4	8.1	6.1	1.6	2.3

Variation (Efficiency gains)	33%	-36%	-22%	-37%	-8%	-31%	-49%	-49%
------------------------------	-----	------	------	------	-----	------	------	------

Clarifications/ Assumptions:

- The Competition period is considered to be the time spent between the launch of the competition and the pre-selection of Grants by the Steering Committee.
- The Processing period is considered to be the time spent between the pre-selection of the Grants by the Steering Committee and the First Disbursement.
- Time spent is an average of the First and Second Round.
- In a parallel scenario for the grants of the Second Round, we are subtracting 2 months of the total time. This subtraction is the result of a conservative estimate of time we spent without being able to process the GFRs due to the misallocation of 2015 GPSA budget.

Source: GPSA Secretariat

ANNEX 8 GPSA BUDGET

GPSA CONTRIBUTIONS (+)		GPSA EXPENDITURES (-)	
<u>Contributions Paid In and Committed</u>	<u>23,275,000</u>	<u>Own-Managed Activities (MDTF)</u>	<u>1,730,913</u>
IBRD	20,000,000	Staff Costs	790,967
Ford Foundation	3,000,000	Consultant Fees	668,468
The Aga Khan Foundation USA	250,000	Associated Overhead Costs	65,611
Dominican Republic	25,000	Travel expenses	176,989
		Communication	22,494
		Contractual Services	6,385
<u>Contributions Pledged</u>	<u>2,300,000</u>	<u>Disbursements to Grantees</u>	<u>6,528,606</u>
Ford Foundation	1,000,000	to RETF Grant First Round	2,760,554
Finland	1,300,000	to RETF Second Round	1,220,252
		BETF	349,749
<u>Parallel Funding</u>	<u>3,250,000</u>	from OSF Both Rounds	1,948,050
Open Society Foundation	3,000,000	from Aga Khan Foundation USA	250,000
The Aga Khan Foundation USA	250,000		
<u>Other</u>	<u>41,760</u>	TOTAL	8,259,519
Investment Income	106,760		
Administration Fee	(65,000)		
TOTAL	28,866,760		

Bank Additional Resources (BB) 2012 - 2018	
Total Supervision for GPSA Portfolio and Staff Time	9,840,000

GPSA COMMITMENTS (-)	
<u>Commitments</u>	
Bank Executed (Operations + K&L)	5,543,991
RETF First Round	5,861,324
RETF Second Round	4,579,748
TOTAL	15,985,062

<u>Balance</u>	<u>4,622,179</u>
(+) GPSA Contributions and Pledged	28,866,760
(-) GPSA Expenditures	8,259,519
(-) GPSA Commitments	15,985,062

* As of May 4, 2015

ANNEX 9 SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1: The Secretariat and the Governance Global Practice should actively promote the value of GPSA membership among Executive Directors and client countries, drawing on support from existing opt-in countries, senior Bank management and Country Directors/Managers.

Recommendation 2: The secretariat established under the two Global Practice Vice Presidents (GPVPs) should provide periodic coordination between the Citizen Engagement initiative and GPSA, as a basis for joined-up knowledge management, communications and lesson learning. GPSA staff should be actively engaged in the Technical Support Group for Citizen Engagement and Community of Practice.

Recommendation 3: Future Calls for Proposals should retain the principle of competition but could explore the option of focusing on specific sectors where the GPSA has not achieved a critical mass of investment, such as water and sanitation or social protection, and regions where existing coverage is low but the potential for impact is significant.

Recommendation 4: Consideration should be given to the pros and cons of lowering the minimum size of grants to enable the GPSA to include more grants and organizations that are able to manage smaller grants and to bring in a larger number of CSOs into the GPSA. A clearer indication that grant amounts are “indicative” and that the SC would consider smaller grants could be incorporated in CfPs. This should form the basis for consultation with the Steering Committee and with the Global Partners working group on grant making in time to inform the next Call for Proposals.

Recommendation 5: The GPSA Secretariat should continue to highlight to grantees the value of PEA and context analysis to project implementation at the project inception stage; monitor progress through grantee results frameworks and TTLs; emphasize PEA in capacity building and Knowledge Platform products; and encourage TTLs to draw on PEA in project formulation and design.

Recommendation 6: The Secretariat should review the GPSA Results Framework to determine whether the expectations on the outputs concerning the application of political economy analysis by TTLs and CMUs is fundamental to constructive engagement or should be reduced in significance as program results.

Recommendation 7: State accountability institutions should be closely involved in project inception and implementation as integral actors in constructive engagement between civil society and government in all GPSA projects. TTLs and the GPSA advisors will need to monitor this closely and offer constructive advice and share good practice from grantee projects where this works well and from global knowledge sources in the Bank.

Recommendation 8: The GPSA Secretariat and TTLs should actively promote the Knowledge Platform as a learning resource among grantees to maximize uptake and dissemination of innovation and lesson learning. Simple navigation tools should be introduced to maximize usage of the resources available through the KP.

Recommendation 9: Improve the accessibility and usage of the Knowledge Platform through selective translation of key knowledge products into Spanish, Arabic and French. Offer selected webinars in Spanish or French, by selecting either bilingual experts to deliver sessions twice a day, or specialists from the relevant region, timed to maximize access. Additional resources will be required for this purpose and should be pursued through a small matching grant from a donor or private foundation.

Recommendation 10: The Secretariat should reach out more intensively to Bank staff to register to use the KP through relevant Global Practices in order to promote understanding of social accountability issues within the World Bank, especially among TTLs and practice specialists in governance, social development and the social sectors, and the Community of Practice on Citizen Engagement. Secretariat staff should draw more systematically on Bank technical expertise in cross-regional and cross-sector learning events to deepen interest and commitment.

Recommendation 11: The GPSA Secretariat should devise a clear set of indicators for measuring the reach and significance of knowledge and learning activities in order to document the results from this GPSA component more systematically.

Recommendation 12: Secretariat staff responsible for M&E should closely review progress reports to ensure they are of adequate quality and report comprehensively against agreed milestones. Where improvements are required these should be made at this early stage of implementation to ensure that quality is ensured from the outset and that best practice from grantees is shared widely. Reporting formats used in GRMs should also be reviewed to ensure these capture intermediate results and progress towards outcomes.

Recommendation 13: Conduct an independent impact evaluation after a minimum of four years of grant implementation to determine how far project outcomes have been realized and the overall impact of the program, both grant making and the knowledge and learning components.

Recommendation 14: Five sources of potential financial contributions to the GPSA should be vigorously pursued with active senior management support over the 2015 calendar year. **First**, GPSA member states should be encouraged to make financial contributions through their Executive Directors, both from the OECD and the MICs. **Second**, aid donors that prioritize social accountability should be a focus for bilateral contributions to the GPSA, informed by the findings of this evaluation through a donor pledging meeting convened for this purpose, potentially through the OECD-DAC. As well as making contributions to the GPSA program budget, bilateral donors could serve as joint funders of future calls for proposals focused on specific sectors, countries or regions. **Third**, potential interest from other private foundations engaged in international work needs to be pursued more intensively, potentially through a special meeting of foundation Presidents convened by Bank senior management. **Fourth**, national philanthropies that have an interest in accountability and transparency work could be approached to join the GPSA as funding partners, for example through matching contributions for grants in the countries where they operate. **Fifth**, the scope for additional contributions from the WBG should be explored to provide assurance of the Bank's ongoing commitment to other potential contributors.

Recommendation 15: International forums such as the SDG process and OGP should be used to mobilize financial contributions for the GPSA, and the Secretariat should work with Global Partners to maximize visibility and support for the GPSA in these forums.

Recommendation 16: Financial risk mitigation should be a high priority and needs to be pursued with Board and Steering Committee support to complement the senior management actions proposed in Recommendation 14. To this end, the Board needs to affirm the value and opportunity presented by the GPSA to shareholders and clients by drawing on the commitments from Executive Directors representing countries that have opted in. In addition, Steering Committee members should be encouraged to actively solicit additional financial contributions as part of their expected role.

Recommendation 17: Senior management needs to identify champions in the Global Practices at the VP level and in the President's Office who would be accountable for promoting the value of the GPSA to staff and external stakeholders and for leading the GPSA resource mobilization effort.

Recommendation 18: The 2015 GPSA Forum presents a major opportunity for Bank senior management and the Governance Global Practice leadership to reaffirm the value and significance of Bank commitment to the GPSA and its relevance for the Bank's citizen engagement agenda.

Recommendation 19: Options for further simplification of Bank administrative and due diligence procedures should be developed as a high priority while adhering to strong fiduciary controls. One option for mitigating administrative risk would entail lightening of Bank compliance requirements for GPSA grants, drawing on the simplification of the Small Grants procedure for RETFs led by OPCS. An alternative option is for the GPSA Secretariat to develop detailed proposals for a revised policy environment for consideration by the Bank's legal and financial teams and for review and approval by Bank senior management. This would require the Bank and donors to accept a higher level of risk for GPSA grants as it would set a precedent for future Bank support to CSOs through MDTFs but with potential gains in administrative efficiency.

Recommendation 20: A review of Secretariat staffing by the GGP Senior Management would be advisable to ensure that the current spread of responsibilities is fit for purpose beyond the early implementation stage. This would address the current roles and responsibilities and succession planning for permanent staff and consultants.

Recommendation 21: The Steering Committee should be engaged more consistently in providing advice and oversight to the GPSA. SC members should continue to receive periodic implementation updates to keep them informed of progress and have an opportunity to advise on the Bank's response to the recommendations of the independent evaluation. SC members should continue to be consulted by the Secretariat on strategic options for future calls for proposals. They should also play a more proactive role in fundraising for the GPSA. Consideration should be given to SC representation based on a minimum financial contribution of \$3m, equivalent to the amount contributed by Ford and OSF. Consideration should be given to widen membership of the SC on the basis of financial contributions while preserving the current organizational balance.