

**Global Partnership for Social Accountability (GPSA)
Results Framework Non-Operational Indicators Assessment:
Findings and Process Report
November 2022**

1. Introduction

The GPSA has developed and continues to test and iterate a Results Framework for the program with a set of targeted outcomes and outputs. This includes a set of both grant partner and World Bank indicators linked to the most recent version of the GPSA Theory of Action. In late 2020, a consultant was hired to support the methodology and operationalization of Monitoring, Evaluation, Reporting and Learning (MERL) including specific methodology and guidance for assessing each of the relevant indicators to be monitored and evaluated for the GPSA of the relevant indicators to be monitored and evaluated for the GPSA at the level of Secretariat and features of the Program outside of grant operations¹. These are referred to as non-operational indicators' and are the focus of this exercise (as opposed to operational indicators which were done in a different exercise and report by the same consultant in late 2021/early 2022)

In 2022 an independent and external evaluation of the GPSA (the Program evaluation) was commissioned to better understand its progress and performance against the Theory of Action and the Results Framework, amongst other elements. As a part of this exercise, the GPSA decided to use the available data and some limited primary data to assess the non-operational indicators based on the most updated Results Framework (2022).

This report provides an overview of the process and findings of exercise. It is intended to inform the Program evaluation and support strategic decisions on the future of the GPSA and the Bank's collaboration with civil society organizations (CSOs). The results and data from this assessment will be provided to the external contracted evaluators to inform the Program evaluation. It also provides an important institutional memory for interested parties that may need to reference and understand how the process this took place as well as observations on the dataset and exercise overall. It is important to note that there is an accompanying reference document (in excel) with more explanation, source evidence and other qualitative details about the findings and limitations.

The exercise demonstrated how the Theory of Action and Results Framework can be evidenced in practice, indicating that a) GPSA at the portfolio level can be assessed against the Theory of Action and Results Framework b) the results show the GPSA Secretariat is overall performing in line with the trajectory of the GPSA Theory of Action and its intended outcomes and non-operational indicators of the Results Framework. More consistent use of the methods and standardization of project and portfolio level assessment process over time will be needed to build on this preliminary evidence. However, as a first exercise (complementing the previous operational indicators exercise), it reflects good performance and promising potential for the GPSA. Specifically, this assessment, even within its limitations, evidences the strategic and practical value of GPSA Secretariat in terms of capacity building, fostering diverse partnerships, evidence generation, knowledge transfer, and adaptive learning to support its ultimate aims. To summarize, these are to invest in and support small-scale civil society-led collaborative social accountability grants to target proximate causes of service delivery failure and jointly problem solve with public sector and community counterparts in a diverse range of public sectors and countries.

2. Process Overview

This section provides an overview of the process of how the exercise was designed and executed including the objectives, scope, sample selection, methodology and limitations.

2.1 Objectives

¹ These mostly include the GPSA's knowledge, learning, capacity building and partnerships work streams.

- To contribute evidence for assigning how the GPSA is performing against its Theory of Action.
- To support the external evaluation of the GPSA by assessing and aggregating data against the updated GPSA Results Framework's non-operational indicators.
- To test the newly developed criteria for assessing Results Framework non-operational indicators.
- To support building of the GPSA evidence base and adaptive learning, in order to inform strategic evidence-based decision-making by the GPSA Secretariat and Board.
- To provide concrete examples and source materials on how to code the GPSA non-operational indicators for other stakeholders (i.e., MERL Consultants, GPSA/World Bank staff).
- To provide a detailed reference for the GPSA's institutional memory (i.e., the assessed dataset and the process and findings report).
- To provide relevant evidence for reporting to GPSA stakeholders.

2.2 Scope

This exercise focused on the non-operational indicators from the GPSA Results Framework are intended to be assessed at the Program level. They have not been formally assessed previously. These are provided below for reference. The other indicators meant for GPSA funded grant partner projects (operational indicators) are not included. Another exercise was conducted for this purpose in Sept 2021-Feb 2022 with its own separate dataset and report. For reference to all indicators, please see the completed revised Results Framework (updated in July 2022).

Table 1: Non-operational GPSA Results Framework indicators -

| Outcome or output | Indicator |
|--|---|
| Outcome 5: 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. Unit of measurement: Number |
| Outcome 6: 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). Unit of measurement: Percentage |
| Output 2: 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. Unit of measurement: Percentage 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. Unit of measurement: Rating on scale of 1-4 as per rubric below: 1 - Does not adapt strategies or engagement approaches with poor/weak use of monitoring, reflection, research and/or evaluation evidence. |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <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>Output 3: The 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>Unit of measurement: Yes, no or partial, as per the rubric criteria below:</p> <p>Yes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. • The evaluations identify specific positive examples regarding the support provided to the project by the WB TTL or WB country teams and the GPSA Secretariat and either very limited or no negative examples or gaps in this regard <p>Partial:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The grantee report sections of their GPSA reports are both positive and critical or negative about GPSA and WB TTL/Country teams support, with ratings are a mix of “satisfied” and those below and above “satisfied”. • 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. • 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 WB TTL/WB country teams and the GPSA Secretariat. <p>No:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The grantee² 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. • The ICR section of “Bank Performance, compliance issues and risk to development outcomes” identifies specific |

² Please note that ‘grantee’ is a term that has been used previously and internally at the WB GPSA but that the preferred term especially for external documents is ‘grant partner’.

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>issues of gaps and weaknesses here; even if there are positive accounts, the negative ones outweigh the positive ones.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 the negative ones outweigh the positive ones. |
|--|--|

2.3 Methodology

The method for assessing each non-operational indicator used the criteria and instructions developed by the MEL Consultant) hired to do this exercise, with inputs from two other GPSA MEL Consultants (as per the descriptions in the table above). The scope for most indicators was from 2019 with a couple of exceptions.

The main sources were key relevant GPSA documents (e.g., Theory of Action and Results Framework iterations, learning notes, portfolio reviews); key informant interviews (KIIs); and specific data related to GPSA social media engagement and the annual partner forums’ participants provided by the GPSA Communications Team.

Due to the limitations in the available data and the resources for this scope of work, there are some gaps and trade-offs. However, the process provided enough rigor and relevant data to assign values (or proxy estimates) to all the indicators and to aggregate the data. The methods for the Results Framework indicators are new and being tested, therefore are still a work in progress to be improved upon. This provided a good initial ‘test’, despite the limitations.

2.4 Limitations

Documentation and data quality: As with the assessment of operational indicators, the quality and ease of access to the internal GPSA data required took time to organize and access, more so than if there were stronger knowledge management systems in place. The quality of this data was also variable with certain gaps that could not be retroactively filled; this meant a couple of the indicators were not assessed in full as intended and modified.

Indicators: Some adaptations were made on the assessment of certain indicators in terms of scope and what could be feasibly assessed with the available resources and time – in particular indicators for outcomes 5 and 6 which had to be assessed on a more limited scope (see more details below under these indicators).

KII sample size and scope: The ten key informants were all from the GPSA Secretariat (former and current). Given the insider and tacit knowledge required to assess these indicators, this made sense as the main focus of KIIs and covered a large percentage of people who have worked closely for the GPSA over the program life (since 2012). However, there is risk of bias given that all have a vested interest in the GPSA and its success. Future exercises should also consider doing KIIs or survey (or both) with external to the GPSA Secretariat, including grant partner representatives especially.

Inter-rater reliability: As this assessment was completed by the consultant who developed methods and the first time they are being used, there is still a need in future for testing of inter-rater reliability of the methodology for all the non-operational indicators. This should continue to be tested as the GPSA continues to use the Results Framework and different parties assess (the GPSA team/consultants or external evaluators) the non-operational indicators.

Comparisons over time: It was suggested this be done each two years. However, it is important that the GPSA looks ahead to the next assessment and ensures certain data is collected and organized ahead of time that cannot be recreated. For example, GPSA events/forums participants is not possible to obtain or recreate, resulting in gaps in the analysis and assessment values provided.

2.5 Utility and validity

Despite the limitations and trade-offs noted above, there are several points to note that validate the usefulness and justify the validity of findings for the intended purposes this assessment and to support the evaluation data as follows:

- Even with limited primary dataset and documentation gaps, the exercise reflects the Results Framework non-operational indicators can be assessed using the new proposed methodology. Therefore, it provides a useful starting point for sense checking the indicators, methodology and the performance of the GPSA Secretariat against them.
- While some of the indicators rely on only one data source because of their unit of measurement and associated methods, the assessment triangulated across other sources to validate the values and findings as much as possible.
- The efficiency and quality of assessments of future non-operational indicators can improve and become easier so long as the GPSA plans ahead for the next assessment and ensures certain data is collected and organized in real-time that cannot be recreated. This also depends on a well-resourced MERL budget and improved internal knowledge management of GPSA data and documentation at the portfolio level, which needs targeted improvement (see section 4).
- This exercise also indicated where there could be some adjustment or editing of the non-operational indicators and methods in the future as it will continue to be iterated over time. It may not be preferred to make such changes now since considerable effort and time went into the updated Results Framework and the external evaluation is yet to take place. However, this document provides some reflections on changes that could be considered in future iterations and could be considered in line with the evaluation findings, but in advance of the next assessment of the non-operational indicators as to plan accordingly for data collection and documentation by the GPSA Secretariat.

3. Overview of Findings

The below table and section provide the assessed values for all the non-operational indicators. The source excel file includes more details on the analysis with detailed explanations for each indicator and scores, with limitations and a reference to the sources referenced with quotes and pages numbers. It is important to reference the qualitative information that is available in these files in addition to the percentage and numerical values to interpret a nuanced and comprehensive understanding of the process and findings.

Table 2: Results for assessment of non-operational indicators

| Outcome/output Indicator | Assessed Value | Other relevant units of analysis or considerations of note |
|--|--|---|
| <p>Outcome 5 indicator: Number of social media (twitter) engagements (shares, likes and retweets) related to GPSA-produced knowledge and learning content*</p> <p>*Disaggregated by type of engagement (share, like, retweet) and type of knowledge/learning product.</p> <p>Unit of measurement: Number</p> | <p>Total engagements: 228</p> <p>Breakdown: Likes: 138 Retweets: 88 Comments: 2</p> | <p>Aggregated based on 21 tweets from 2019-2021 on GPSA-produced notes and publications (out of 5,000 tweets)</p> <p>Top post for retweets (tied): GPSA in Review posted 12-15-21: 14 retweets GPSA Blog #1 posted 11-02-2020: 14 retweets</p> <p>Top post for 'likes': GPSA Blog #1 posted 11-02-2020: 20 likes</p> <p>GPSA account Twitter followers: 3,319</p> |
| <p>Outcome 6 indicator: Percentage of participants from the Global South in GPSA forums</p> | <p>2019 partners' forum (in person): no data available on non-sponsored participants and data on sponsored ones hard to</p> | <p>For Global North, the vast majority were participants from the US and then UK (with a few from Netherlands, Canada, Australia, France, Belgium, Spain, Italy,</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p>and other events hosted by the GPSA. *Disaggregated by forums and other events (webinars). Unit of measurement: Percentage</p> | <p>interpret. An estimate is that there were 70 participants from Global South (sponsored). But not possible to determine % because no overall participant figure nor for non-sponsored attendees.</p> <p>2020: N/A postponed and then cancelled for 2020 due to COVID-19 pandemic</p> <p>2021 7th partners' forum (virtual): 71% Global South (27% Global North and 2% unknown/unspecified); n=612 registered (data on attendance unavailable)</p> <p>2022 8th partners' forum (virtual): 82% Global South (17% Global North and 1% unknown/unspecified); n= 729 registered (data on attendance unavailable).</p> | <p>Denmark). It was very diverse spread for the Global South participants.</p> <p>There is upwards growth in participants in forums, however this was also impacted by the virtual from in-person switch, enabling more people to attend. There is not information on how long each participant attended though.</p> <p>The qualitative data is not part of this indicator measure (because it is a percentage). But there is consensus generally in KIIs that the participation of Global South and balance between Global North/South participants and presenters has improved (in terms of diversity and representation) with targeted efforts over the years since the forums began.</p> |
| <p>Output 2b) indicator: Percentage of GPSA grants in which learning and evidence on collaborative social accountability informed project design and implementation. Unit of measurement: Percentage</p> | <p>100%</p> | <p>The operational indicators assessment includes a detailed account of course corrections made in the sample of 15 projects. This supports this indicator measure since the vast majority of them made several course corrections during implementation based on adaptive learning.</p> |
| <p>Output 2c) indicator: 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. Unit of measurement: Rating on scale of 1-4 rubric.</p> | <p>3 - Adapts based on monitoring, reflection, research and/or evaluation evidence, but practice varies and is not institutionalized.</p> | |
| <p>Output 3 indicator: Evidence that World Bank counterparts supported capacity development of and/or meaningful engagement between civil society and government through GPSA projects. *Counterparts includes project Task Team Leader (TTL), WB Country Team members, and GPSA Secretariat staff. Unit of measurement: Yes, no or partial, as per the rubric criteria.</p> | <p>Overall: Yes</p> <p>This is determined based on 15 projects in the sample for the operational indicators' assessment as follows:</p> <p>Yes: 8 project (53%)</p> <p>Partial: 7 project (47%)</p> <p>No: 0 projects (0%)</p> | |

Below is a brief overview of key points of note for the analysis and limitations for each indicator.

Outcome 5 indicator

Overview: To determine the number of social media (twitter) engagements (shares, likes and retweets) related to GPSA-produced knowledge and learning content, the GPSA communications team provided a manual review of over 5,000 tweets on the GPSA twitter account from 2019-2021. The 21 tweets in the sample for counting the engagements were restricted to those tweets that specifically shared GPSA produced knowledge and learning content. Then tweets were also analyzed to identify the top ten tweets for the number of 'likes' and 'retweets' respectively. Overall, there were 228 total 'engagements' which included 138 likes, 88 retweets, and 2 comments.

Limitations: The relevant data was not readily available and centrally stored. It had to be done manually because the GPSA Secretariat does not perform routine analytics for tracking its social media engagement (twitter in this case). The delegated team members were very supportive in doing the work to provide this information. However, it took resources (staff time) while doing it manually is prone to human error while an analytics program could provide accurate and timely information on a regular basis.

Relevant quotes from KIIs related to outcome 5 overall:

- *"Webinars and Brown Bag Lunches are the most effective because we carefully plan and advertise – uptake was strong...If webinars are done well, they are a strong medium for learning and comms. Then they can be followed with blogs so the event can have a multiplier impact with comms and follow-on processes of influencing"*
- *"The things [for influencing] that are happening, it's because someone comes up with an idea rather than an operational plan on influencing, targeting, visibility - not systematic - there is still a lot to do as it can help us with other things too."*
- *"[For social media] we need to promote partners content to show engagement online and give more incentives to cross promote GPSA's stuff."*
- *"Visibility needs to be ongoing, and we need to reach other fora and platforms. The potential of GPSA events and research could be higher if there was more investment in that in a more proactive way."*
- *"GPSA can support as a convening body with INGOs to help and encourage their HQs or other offices to share info on CSA between them and for CSA practitioners in the INGOs across the world to join in the GPSA events and knowledge platform."*

Outcome 6 indicator

Overview: In order to determine the percentage of participants from the Global South in GPSA forums and other events hosted by the GPSA, the first step was to determine the available data. Upon discussion with the relevant GPSA focal points, it was decided the scope had to be limited to the annual partner forums because there was not available participant attendance data (and not by location especially) for other events such as webinars. As this assessment is meant to be done on a bi-annual basis, we limited the scope to go back until 2019 to capture relevant data from the forums since then – a total of three because there was no forum in 2020 due to COVID-19.

2019 partners forum (in person): data on non-sponsored participants was unavailable or non-grant partner participants (i.e., those from the WB, other INGOs/think tanks/academia, etc.). Therefore, determining the percentage was not possible for 2019 since there was no denominator of the total participants to calculate the percentage of Global South participants. The excel file provided for 2019 was hard to interpret in terms of the exact final number of sponsored participants, however **an estimate is 70 sponsored participants from the Global South.**

The data for the virtual forums in 2021 and 2022 was much more organized, robust and easy to interpret. However, it was based on registration of participants, not on confirmed attendance. This still provides a good proxy metric for comparing Global North and South participation and representation though.

2021 7th partners' forum (virtual): There were 612 registered participants, **with 71% from the Global South**, 27% from the Global North and 2% unknown/unspecified.

2022 8th partners' forum (virtual): There were 729 registered participants with **82% from the Global South**, 17% from the Global North and 1% unknown/unspecified.

Several KIIs expressed that the new virtual annual forums are helpful as they widen the potential for participants from everywhere (for access, cost, times, logistics) but there are also some downsides such as quality of engagement and lost potential for good networking and relationship building which is easier in person. There was not a consensus in the KIIs as to whether the face-to-face forums should resume or continue to be virtual. This is something for the GPSA to closely consider especially regarding this outcome/indicator.

Limitations: As mentioned, this is limited to GPSA partner forums, not all events and it also is based on registration data, not participation. If the GPSA is not tracking participant attendance (and their location) to its various events in real-time, it, it will not be possible to assess this indicator in the future for all events as intended.

Relevant quotes from KIIs related to outcome 6 overall:

- *"One key strengths of the forum, [it's] one of least northern white congregations seen in the World Bank. GPSA grant partners are almost exclusively Southern. So, [there are] folks on the panels that we haven't seen in other spaces. We try to balance for overexposure of some of the CSOs and actors who presented a lot before."*
- *"A lot more diversity now than before. Now about 80% of what is presented comes from grantees not just the academics and CSA practitioners that are very well known like ARC and WB. Definitely better than before. Interesting to go back to face-to-face and see if it shifts back or not."*
- *"We strategically moved the needle on this, and it's worked. It's not just regular people who would usually come but we widened it out and got the diversity in 2019."*
- *"It took a long time. By 2019, if you look at the forum, it's more all about grantees and the usual suspects are given less and less space.... Now at this year's forum it was all grantees at center stage and showcased."*
- *"I've been surprised at how well some of the forum events' work can lead to more conversations and research and can be a surprising well-placed mechanism for convening and ripple effects... when things don't only focus on GPSA but bring in lessons from the broader field, it's more credible."*
- *"We created a community of organizations with thought leaders of institutions, private sector and CSOs/NGOs...You can host events that will be attended by World Bank people, but because of our community, we had a lot of external partners engaged on an ongoing basis and helped build the social accountability field. I think the contribution of this was quite major."*
- *GPSA culture is not problem in terms of the attitude and intention but there are gaps - LGBTQ and disability – we haven't nailed it. Now targeting two new grants for support of LGBTQ."*

Output 2b) indicator

Overview: The assessed value is 100% of projects in which learning and evidence on collaborative social accountability informed project design and implementation. This was determined based on qualitative data analysis from the 10 KIIs with former and current GPSA staff and the document review. The logic is that the GPSA has made several changes over the years based on learning, which impact all grant partner projects in terms of their design and implementation. KIIs noted that the institutionalization and documentation of these processes could and should be better, but this happens organically and there is an intentional effort by the GPSA Secretariat to ensure learning and evidence from previous experience is reflected in all new projects in design and ongoing adaptation is supported during project implementation.

For example:

Changes in each GPSA Call for Proposals (CfPs) on the requirements, such as the shift to require grant lead organizations (often large INGOs) to partner with local CSOs or to include specific components across all of the grants (capacity building, MERL, etc.).

Sector-specific learning: the repeated experience of several grants in sectors of health and education especially mean that the GPSA has a wealth of trends and lessons which are applied in new projects in these same sectors. While the GPSA is expanding more in terms of sectors in recent years, several GPSA projects have been designed and implemented based on learning from previous sector experience. Also, the GPSA has published learning notes on health and education sector experience, based on its work across several grants, countries and partners.

GPSA capacity building support: The targeted capacity building support provided by the GPSA Secretariat through its capacity building and MEL advisors is also another element that enables adaptive learning at the project-level. For example, there is an intensive process the grant partners go through after their initial application is accepted, in the project design stage to develop the Project Paper. During this process, GPSA team members provide concrete inputs based on their experience and evidence from other similar projects and sectors. During implementation, the capacity building advisors continue provide targeted support to grant partners, for example on approaches to CSA and through the annual grant partner workshops. This is also informed by their previous experience and GPSA evidence and learning. GPSA advisors work with project teams directly to connect the dots and gather learning and information on the ground, in addition to the grant partner reports/

Revisions to the GPSA Theory of Action and Results Framework: As the guiding foundations of the GPSA and all of its projects, the continuous analysis and updates of these over the years impact the design and implementation of all projects. This is evidence of the practice of continuous adaptive learning efforts made by the GPSA Secretariat.

Limitations: This is not based on a project-by-project review to verify this in more granular detail (out of scope and resources for this assignment). Also, it would be very challenging due to documentation gaps on the projects in design stage to be able to see how this was done pre-Project Paper. For during implementation, it would be easier as project reports ask grant partners to list how they are course correcting and adjusting project implementation based on adaptive learning.

There is some bias potential in the KIIs as they are all internal GPSA. However, the key informants provided many sound examples that can be substantiated while the logic makes sense since some changes such as changes to CfPs and revisions to the Theory of Action and Results Framework do impact all projects. It would also likely be quite challenging for those external to the GPSA to comment on internal processes and changes of this nature for the design phase. For implementation, one could interview grant partners on their experience and views of the GPSA in this regard.

Output 2c) indicator

Overview: The assessment method for assessing “the 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,” is based on a rubric. This encompassed a qualitative review of the relevant GPSA strategic and program documents and KIIs on relevant data and examples that demonstrate how and how well the GPSA is doing this over time. The scope for this one is since the GPSA started, since it has never been assessed and the data available allowed for this timeframe. The consultant’s tacit knowledge of the GPSA since she started worked with the team in late 2020, also helped with the assessment given her first-hand experience with the Secretariat and gained through developing the MERL guide and the other deliverables until now, which required in-depth review of several documents and projects and a firm understand of the GPSA’s evolution and adaptive learning trajectory.

The **score of 3** provided reflects that the GPSA “Adapts based on monitoring, reflection, research and/or evaluation evidence, but practice varies and is not institutionalized.” This is backed up by both the documents and KII perspectives offered. The examples provided for indicator 2b) above are also relevant for this indicator and therefore not repeated in detail again here (i.e., changes to CfPs; capacity building, sector-specific learning and revisions to the GPSA Theory of Action and Results Framework). Other examples relevant to this indicator are:

- **Learning Notes:** The GPSA team has invested in compiling learning based on CSA experience, grant making capacity building, and sector-specific learning and developing published learning notes (16) which are also publicly available for others on the GPSA website (partners, CSA practitioners, etc.).
- **Weekly team meetings:** these allow for some time to reflect with the team is another way larger changes are informed, but these are not all documented or organized in a consistent way.
- **Project-level evaluations and portfolio reviews:** this have informed the GPSA’s overall efforts and positioning.
- **Ongoing research that the GPSA** commissions or is a part of such as [CEDIL](#) also support this.
- **Project reports from grant partners and the ICR/ISRs** (when they are done well) help inform the knowledge and learning priorities and focus for GPSA planning and resource allocation.
- **The MERL Guide:** an in-depth iterative process to standardize this across grants more for quality and consistency and ensure MERL can be used effectively for comparisons and aggregations at the portfolio level to support more robust learning and evidence to inform decision-making/adaption.

The general consensus amongst KIIs was that adaptation at the Program-level (strategies, approaches, etc.) based on learning and evidence happens and is intentional. However, the documentation of these changes, the mechanisms, and the processes are not well-institutionalized and more ad hoc with specific initiatives often driven by key individuals in the team. It could also be done more quickly, efficiently. Updates/revisions to core GPSA documents and the finalization of key learning documents take a long time to go through the various processes of approval which can be a hinderance to timely changes and the publication of knowledge and learning content, so it is made available in a timely manner and is still relevant.

Limitations: Based on one person's assessment of the qualitative data to determine the rubric score - might be different if another person reviewed. The KII sample for the GPSA is a decent size and range in terms of staff (positions, seniority, time with the GPSA). However, it doesn't include any stakeholders outside the core GPSA team for external opinion/views - this type of information might be challenging for an external stakeholder to know details about. That said, future assessments of this indicator could seek to interview others such as GPSA board members and grant and non-grant partners who have long-term experience with the GPSA.

Relevant quotes from KIIs related to output 2 overall:

- *"One hundred percent of new projects build on, learn from and reflect what is learned by others [projects and evidence] ...but it's not optimal. I would still wish we had a glossary of lessons learned that we could reference as a checklist...But I think we are good at bringing lessons from previous calls into new ones consistently."*
- *"The first and second round of grantees were really important to shape our CSA work in health and education and connecting with governments and reforms and who to work with in different countries and finding policy entry points and mechanisms existing in ministries... We took that experience and tried to understand where we can make a difference at central level."*
- *"GPSA focus on lessons from the key sectors like health and education mostly and to use that in the new projects. It gave us more info on quality of proposals based on our experience supporting other ongoing projects in these sectors."*
- *"The 4th CfP recognized that previous projects weren't taking advantage of presence of the project within the context of bigger World Bank projects in country so they would be aligned and co-financing to demonstrate this investment of the World Bank in addition to the GPSA grants. This was a reflection of the learning at a programmatic level. The 4th CFP was a nod to that leverage of additional investment and systems even if the GPSA is small grants."*
- *The Theory of Action and its evolution over time is "a codification of the practices that we started to learn from our grantees"*
- *"No documented system and method [for adaptive learning] We don't do it systematically. But the absence of documents and a codified system does not translate to poor results in us doing that."*
- *"[Adaptive learning is] not very institutionalized or well-documented - more ad hoc."*
- *"The GPSA portfolio review in 2016 also helped focus the capacity building support. We had identified the direction in which the ToA had to go and what wasn't working and, in the Results Framework, and M&E. But when we looked at ops/management situation, we knew that we could start raising the issue but wouldn't see change immediately. So, we built a gradual path to change until things were aligned to go full force. You can definitely see this trajectory. "*

Output 3 Indicator

Overview: To assess if there is "Evidence that World Bank counterparts³ supported capacity development of and/or meaningful engagement between civil society and government through GPSA projects," the consultant reviewed project level documentation in addition to KIIs. The document review of the 15 sample projects from the operational indicators' assessment provided details and examples of the types of support received from WB counterparts for each project (especially from grantee report sections specially on support from WB, ICRs and final evaluations). The overall assessment of **Yes** is based on this review in which 8 projects received a 'yes' and 7 received a 'partial' and none received a 'no'. The triangulated KII data also reinforces this balance and the strengths and gaps identified in the project document review.

Limitations: This was a quite in-depth review of the documentation per project in the sample however some of the projects had gaps on ICR completion and quality and evaluations did not all mention this aspect. However, it was generally quite thorough. It was also backed up by the KIIs data with a general consensus that it is 'mixed' for TTLs support so this overall % split for the projects (8 yes/7 partial) is reasonable.

At present, the indicator is not designed to assess the different counterparts separately (GPSA, TTLs and CMUs) so this means that the assessment is not disaggregated in this way. Rather the evidence is compiled and analyzed related to these three key stakeholders to determine the overall appraisal of "yes", "no", or "partial" value, based on the criteria for the indicator, as outlined in Table 1 above.

³ These WB counterparts are specific to the GPSA, i.e., those with the WB that the GPSA Program and its projects interact with and rely on for support to implement GPSA grant partners' projects and ensure the Program can meet its intended outcomes and outputs. These are usually WB TTLs and WB CMUs working specifically in the countries of GPSA programming, and TTLs assigned to the GPSA's grant partner projects.

TTLs The consensus was that they are key to projects and can be critical to their success, especially with brokering Government relationships and entry points, when TTLs are motivated and enabled to provide needed support. However, the experience to date is mixed with some positives and some less successful examples of TTLs' support. **Key challenges were cited as:**

- The GPSA very different program for the WB and many TTLs are not used to it or aware of CSA.
- Some TTLs see the support as checkbox and doesn't fit with their agenda and their skillsets differ
- TTLs have large portfolios with much larger WB investments in-country so getting requisite time and attention on a GPSA grant can be challenging.
- The incentives are not aligned for the kind of support the GPSA really needs from TTL. Issues on payment for their time (20K) and the priority they give as a result. So, the GPSA has to work hard in many cases to keep their attention and get them to support grant partners and the GPSA projects.
- There is also often turnover of TTLs which hinders the consistency of support to grants. Then new TTLs must be sensitized and engaged to the GPSA, CSA, the grant partners and the project.

While many issues expressed about TTLs and the challenges, KIIs emphasized that when it works, it's very effective and there were specific examples of this provided.

GPSA secretariat: The general consensus in KIIs is that GPSA Secretariat support is high-quality, intensive and an essential function. This is also relevant for trying to increase and coordinate TTL engagement. But it's a lot of work and heavy lift for the team to do this. The resources and plans for GPSA capacity building/technical support vary by grant depending on their needs and resources available tailored to each grant, not the same for all. The GPSA Secretariat is very important for continuity of support to projects and grant partners because if TTL or the manager of the TTL changes, the GPSA has a mandate and overview that doesn't change. When it works, the triangular design of GPSA Secretariat, TTL/CMU and grant partners' engagement for supporting projects is quite effective.

Lastly, a couple of key informants noted that cuts to GPSA consultant budgets along with the growth of the portfolio since 2018, means that capacity building support for many more grants with less resources, so had to be lighter touch support and this resourcing should be considered carefully for future. Also, GPSA team members have not been able to travel since 2020 due to COVID-19 which has limited the type of hands-on support possible in the past 2.5 years.

Limitations: There were more favourable views of the GPSA support expressed in KIIs. There is inherently some bias as all interviewees were/are GPSA staff. This indicator assessment would benefit from external KIIs, especially TTL and grantee perspectives in future exercises to balance the perspectives and mitigate bias (although there would still be a power dynamic risks of bias because of donor the grantee relationships). Similarly for the questions in grant reports on GPSA/WB support to the projects – these asks grant partners to rate and provide feedback, which is helpful and good practice. However, it might mean that responses are not completely candid. A more anonymous method like an annual survey online would be another means to consider gathering more insights from partners on the quality and consistency of GPSA/WB support. The documents reviewed were a good triangulation source for examples of GPSA support and the majority of grant partners and evaluations (where applicable) rated this quite favorably.

Relevant quotes from KIIs related to output 3 overall:

- *"Compared to other trust funded World Bank projects, never seen such intense follow-up and support to grantees, on the technical side too...The attention to detail is very high and regular weekly meetings regarding all projects, knowing if things are on and off track, the assignment of*

capacity building leaders and the resources allocated to it by the GPSA. We are doing our best and always room to be more effective..."

- "Capacity building advisors are great resources and have been in the roles a long time, and the quality of support and advice are extremely beneficial. Also, very responsive and proactive in reaching out and anticipating them to be ready to provide advice through 1-1 calls and regular check ins... the level of support depends on the project and partner and dynamics, but I think it works very well...A flexible approach to see the needs and then provide based on this so it's not very structured as it's more case by case, which is an advantage..."
- "TTLs are so important. They play a critical role, and it is very intentional for the project support. Without them, as GPSA, it would be more difficult."
- "Maybe 50-60% of TTLs were connected to grantees and [made] conscious efforts to help the project and connect to reforms, etc. the rest were quite absent or TTLs changed a lot."
- "The GPSA becomes the conduit and sometimes we have to ask for TTLs to support or escalate to management. We can't broker relationships with Government, we need TTLs and CMUs to do this, but we need the GPSA for this conduit or we would lose the follow-up. So highest quality and consistency [for support is] with GPSA Secretariat and [it is] ad hoc and case by case more so with TTLs and CMUs."

4. Observations and recommendations

The following table provides some observations that the consultant documented through undertaking this exercise regarding the process, knowledge management, data access and quality. Where relevant or possible, there are recommendations included that could be considered in general related to relevant data/evidence the GPSA Secretariat should track and document and for future Results Framework assessments and evaluations. These should be read alongside the report and table of observations and recommendations provided for the operational indicators' assessment exercise.

Table 3: Key observations and recommendations

| Topic | Observation | Recommendation |
|--|---|---|
| Access and availability of evidence/data | As with the assessment of operational indicators, the quality and ease of access to the internal GPSA data required took time to organize and access, more so than if there were stronger knowledge management systems in place. The quality of this data was also variable with certain gaps that could not be retroactively filled; this meant a couple of the indicators were not assessed in full as intended and modified. | This can be improved with ongoing tracking and central storage of key metrics – especially for participant and attendance information for all GPSA events and social media analytics. Recently a weekly dashboard for the GPSA website stats was compiled, but this should be done regularly for socials as well (at least twitter). |
| Documentation of processes and decision making | The findings on the use of learning and evidence for adaptation (output indicators 2b and 2c) show good evidence for these practices and that they are intentional. But there are gaps in terms of how they are documented both in terms of the processes/mechanisms and the recording of key changes/decisions. The processes and mechanisms could also be more institutionalized as they may be dependent on specific individuals and initiatives rather than fully embedded. | GPSA to consider how to better institutionalize and standardize the documentation of the processes for and key decision making/changes based on learning and evidence. This could be a simple excel file that is updated on a quarterly basis supported by a team reflection exercise in which the key processes, learning and decisions (strategic, etc) are discussed and recorded. |
| GPSA grant partner feedback on WB/GPSA support | While the grant project reports are a good source for feedback on WB/GPSA performance and support from the grant partner perspective, | A more anonymous method like an annual survey online would be another means to consider gathering more insights from |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | (and should be continued) there is risk of social desirability bias issue due to the inherent grant partner/donor power dynamic. | <p>partners on the quality and consistency of GPSA/WB support.</p> <p>All evaluations could include this as a theme with lines of inquiry for independent evaluators to also assess (for all counterparts). For example, a standard key evaluation question for all GPSA project evaluations (and ToRs) could be:</p> <p>"What evidence is there that the key GPSA WB counterparts of the project (GPSA Secretariat, the project TTL and the WB CMU in the country of the project) supported capacity development of and meaningful engagement between the grant partner, and their CSO partners and government through this GPSA project? What worked well and what could have been done better?"</p> <p>Future non-operational indicator assessments/evaluation should include KIIs with grant partners, TTLs and other relevant people external to the GPSA Secretariat for a more balanced view.</p> |
| Measurement of Outcome 5 (The GPSA increases awareness about what works, what does not work, and why for social accountability) | While the indicator unit is a number, qualitative data that could support this outcome measure, would be external views (outside GPSA) about how/if the GPSA is increasing awareness on collaborative social accountability and 'what works' and also perceptions on the influence of GPSA in this regard. Social media engagement only provides a limited view of this outcome. | Consider adding another non-operational indicator to widen the scope of this outcome measure with other data sources, including qualitative. |
| Social media engagement | The GPSA's twitter account is quite limited in terms of engagement by others, at least on the GPSA produced content, with the highest number of likes for a tweet being 20 and the highest number of retweets being 14. Only 2 comments were posted on the 21 tweets in the sample. | If this measure for outcome 5 is to be more reflective of the GPSA's influence, the engagement on social media should be more closely analyzed with targeted strategies and more actions for increasing engagement by others on the platform |
| Outcome 6 indicator definition | The definition of Global North and South in terms of participation in events could be better articulated to be clear about: a) What are the countries that are considered Global South/North? b) For a participant what constitutes this: their citizenship, location of work, organization, other? | GPSA to discuss and decide on this and then integrate it into the indicator definition in the Results Framework and its method for assessments in future. |
| Documentation/data of GPSA events participation. | In order to reliably track participation in all annual forums and all GPSA hosted events (as per the indicator for outcome, there should be a more standard tools and central storage of this information. This should include info on actual | This will need to be improved in future for forums and ideally all events tracking if this indicator is to be accurately assessed. |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>attendance not just registration as well as the location of the participants (for Global North/South identification to be possible).</p> | <p>The GPSA Secretariat team could also inquire and learn from approaches of other WB actors that host forums regularly.</p> <p>For example, there are Zoom features that asks for people to fill basic info when they log onto a Zoom session (country, org, name, etc.) before getting into the session.</p> <p>Even though this is a percentage measure and doesn't require qualitative data, KII's from grant partners and GPSA partners/stakeholders would also help round out the perspectives on inclusion and diversity in GPSA partnerships, forums and events.</p> |
|--|---|--|