

## Annex E. Indicative Draft Results Framework of the GPSA<sup>1</sup>

**Table 1. Indicators Table for GPSA Results Framework**

Revised Draft - July 21, 2021

### The Partnership Development Objective (PDO):

**Original:** To contribute to country-level governance reforms and improved service delivery through developing more sustainable and effective CSOs supporting collaborative social accountability initiatives.

**Please see the MERL Guide for GPSA Grant Partners and MERL Consultants and the Internal GPSA RF Guide for more information and detailed guidance for every indicator.**

Outcomes/outputs	Potential indicators	Methodological approach	Data Source(s)	Responsibility
<b>Outcomes</b>				
<p><i>Outcome 1:</i> <i>Civil society partners (lead grant partner and implementing CSO partners) have improved capacity to engage meaningfully and collaboratively in policy making and implementation and service delivery processes.</i></p>	<p>1a) Percentage of grant partners and their implementing CSO partners with improved capacity to engage meaningfully and collaboratively with one another and other stakeholders in the compact(s).</p> <p>1b) Percentage of grants in which civil society actors, citizens and public sector institutions demonstrate improved capacity to engage meaningfully and collaboratively.</p> <p>1c) Percentage of grants that contribute to corrective measures taken by public sector actors to address proximate causes of service delivery failure.</p> <p>The third indicator (1c) is a measure of the grant's contribution to improvement in service delivery in each project, based on the requirements of each grant. This indicator will be at the PDO level in grant partner projects.</p>	<p><b>1a)</b> MERL Consultant (independent evaluator) assessment in comparison to initial GPSA Secretariat assessment at proposal</p> <p>MERL Consultant (independent evaluator) assesses capacity at grant closing, and judges change in capacity on a four-point scale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Significantly improved</li> <li>- Improved</li> <li>- Neither improved nor deteriorated</li> <li>- Deteriorated</li> </ul> <p>Create a weighted capacity assessment for the core 5 capacities:</p> <p><b>(1) intra-civic capacity:</b> ability to create and sustain collective action with civil society partners – organizations and citizens (joint problem-solving, relational abilities, responsiveness to context)</p> <p><b>(2) inter-civic capacity:</b> ability to create and sustain collaboration, coordination, commitment of providers and targeted public sector officials (joint problem-</p>	<p>Sources for baseline include initial grant proposal, GPSA team and external expert reviews of initial proposals, and early biannual technical reports to evaluate capacity at entry.</p> <p>Other important sources for all evaluative assessments:</p> <p>KIIs with grant partners, CSOs and compact stakeholders and WB/GPSA team members.</p> <p>Reports, strategies, analysis, M&amp;E data, evidence of corrective measures, etc.</p>	<p>GPSA Secretariat assesses grant partner and CSO implementing partner capacity at proposal.</p> <p>The MERL Consultant assesses this at baseline.</p> <p>Grant partners submit timely and complete biannual technical reports, reviewed by GPSA Secretariat and TTL in real time and by evaluator at mid-term and completion.</p> <p>MERL Consultant assess grant partner and CSO implementing partner capacity at mid-term and completion.</p> <p>Project grant partners are strongly advised to use the GPSA standard model ToR outlining the requirements for the annual RF assessments, baseline, mid-term assessment and final evaluations. Grant partner contracts the MERL Consultant and ensures deliverables. GPSA responsible to</p>

<sup>1</sup> This draft document was prepared by Jeff Thindwa, Ann-Sofie Jespersen, Brett Libresco, Florencia Guerzovich, Maria Poli, Emilie Fokkelman. The team is grateful to Saad Mekkassi for comments. The team is especially grateful to Participants in the Seventh Annual Grant Partners' Workshop, November 18th, Thursday and Friday, November 21st -22nd, 2019 who provided useful input to validate and improve this document, as well as to Jean Benoit Falisse, Linnea Mills, and other project evaluators who explored the validity of this theory of action in specific projects, as the team developed the document.

		<p>solving, relational abilities, responsiveness to context)</p> <p><b>(3) organizational and operational capacities:</b> capability to manage and implement projects</p> <p><b>(4) analytical capacity:</b> ability to apply problem-driven approaches for results and other relevant technical competencies</p> <p><b>(5) adaptive capacity:</b> ability to course correct based on emerging knowledge and learning, new data and information, others' insights and changes in the context</p> <p><b>1b)</b> same as above however assessment is directed at 3 compact stakeholders and is not assessed on a 4-point scale. The unit is “yes or no” based on evidence of capacity development throughout grant in comparison to the qualitative baseline assessment.</p> <p><b>1c)</b> PDO level indicator; MERL Consultant assesses the % of the targeted proximate causes of service delivery failure with implemented corrective measures to which the project contributed.</p> <p><b>For aggregation at the portfolio level:</b> GPSA aggregates and analyzes assessments across portfolio, calculating the percentage of grant partners rated to have “improved” or “significantly improved”.</p>		<p>review and feedback.</p>
<p><i>Outcome 2:</i> <i>Civil society partnerships (lead grant partner and CSO implementing partners) and relevant public sector counterparts engage in collaborative social accountability processes that include citizens.</i></p>	<p>Percentage of GPSA grants in which civil society partnerships and relevant, targeted public sector counterparts engage in collaborative social accountability processes that include citizens.</p>	<p>MERL Consultants (Independent evaluators) of individual grants will assess the extent to which governments and providers collaborate with citizen groups in setting priorities, planning policies, designing programs, and/or managing, delivering, or monitoring service delivery.</p> <p>Evaluators will validate grant partner assessment of quality of processes in biannual technical reports.</p>	<p>Independent evaluation of individual grants, building on inputs from biannual technical reports, ISRs, ICRs</p> <p>Mid-year and annual technical reports, KIIs, compact level data such as meeting mins, action plans, etc.,</p>	<p>The MERL Consultant assesses this indicator at baseline (value is likely to be zero as the CSA process will be new to these stakeholders)</p> <p>Grant partners submit timely and complete biannual technical reports, reviewed by GPSA Secretariat and TTL in real time and by evaluator at mid-term and completion.</p> <p>MERL Consultant (Independent evaluators) assesses the progress and value of indicator at mid-term assessment and final evaluation and for annual RF updates.</p> <p>Project grant partners are strongly advised to use the GPSA standard</p>

				<p>model ToR outlining the requirements for the annual RF assessments, baseline, mid-term assessment and final evaluations. Grant partner contracts the MERL Consultant and ensures deliverables.</p> <p>GPSA responsible to review and feedback on all RF and evaluation deliverables.</p>
<p><i>Outcome 3: Collaborative social accountability processes are used to target proximate causes of service delivery failure to improve targeted service delivery.</i></p>	<p>Percentage of GPSA grants in which collaborative social accountability processes targeted the proximate cause of service delivery failure.</p>	<p>MERL Consultants (independent evaluators) of individual grants will assess the extent to which collaborative social accountability processes targeted the appropriate proximate causes of service delivery failure to contribute to improving upon existing service delivery chains and systems relevant for the political economy contexts such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Poor targeting of government actions to address citizens' needs</li> <li>- Bottlenecks in service delivery chains and public management.</li> <li>- Risks associated with the implementation of interventions</li> <li>- Asymmetries of power and other political risks that undermine the implementation of reforms and policies.</li> <li>- Supported stakeholder alignment</li> </ul>	<p>MERL Consultants will use multiple sources of evidence, including mid-year and annual technical reports, interviews with stakeholders, and survey of Bank Sector Teams, relevant sectoral documents, policies and strategies.</p>	<p>The MERL Consultant assesses this indicator at baseline (value is likely to be zero as the CSA process will be new to these stakeholders)</p> <p>Grant partners submit timely and complete biannual technical reports, reviewed by GPSA Secretariat and TTL in real time and by evaluator at mid-term and completion.</p> <p>MERL Consultant (Independent evaluators) assesses the progress and value of indicator at mid-term assessment and final evaluation and for annual RF updates.</p> <p>Project grant partners are strongly advised to use the GPSA standard model ToR outlining the requirements for the annual RF assessments, baseline, mid-term assessment and final evaluations. Grant partner contracts the MERL Consultant and ensures deliverables. GPSA responsible to review and feedback.</p>
<p><i>Outcome 4: Elements of collaborative social accountability processes are taken up by governments beyond individual GPSA projects.</i></p>	<p>4a) Percentage of GPSA grants in which governments seek to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Use substantive lessons for improvements of targeted policies, processes, and mechanisms;</li> <li>(ii) Sustain elements of collaborative social accountability processes</li> </ul>	<p>4a) Independent evaluation of individual grants will assess the extent to which governments sought to adopt, sustain, apply and/or adapt the lessons or elements of the CSA processes and sectoral lessons beyond individual grants.</p> <p>Evaluators will use multiple sources in their judgements, including documentation provided by grant partners in biannual</p>	<p>4a) Independent evaluation of individual grants, using survey of Bank Sector teams and interviews with government official and civil society partners.</p> <p>ICRs</p> <p>Survey of grant partners</p>	<p>The MERL Consultant assesses this indicator at baseline (value is likely to be zero as the CSA process will be new to these stakeholders)</p> <p>Project grant partners are strongly advised to use the GPSA standard model ToR outlining the requirements for the annual RF</p>

	<p>after the life of the project;</p> <p>(iii) Adapt insights from GPSA projects to scale them through programs or policies; or</p> <p>(iv) Apply elements of collaborative social accountability processes in additional localities or sectors.</p> <p>Note: this can be done through the government's own reform program, donor-funded programs, or Bank-financed programs.</p> <p>[Target: 25%]</p> <p>4b) Number of reforms in which GPSA projects have played a substantive role.</p> <p>Indicator 4b) is for the GPSA to assess and aggregate. This indicator is not for inclusion in project-level Results Frameworks.</p>	<p>technical reports, survey of Bank sector teams, and feedback from government and civil society partners.</p> <p>MERL Consultants will judge whether government uptake and/or expansion of elements or lessons from CSA processes are plausibly linked to GPSA grant and dialogue.</p> <p>Indicative survey questions of Bank Sector teams as input for evaluator:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Has any level of government, and/or any public sector institutions, introduced new social accountability processes in your sector besides those supported by GPSA grants?</li> <li>- Has any level of government, and/or any public sector institutions, new social accountability processes in other sectors using insights from the GPSA grant?</li> <li>- Survey and interview questions for grant partners such as the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- On which government reforms have you been consulted by government (any level), and/or any public sector institutions?</li> <li>- On which government reforms have you advocated a position with government bodies (any level), and/or any public sector institutions?</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>See MERL guide for other key questions for key informants or surveys.</b></p> <p>4b) Review of the reforms observed under the portfolio through all grant reports and evaluations to aggregate the total for the final number of reforms in which GPSA projects played a substantive role. Includes an assessment of the quality of evidence from reports/evaluations to determine the strength/proactive value of evidence to claim GPSA contribution.</p>	<p>or representative sample of grant partners</p> <p>Meeting mins and emails with relevant govt/WB stakeholders</p>	<p>assessments, baseline, mid-term assessment and final evaluations.</p> <p>Grant partner contracts the MERL Consultant and ensures deliverables. GPSA responsible to review and feedback.</p> <p>Independent evaluators responsible for assessment at completion.</p> <p>GPSA Secretariat responsible for fielding survey to relevant Bank Sector team and reporting results to evaluators and in aggregate.</p> <p>4b) GPSA Secretariat is responsible to assess this indicator or contract specific assignment for independent assessment</p>
<p><i>Outcome 5: The GPSA promotes learning and knowledge about</i></p>	<p>Percentage of pre-identified global intermediaries of knowledge in the social accountability space (e.g., funders, social accountability and M&amp;E advisors of INGOs, academics) who report that</p>	<p>Collect results stories from a sample of global partners</p>	<p>Baseline and methodology developed in programmatic independent evaluation</p>	<p>GPSA Secretariat</p>

<i>what works and does not for social accountability.</i>	collaborative social accountability has been applied to their model, programs or knowledge			
<i>Outcome 6: Vibrant global partnerships advance stronger social accountability community that can deliver collaborative approaches beyond direct GPSA grants.</i>	Percentage of participants from the Global South in GPSA forums and other events including hosted by the GPSA Knowledge Platform (distinguishing current and former grant partners and non-grant partners).	Data aggregated from registration for GPSA forum and learning events	GPSA Forum registration records	GPSA Secretariat
<b>Outputs</b>				
<i>Output 1: Civil society GPSA grant partners lead multi-stakeholder compacts.</i>	Percentage of GPSA grants with partnered compacts with involvement from at least 3 fit-for-purpose stakeholder groups	<p>Survey and/or interview questions for grant partners such as the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-How many compacts were included in the project? At which sites?</li> <li>-Which counterparts did you collaborate with in each compact?</li> <li>- How often did each compact meet?</li> </ul> <p>Review of documentary evidence of compact meetings, stakeholder attendance, emails, action plans, etc.</p> <p>Data reported by grant partners in biannual technical reports.</p> <p>Assessment of fit-for-purpose, aggregation, and analysis completed by GPSA Secretariat.</p>	<p>Survey and/or KIIs with grant partners or representative sample of grant partners &amp; other compact stakeholders</p> <p>Review of documentary evidence of compact meetings, stakeholder attendance, emails, action plans, etc.</p> <p>Mid-year and annual technical reports</p>	<p>The MERL Consultant assesses this indicator at baseline</p> <p>Project grant partners are strongly advised to use the GPSA standard model ToR outlining the requirements for the annual RF assessments, baseline, mid-term assessment and final evaluations.</p> <p>Grant partner contracts the MERL Consultant and ensures deliverables. GPSA responsible to review and feedback.</p> <p>Independent evaluators responsible for assessment at completion.</p> <p>GPSA Secretariat responsible for fielding survey to relevant Bank Sector team and reporting results to evaluators and in aggregate.</p>
<i>Output 2: Lessons from experience inform GPSA engagement.</i>	2a) Percentage of GPSA of grants in which lessons learned during implementation informed course corrections.	2a) MERL Consultants of individual grants will assess the extent to which relevant lessons have informed project design and course corrections and assign a value (number) for the lessons providing	2a) Independent evaluations for individual grants. Meeting and workshop	GPSA Secretariat assesses grant partner capacity at proposal. Grant partners submit timely and complete biannual technical reports, reviewed by GPSA

	<p>2b) Percentage of GPSA of grants in which lessons learned from other grants informed project design and implementation.</p> <p>2c) Extent to which the GPSA adapts its operational strategies and overall strategy using monitoring, reflection, research, and/or evaluation.</p> <p>Indicators 2b) and 2c) are for the GPSA to assess and aggregate. These indicators not for inclusion in project-level Results Frameworks.</p>	<p>details about the learning process and narrating an evidence-based account of each course correction.</p> <p>2b) GPSA &amp; Independent evaluator of the portfolio will review all the portfolio grants to assess the percentage of grants that met the indicator criteria. Includes an assessment of the quality of evidence from reports/evaluations to determine the strength/proactive value of evidence to verify the final assigned percentage.</p> <p>2c) GPSA &amp; Independent evaluator of the portfolio will judge the extent to which each of the GPSA's work streams (Operations, Capacity Building and Implementation Support, Knowledge and Learning, Partnerships, Communications, and Strategic Management) is able to justify its adaptive learning on a four-point scale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Well-Justified</li> <li>- Justified</li> <li>- Poorly Justified</li> <li>- Unjustified</li> </ul> <p>GPSA team will self-report in updates to the program document as well as required reports to World Bank Management, Steering Committee, funding proposals and GPSA Partners' Forum</p>	<p>mins for reflection</p> <p>Review of work plans and budgets</p> <p>Mid-year and annual technical reports, ISRs, ICRs</p> <p>2b &amp; 2c) through internal GPSA aggregation or independent evaluation</p> <p>Review of all grant partner final evaluations, reports and other GPSA Documents e.g., presentations of GPSA, updates, funding proposals, strategy and board paper documents.</p>	<p>Secretariat and TTL in real time and by evaluator at mid-term and completion.</p> <p>Independent evaluators assess grant partner capacity at mid-term and completion.</p> <p>Project grant partners are strongly advised to use the GPSA standard model ToR outlining the requirements for the annual RF assessments, baseline, mid-term assessment and final evaluations. Grant partner contracts the MERL Consultant and ensures deliverables.</p> <p>GPSA responsible to review and feedback.</p> <p>2b) and 2c) GPSA Secretariat and independent evaluator</p>
<p><i>Output 3: World Bank sector teams support meaningful engagement between civil society and government.</i></p>	<p>Number of grants for which World Bank sector teams supported engagement between civil society and government</p>	<p>Survey and interview questions for grant partners such as the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To what extent did the World Bank sector team support engagement between civil society and government?</li> </ul>	<p>Survey of grant partners or representative sample of grant partners</p> <p>Survey of grant partners or representative sample of grant partners</p>	<p>GPSA responsible for collating the documentation and collecting data from grant partners through bi-annual technical reports</p> <p>GPSA responsible for assigning independent evaluations and developing TOR.</p>