

## Global Partnership for Social Accountability (GPSA) Results Framework and World Bank Reporting System Indicators

### Operational indicators

The table below contains:

- The outcomes and outputs of the GPSA Results Framework for all the projects in the GPSA portfolio – these are considered operational as they are the responsibility of the project (first column).
- The GPSA Results Framework operational indicators, on which the GPSA is assessed at the portfolio level for aggregated data and results (second column).
- The standardized evaluative indicators corresponding to these outcomes and outputs (third column). An external evaluator will assess the results and values of these at the end of each project and include the findings in the final evaluation report. These will be localized to the project context (for sector, geography, etc.)
- The simpler standardized required project indicators that are used in the World Bank’s internal reporting system and included in the Project Papers (fourth column). The project grant partner collects the relevant monitoring data on these throughout the implementation period and provides the data to the Project Task Team Leader (TTL) as required Implementation Status and Results Reports (ISRs) and Implementation Completion and Results Report (ICRs). This data also feeds into the assessment by external evaluators for the final evaluations, in addition to the primary data they will collect.

Outcome or output	Portfolio-level indicators	GPSA Results Framework project-level indicators	WB Reporting System project-level indicators
<b>Project Development Objective (PDO)</b>	Percentage of grants that contribute to corrective measures taken by public sector actors to address proximate causes of service delivery failure.	Number of corrective measures proposed through collaborative social accountability processes that are taken by public sector actor(s) that contribute to addressing the targeted proximate causes of service delivery failure targeted by the project.  <b>Unit of measurement:</b> Number with a qualitative description of each corrective measure.	Actions have been taken by relevant public sector actor(s) that contribute to addressing proximate causes of service delivery failure targeted by the project through collaborative social accountability processes.  <b>Unit of measurement:</b> Yes/No

<p><b>Outcome 1:</b> Grant partners have improved capacity to engage meaningfully and collaboratively in policymaking and implementation and service delivery processes.</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 multi-stakeholder compacts.</p> <p>1b) Percentage of grants in which civil society actors, citizens and public sector actors demonstrate improved capacity to engage meaningfully and collaboratively together.</p>	<p>1a) The grant partners have improved their capacity to engage meaningfully and collaboratively with one another and other stakeholders in multi-stakeholder compacts.</p> <p><b>Unit of measurement:</b> Rating on a capacity scale of 1-4 (1) reduced capacity (2) no change (3) increased capacity (4) increased capacity significantly</p> <p>1b) Civil society actors (other than grant partners), citizens and public sector actors involved in the project demonstrate improved capacity to engage meaningfully and collaboratively together.</p> <p><b>Unit of measurement:</b> Yes/No</p>	<p>1a) Grant partners participate in GPSA partner learning events.</p> <p><b>Unit of measurement:</b> Yes/No</p> <p>1b) Number of people (per gender<sup>1</sup>) participating in training on collaborative social accountability approaches used by the project from the following stakeholder groups: -civil society -targeted public sector counterparts -citizens</p> <p><b>Unit of measurement:</b> Number, disaggregated by stakeholder group and gender.</p>
<p><b>Outcome 2:</b> Grant partners, civil society and relevant public sector counterparts engage in collaborative social accountability</p>	<p>Percentage of GPSA grants in which civil society and relevant, targeted public sector counterparts engage in collaborative social</p>	<p>2) Percentage of project sites in which grant partners, civil society, and relevant, targeted public sector counterparts have engaged in collaborative social accountability processes that include citizens.</p>	<p>2) Number of people (by gender) participating in the project's collaborative social accountability process(es) among the following stakeholders: -civil society</p>

<sup>1</sup> Discussions will be had on a project-by-project basis about any additional factors for disaggregation based on context-sensitive socioeconomic vulnerabilities.

processes that include citizens.	accountability processes that include citizens.	<b>Unit of measurement:</b> Percentage	-targeted public sector counterparts -citizens  <b>Unit of measurement:</b> Number, disaggregated by stakeholder and gender.
<b>Outcome 3:</b> Collaborative social accountability processes are used to target proximate causes of service delivery failure to improve targeted service delivery.	Percentage of GPSA grants in which collaborative social accountability processes targeted the proximate causes of service delivery failure.	Evidence of ongoing political economy analysis to identify and target the proximate causes of service delivery failure across project locations and administrative levels throughout the project life.  <b>Unit of measurement:</b> Yes/No	The grant partners involved in the project have identified and agreed upon the proximate causes of service delivery failure through a political economy analysis exercise.  <b>Unit of measurement:</b> Yes/No
<b>Outcome 4:</b> Elements of collaborative social accountability processes are taken up by public sector institutions and other relevant actors* beyond individual GPSA projects. *Other relevant actors can be NGOs, WB teams, funders	Percentage of GPSA grants in which public sector institutions seek to:  (i) Use substantive lessons for improvements of targeted policies, processes, and mechanisms. (ii) Sustain elements of collaborative social	Evidence of uptake* of elements of collaborative social accountability processes by public sector institutions and other relevant actors** beyond the project.  *As defined by the GPSA <sup>2</sup>  **Other relevant actors can be CSOs, NGOs, WB teams, funders.	Evidence of uptake* of elements of collaborative social accountability processes by public sector institutions and other relevant actors** beyond the project.  *As defined by the GPSA  **Other relevant actors can be CSOs, NGOs, WB teams, funders.

<sup>2</sup> With uptake we mean one or more of the following actions: 1) Use substantive lessons for improvements of targeted policies, processes, and mechanisms; 2) Sustain elements of collaborative social accountability processes after the life of the project; 3) Adapt insights from GPSA projects to scale them through programs or policies, or 4) Apply elements of collaborative social accountability processes in additional localities or sectors.

	<p>accountability processes after the life of the project.</p> <p>(iii) Adapt insights from GPSA projects to scale them through programs or policies.</p> <p>And/or,</p> <p>(iv) Apply elements of collaborative social accountability processes in additional localities and/or sectors.</p> <p>Note: this can be done through the government’s own reform program, donor-funded programs, or World Bank-financed programs.</p> <p>[Target: 25%]</p>	<p><b>Unit of measurement:</b> Percentage based on a score of 1-5 on the sustainability rubric as per the GPSA MERL guide.</p> <p>Each number relates to a percentage:</p> <p>1 = 0%</p> <p>2 = 25%</p> <p>3 = 50%</p> <p>4 = 75%</p> <p>5 = 100%</p>	<p><b>Unit of measurement:</b> Yes/No</p>
<p><b>Output 1:</b> Civil society GPSA grant partners lead multi-stakeholder compacts.</p>	<p>1a) Percentage of GPSA grants with CSO partner-led multi-stakeholder compacts with regular involvement from relevant stakeholder groups.</p>	<p>Percentage of CSO partner-led multi-stakeholder compacts* meeting regularly with involvement from relevant stakeholder groups.</p> <p>*This includes national/regional levels where there are multi-stakeholder compacts.</p> <p><b>Unit of measurement:</b> Percentage</p>	<p>Number of CSO partner-led multi-stakeholder compacts* meeting regularly with involvement from relevant stakeholder groups.</p> <p>*This includes national/regional levels where there are multi-stakeholder compacts.</p> <p><b>Unit of measurement:</b> Number</p>

<b>Output 2:</b> Learning from experience inform GPSA engagement and strategies.	2a) Percentage of GPSA grants in which learning and evidence informed course corrections.	Number of course corrections made during project implementation based on learning and evidence.  <b>Unit of measurement:</b> Number with qualitative description of the course corrections.	The project has made course corrections based on learning and evidence.  <b>Unit of measurement:</b> Yes/No
--	---	--	--

### Non-Operational Indicators

The table below contains:

- The outcomes and outputs of the GPSA Results Framework for the GPSA Secretariat – these are considered non-operational as they are not at the project level and the responsibility of the GPSA.
- The GPSA Results Framework non-operational indicators, on which the GPSA is assessed at the portfolio level for aggregated data and results (second column). The GPSA will conduct or contract out periodic assessments of the results and values of these indicators (approximately every two years).

<b>Outcome or output</b>	<b>Indicator</b>
<b>Outcome 5:</b> The GPSA increases awareness about what works, what does not work, and why for social accountability	Number of social media (twitter) engagements (shares, likes and retweets) related to GPSA-produced knowledge and learning content.*  *Disaggregated by type of engagement (share, like, retweet) and type of knowledge/learning product.  <b>Unit of measurement:</b> Number
<b>Outcome 6:</b> Vibrant global partnerships foster strong and diverse social accountability communities that can deliver collaborative approaches beyond direct GPSA projects.	Percentage of participants from the Global South in GPSA forums and other events hosted by the GPSA. *Disaggregated by forums and other events (webinars). <b>Unit of measurement:</b> Percentage
<b>Output 2:</b> Lessons from experience inform GPSA engagement and strategies.	2b) Percentage of GPSA grants in which learning and evidence on collaborative social accountability informed project design and implementation.

	<p><b>Unit of measurement:</b> Percentage</p> <p>2c) Extent to which the GPSA adapts its overall and operational strategies and engagement approaches based on learning and evidence from monitoring, reflection, research and/or evaluation.</p> <p><b>Unit of measurement:</b> Rating on scale of 1-4 as per the GPSA MERL Guide.</p> <p>1 - Does not adapt strategies or engagement approaches with poor/weak use of monitoring, reflection, research and/or evaluation evidence.</p> <p>2 - Adapts but based more on ad hoc factors rather than use of monitoring, reflection, research and/or evaluation evidence.</p> <p>3 - Adapts based on monitoring, reflection, research and/or evaluation evidence, but practice varies and is not institutionalized.</p> <p>4 - Adapts based on MERL evidence as an institutionalize practice.</p>
<p><b>Output 3:</b> World Bank counterparts support capacity development of and/or meaningful engagement between civil society and government.</p> <p>*Counterparts includes project Task Team Leader (TTL), WB Country Team members, and GPSA Secretariat staff.</p>	<p>Evidence that World Bank counterparts supported capacity development of and/or meaningful engagement between civil society and government through GPSA projects.</p> <p>*Counterparts includes project Task Team Leader (TTL), WB Country Team members, and GPSA Secretariat staff.</p> <p><b>Unit of measurement:</b> Yes, no or partial, as per the rubric criteria of the GPSA MERL Guide.</p> <p><b>Yes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The grantee report sections of their GPSA reports are positive about GPSA and TTL/WB support, with either satisfied or very satisfied ratings on the majority of or all the grantee reports.</li> <li>• The ICR section of “Bank Performance, compliance issues and risk to development outcomes” identify positive and specific examples of WB support to the project and note either really limited or no issues regarding major gaps and weaknesses here.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The evaluations identify specific positive examples regarding the support provided to the project by the TTL/WB country teams and the GPSA Secretariat and either very limited or no negative examples or gaps in this regard.</li> </ul> <p><b>Partial:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The grantee report sections of their GPSA reports are both positive and critical or negative about GPSA and TTL/WB support, with ratings are a mix of “satisfied” and those below and above “satisfied”.</li> <li>• The ICR section of “Bank Performance, compliance issues and risk to development outcomes” identify both positive examples as well as specific issues of gaps and weaknesses here; the balance of both are relatively equal.</li> <li>• The evaluations identify specific examples of both positive examples of support as well as a gaps or weaknesses that need improvement regarding the support provided to the project by the TTL/WB country teams and the GPSA Secretariat.</li> </ul> <p><b>No:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The grantee report sections of their GPSA reports are critical or negative about GPSA and TTL/WB support, with ratings as below satisfied on the many or all reports.</li> <li>• The ICR section of “Bank Performance, compliance issues and risk to development outcomes” identify specific issues of gaps and weaknesses here; even if there are positive accounts, the negative ones outweigh the positive ones.</li> <li>• The evaluations identify specific examples of a lack of support or weaknesses that need improvement regarding the support provided by the TTL/WB country teams and the GPSA Secretariat; even if there are positive accounts, the negative ones outweigh the positive ones.</li> </ul>
--	---