Using the SDGs as a shared framework for results: demonstrating good practice
SDG Indicator 4.1.1: Education Proficiency
Draft technical report

This technical report examines challenges and opportunities relating to alignment, measurement and use of SDG 4.1.1 (proficiency levels) in development co-operation, from a global perspective and from the perspective of two case study countries: Ethiopia and Myanmar.
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Introduction

This technical report is part of a broader case study project covering three Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) targets related to education, sanitation and energy. Purpose of the project is to generate evidence, analysis and good practice examples of how development co-operation providers and partners can concretely use the SDG framework as an entry point for co-ordinating around, investing in and using country-led results frameworks and data which are aligned to the SDGs from both a technical/methodological and an organisational/political perspective.

This report examines challenges and opportunities relating to alignment, measurement and use of SDG 4.1.1 on proficiency levels at primary and lower secondary education, from a global perspective and from the perspective of two case study countries: Ethiopia and Myanmar. The report starts with a presentation of the global profile of Indicator 4.1.1 (Section 1), setting out the current global context for measurement of SDG 4.1.1 (sub-section 1.1), and then providing a detailed analysis of the extent to which development co-operation providers have aligned to this indicator in their corporate results frameworks (sub-section 1.2). Section 2 provides an analysis of challenges and opportunities related to alignment, measurement and data use in relation to SDG 4.1.1 in Ethiopia and Myanmar. The report ends with suggesting recommendations for development co-operation providers to support enhanced alignment, measurement and use of SDG 4.1.1 (Section 3). Three annexes present the country contexts, an assessment of results indicators, and the project’s underlying methodology, respectively.

The research work was conducted by the OECD/DAC Results team with the support of Finland and Australia as donor focal points in Ethiopia and Myanmar respectively. A steering group and technical experts accompanied the project, helping to design the concept and methodological approach and reviewing documents.

Broader findings from across the three SDG case studies will be presented in a synthesis document by June 2019.
1. SDG Indicator 4.1.1 – Global profile

**Goal 4: Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all**

Target 4.1: By 2030, ensure that all girls and boys complete free, equitable and quality primary and secondary education leading to relevant and effective learning outcomes

Indicator 4.1.1: Proportion of children and young people: (a) in grades 2/3; (b) at the end of primary; and (c) at the end of lower secondary achieving at least a minimum proficiency level in (i) reading and (ii) mathematics, by sex

- Minimum proficiency in mathematics, by education level and sex (%)
- Minimum proficiency in reading, by education level and sex (%)

1.1. Global SDG Measurement and Reporting

Motivated by the significant achievements in expanding access to education since 2000 against the education-related Millennium Development Goal (MDG), the international community placed greater emphasis on learning outcomes and lifelong learning in the 2015 Incheon Declaration (WEF, 2015[1]). This evolution was reflected in the new Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) on Education and, to a great extent,[1] guided the priority results monitored under SDG 4. SDG indicator 4.1.1 places the focus on learning outcomes (quality) along three points in time across the educational cycle, i.e. early grades, end of primary education, end of lower secondary education.[2]

The United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) Institute of Statistics (UIS) (UNESCO, 2018[2]) is the custodian agency for most of the SDG 4 global indicators, including 4.1.1, with the Organisation for Economic Development and Co-operation (OECD) as partner agency.[3] UIS is coordinating efforts to establish common reading and mathematics scales for all three points of indicator 4.1.1, building on the existing cross-national assessments. These cross-national assessments are used to assess student proficiency for 4.1.1a (early grades), 4.1.1b (end of primary) and 4.1.1c (end of lower secondary). Currently, most of the available data against indicator 4.1.1 comes from the following cross-national assessments:

---

1 Together with the Framework for Action adopted by UNESCO Member States in November 2015.


3 The United Nations Children’s fund (UNICEF) is the custodian agency for indicator 4.2.1 (proportion of children under 5 years of age who are developmentally on track in health, learning and psychosocial well-being, by sex) and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) for 4.b.1 (volume of official development assistance flows for scholarships by sector and type of study). The OECD is a partner agency for all the SDG4 global indicators with the exception of 4.b.1, for which it is the custodian agency.
- Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) reading test;
- Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS);
- Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS);
- Programme d’analyse des systèmes éducatifs de la CONFEMEN (PASEC), or Southern and Eastern Africa Consortium for Monitoring Education Quality (SACMEQ) in English; and
- Tercer Estudio Regional Comparativo y Explicativo (TERCE), or Third Regional Comparative-Explanatory Study in English.

As of 2019, 137 countries reporting complete or partial data for indicator 4.1.1: (a) 94 countries report data for 4.1.1(a); (b) 69 countries report data for 4.1.1(b); and (c) 100 countries report data for 4.1.1(c).

**Figure 1.1. Global availability of SDG indicator 4.1.1 data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Component</th>
<th>Number of Countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1.1 A (early grades)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.1 B (end of primary)</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.1 C (end of secondary)</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Add the note here. If you do not need a note, please delete this line.

Source: UIS (2019).

Many countries administer their own national learning assessments. However, it is not possible currently to derive internationally comparable data for indicator 4.1.1 from most national assessments, as countries set its own standards (UN Statistical Commission, 2018[3]). UIS is currently preparing a Global Framework for reading and mathematics and developing approaches for equating or linking the data from certain national assessments to this framework. However, it is unlikely that measurements from cross-national assessments are administered in schools and thus only cover in-school children, with the exception of PISA for Development. Household surveys would be required to assess the proficiency levels of out-of-school children, which represent a significant proportion of the school-aged population in some countries. Such household surveys would be very costly and difficult to administer, and present additional methodological challenges, making the availability of proficiency data for out-of-school children unlikely in the next three to five years. UIS is focusing on improvement the assessment of proficiency for children in school in the medium term with an eye to expanding assessments to out-of-school children in the long term (UN DESA, 2016[17]).

---

4 It should be noted that these cross-national assessments are administered in schools and thus only cover in-school children, with the exception of PISA for Development. Household surveys would be required to assess the proficiency levels of out-of-school children, which represent a significant proportion of the school-aged population in some countries. Such household surveys would be very costly and difficult to administer, and present additional methodological challenges, making the availability of proficiency data for out-of-school children unlikely in the next three to five years. UIS is focusing on improvement the assessment of proficiency for children in school in the medium term with an eye to expanding assessments to out-of-school children in the long term (UN DESA, 2016[17]).
these equating/linking exercises will be available to inform reporting on 4.1.1 for all countries for several years. Parallel with these efforts, there is increasing demand from countries to participate in cross-national assessments and this indeed is the quickest route to expanding global coverage of the indicators in the medium and long term.

At present, data gaps for 4.1.1a, 4.1.1b, or 4.1.1c concentrate in particular regions, being more pronounced in lower-middle and low income countries in sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia. Out of the three sub-indicators, indicator 4.1.1a presents the most significant limitations in data availability. UNESCO-UIS is leading an ongoing data collection process, with data release due in February 2019 (UN Statistical Commission, 2018[5]).

Additional thematic indicators complement current measurement of SDG 4.1.1 to cover the full extent of the SDG target, and to build on available alternative data (Box 1.1).

---

**Box 1.1. Other thematic indicators complement SDG 4.1.1. measurement**

The *Education 2030 Incheon Declaration and Framework for Action* (UNESCO, 2016[6]) introduced six additional thematic indicators related to target 4.1. These indicators should be viewed as complementary to indicator 4.1.1 and are necessary to reflect the entirety of the concepts included in Target 4.1. UIS maintains a data repository for these additional indicators (UNESCO, 2018[7]). Data for these thematic indicators is generally available, although availability varies greatly among these thematic indicators (UNESCO Institute of Statistics, 2018[7]). The percentage of necessary data that is available globally against each indicator is given in parenthesis:

- **4.1.2**: Administration of a nationally representative learning assessment in (i) reading and (ii) mathematics (47.1%)
- **4.1.3**: Gross intake ratio to the last grade (19.3%)
- **4.1.4**: Completion rate (4.7%)
- **4.1.5**: Out-of-school rate (0.5%)
- **4.1.6**: Percentage of children over-age for grade (13.2%)
- **4.1.7**: Number of years of (a) free and (b) compulsory primary and secondary education guarantee in legal frameworks (61.3%)

---

5 This indicator has been categorized as a Tier III SDG indicator by the UN, meaning that it lacks a well-established methodology and sufficient data. A workplan is available which details UIS’s efforts to establish a methodology approach for this indicator (UN DESA, 2018[4]).

1.2. Alignment of the corporate results frameworks of development co-operation providers to SDG 4.1.1

In general, very few of the 14 assessed providers include corporate or country-level indicators measuring student proficiency. At corporate level, only two providers (US and New Zealand) use standard indicators that measure student proficiency (Tier 1), although only at one single education level each as opposed to the three different levels included in indicator 4.1.1. The European Union (EU) has a standard corporate indicator for youth literacy. Most corporate indicators are sex-disaggregated (Table 1).

Most donors favour indicators related to education access, such as enrolment, completion and retention at the outcome level, while the most common output (Tier 2) corporate level indicator measures the number of students supported by the provider. This approach reflects a prioritisation of concerns about expanding access to education preceding quality concerns, reflecting legacy effects of the related Millennium Development Goal (MDG) target.

Table 1. Summary of indicator analysis: extent of alignment of development co-operation provider indicators to SDG indicator 4.1.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Providers: Corporate Results Frameworks</th>
<th>Number of indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total no. of provider indicators at corporate level linked or aligned to SDG 4.1.1</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of corporate outcome indicators</td>
<td>18 (53%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of corporate outcome indicators that are a direct match with one of the sub indicators of SDG indicator 4.1.1</td>
<td>2 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of indicators referring to enrolment</td>
<td>6 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of indicators referring to completion</td>
<td>5 (28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of corporate outcome indicators that apply sex disaggregation</td>
<td>9 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of corporate output indicators</td>
<td>16 (47%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of corporate output indicators that are a direct match with one of the sub indicators of SDG indicator 4.1.1 (measuring numbers rather than proportion)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of corporate output indicators that refer to enrolment numbers</td>
<td>3 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of corporate output indicators that refer to completion numbers</td>
<td>2 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of corporate output indicators that apply sex disaggregation</td>
<td>11 (69%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: See Annex 2, Table A1 for source data and detailed performance per provider

---

7 See Annex 2 for a detailed description of assessed providers.

8 The DCD Results Team uses a three-tier model of results framework in which Tier 3 is understood as performance information, Tier 2 is understood as development co-operation results, and Tier 1 is understood as development results. For more information on this model, see (Engberg-Pedersen and Zwart, 2018)[19]

9 MDG 2 (“Achieving universal primary education”) had a single target, i.e. to ensure that children universally – including both boys and girls – will be able to complete a full course of primary education by 2015. To a great extent, providers’ current monitoring practices at corporate level still reflect that results measurement focus at corporate level, which is also easier to communicate and for accountability purposes.
2. Country-level analysis: alignment, measurement and use by partners and providers

This section analyses challenges and opportunities related to alignment, measurement and data use in relation to SDG 4.1.1 in Ethiopia and Myanmar. Analysis is based on fieldwork and desk-based research and looks at the partner country government and development co-operation contexts. For background on the overall situation with regards to SDG implementation and the institutional set-up refer to the country annex 1 for Ethiopia and Myanmar.

2.1. Alignment to SDG 4.1.1 in Ethiopia and Myanmar

Country alignment to SDG 4.1.1 is still weak in both countries

In Ethiopia, national development is managed by a series of Growth and Transformation Plans (GTP). The current GTP II (2015/16-2019/20) (Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, 2016[8]), which was prepared concurrently to the negotiation of the global SDG framework and includes several thematic indicators related to SDG 4 (Box 1.1), is not aligned to SDG 4.1.1, as it misses any indicators to measure student proficiency. It instead focuses on enrolment, completion, dropout, and repetition rates at several educational levels (see Annex 2, Table A2).

Ethiopia’s Education Sector Development Program (ESDP) V (Global Partnership for Education, 2016[9]) (2015/16/-2019/20) is better aligned to indicator 4.1.1, with increased focus in the education sector on equity and quality – though metrics still largely focus on access. In addition to measuring enrolment, completion, survival, dropout, and repetition rates, ESDP also includes indicators to measure school quality and student proficiency in both reading and mathematics (Annex 2, Table A2). However, proficiency is determined through national learning assessments rather than cross-national assessments, precluding international reporting against indicator 4.1.1. The government is planning to increase alignment with the SDGs in the next iteration of sector program.

Ethiopia’s Education Management Information System (EMIS) relies on extensive data collection at school and Woreda (district) levels. Quality and reliability of the data collected remains a challenge, and government is committed to increase data quality through investing in EMIS.

In Myanmar, the national development plan (Myanmar’s Sustainable Development Plan - MSDP) is not yet available for analysis but will be aligned to the SDGs. In the new MSDP, under goal 4 (Human resources and social development for a 21st century society), strategy 4.1 (improve equitable access to high quality lifelong educational opportunities) includes 10 action plans, amongst which 4.1.3 aims to “expand access to infrastructures necessary to enable access to education, ensuring gender and disability-sensitive services”. For this action plan, MSDP identifies SDGs 4.a[10] and 4.1 as directly relevant. Yet, indicator 4.1.1 is not yet measurable in Myanmar (Myanmar Central Statistical Organisation & UNDP, 2018[11]).

Myanmar’s National Education Strategic Plan (NESP) 2016-21 (Myanmar, 2016[12]) sets outcome goals for 2021, but does not include any indicators to measure these outcomes and none of the delineated outcomes mentions student proficiency.

---

10 SDG 4.a: Build and upgrade education facilities that are child, disability and gender sensitive and provide safe, non-violent, inclusive and effective learning environments for all.
Efforts are made to increase alignment in the coming years. A National Strategy for the Development of Education Statistics (NSDES 2019-2023) is being developed by the Ministry of Education with the support of UIS to align the national and sector plans with SDG 4. It reports SDG 4.1.1 as national indicator. The NSDES also provides a medium-term vision for a robust education data system and data management platform in the country: the National Education Statistics System (NESS). The NESS is to include four main data sources: learning outcomes data, administrative data, survey data and finance data.

The Ministry of Education (MoE) is also in the process of developing a National Education Indicator Framework (NIF) - to provide data against NESP and SDG 4. The NIF will include a comprehensive list of indicators which monitor the national education situation, and produce regionally and internationally comparable indicators as required for SDG 4. The NIF is further meant to identify data gaps and to provide guidance on data generation. Myanmar has identified 49 indicators for the NIF in which 11 are global indicators and 29 are thematic. The rest are additional indicators needed to monitor education sector in the country. In relation to 4.1.1 NIF includes the following 2 indicators:

- Percentage of children/young people in grade 2/3, at the end of primary and at the end of lower secondary achieving at least a minimum proficiency level in reading and mathematics
- Existence of a nationally-representative learning assessment in the early grades of primary (2/3), at the end of primary and at the end of lower secondary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: SDG 4.1.1 Partner country alignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Plan aligned to SDG 4.1.1?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. National plan (GTP II) does not include any indicators to measure student proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education sector plan aligned to SDG 4.1.1?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of sector level Results/ M&amp;E Framework?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG 4.1.1 Data availability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors’ analysis – See Annex 2, Tables A2 and A4

**Development co-operation providers are yet to align their country results frameworks to SDG 4.1.1**

In addition to the above standard corporate-level indicators, providers have developed additional results framework indicators for their country-level strategies for Ethiopia and Myanmar or sectoral strategies for education. Yet, alignment of their country level results frameworks to SDG 4.1.1 has not yet taken place.
In Ethiopia, none of the 59 outcome/output level indicators that providers use in the results frameworks of their country assistance strategies is fully aligned to 4.1.1. Five providers out of 11 (45%) include indicators that measure student proficiency or competency, but they diverge with 4.1.1 in the grade level at which proficiency is being measured, the assessed competency, or the targeted institutions. Four of these five providers specify that proficiency/competency is measured by national learning assessments. Many providers use additional indicators which are less aligned to SDG 4.1.1 and relate to enrolment, completion, dropout, survival and/or repletion rates, and the number of children enrolled in school or out of school. Alignment with national indicators is uneven: less than a third of the providers’ outcome indicators are a direct match with national or sector plans (15 out of 51 indicators). A five-donor pooled fund managed by the World Bank is particularly well aligned to government results indicators. Finally, a majority of indicators are disaggregated by gender, yet this is not systematic.

In Myanmar, only the Asian Development Bank (ADB) has an indicator in its country assistance strategy that measures student proficiency, though not aligned with 4.1.1. Finland and the World Bank each have an indicator for the administration of an education assessment in primary school. Most outcome indicators refer to enrolment and completion. At the output level, four providers measure the number of students benefiting from their educational intervention(s). All outcome (Tier 1) indicators are disaggregated by gender and some output (Tier 2) indicators are as well.

Table 3: Summary of indicator analysis – extent of country assistance strategy alignment to government and SDG indicators for education attainment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Providers: Country Assistance Strategies</th>
<th>Ethiopia</th>
<th>Myanmar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total no. of provider indicators at country level linked or aligned to SDG 4.1.1</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. of country-level outcome indicators</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of country-level outcome indicators that are a direct match with one or more of the sub indicators of SDG indicator 4.1.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of country-level outcome indicators that are a direct match with national or sector plan strategy indicators</td>
<td>National: 7</td>
<td>National: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector: 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. of country-level output indicators</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of corporate output indicators that are a direct match with one or more of the sub indicators of SDG indicator 4.1.1 (measuring numbers rather than proportion)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of country-level output indicators that are a direct match with national or sector plan strategy indicators</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. of providers</strong></td>
<td>11**</td>
<td>10***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See Annex 2, Tables A2, A3, A4 and A5 for source data

** Including Germany, Italy, Japan and Korea with no defined indicator at country level

*** Including Denmark, the EU, Germany, Japan and UNDAF with no defined indicators at country level.

11 Finland also includes indicators to assess school quality and teaching effectiveness. The United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) includes an indicator for the implementation of education assessments (aligned to thematic indicator 4.1.2).
2.2. Measurement and use of SDG 4.1.1 data in Ethiopia and Myanmar

*Measurement of learning outcomes in both countries is yet to be aligned with international standards*

Neither Ethiopia nor Myanmar currently administer any of the cross-national assessments necessary to report against indicator 4.1.1. Learning outcome data for these two countries are therefore not internationally comparable. The OECD’s *PISA for Development* initiative aims to increase the use of PISA assessments in middle- and low-income countries to monitor educational outcomes, including for monitoring progress on indicator 4.1.1 (OECD, 2018[11]). Currently Ethiopia and Myanmar are not participating countries, although both have expressed interest in joining future cycles of PISA.

In **Ethiopia**, *country-specific measurement of learning outcomes is well established, but the coverage and use of the resulting data can be boosted*

In Ethiopia, the government current focus is expanding to also include and assess education quality, but progress is needed to catch up with the evolution in priorities, and to monitor and measure learning outcomes better. At present, two types of national assessments are conducted: i) the National Learning Assessment (twice yearly – alternating grades); and ii) the Early Grade Reading Assessment (EGRA) (twice yearly - administered by MoE, previously by USAID).

The effectiveness of these national assessments on education in Ethiopia can be improved. In particular, issues related to coverage (e.g. language diversity) and quality still need to be addressed. Similarly, and within the context of the *Leaving No One Behind* agenda, more focus would be needed to ensuring disaggregated data from learning assessments (NLA and EGRA) is available in various locally-relevant disaggregation levels and used to strengthen equity. This requires more sophisticated and integrated (system-level) instruments capable of providing disaggregated results data and can comprehensively map the distribution of learning outcomes across the country.

To increase use, more also needs to be done to strengthen the feedback loop between the federal and the subnational levels regarding education policy planning and budgeting, implementation (subnational) and results measurement and analysis (both). Supporting the analysis of data produced through the EMIS will enable subnational staff at school and Woreda (district) levels to use the results data they collect more effectively, for both planning and decision-making. It is also essential that data is analysed and used to improve Ethiopia’s education system as a whole, as part of national policy dialogue and decision-making.

Most providers working in the education sector in Ethiopia coordinate their support relying on an education sector working group, which provides a strong platform for evidence-based dialogue with the government. The main mechanism of development co-operation support is based on a large, multi-donor programmatic approach, the *General Education Quality Improvement Programme for Equity* (GEQIP-E), managed by the World Bank and supported by DFID, Finland and UNICEF, among others. The programme covers both access and quality concerns, and alignment to national and sector results happens at outcome level, while relying on joint monitoring and measurement approaches for the programme.

---

12 Ethiopia only reported data on enrolment rates in the country’s 2017 Voluntary National Review (Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, 2017[20]). For both Ethiopia and Myanmar, data is available for five of the six additional thematic indicators (4.1.3, 4.1.4, 4.1.5, 4.1.6, 4.1.7 in the case of Ethiopia, and 4.1.2, 4.1.3, 4.1.5, 4.1.6, 4.1.7 in Myanmar).
Nevertheless, beyond that specific programmatic approach, there is certain proliferation of heterogeneous output and outcome level indicators included in the country-level results frameworks of the 11 providers working in the education sector. In most cases, the indicators do not find a match with partner country’s targeted results, and require parallel monitoring arrangements to gather the necessary results data related to the supported intervention(s) (see Table 3 above). None of the 11 providers included the SDG indicator yet in their country-level results frameworks as of December 2018, although some cover certain aspects of 4.1.1 as part of their sets of indicators.

**Facilitated by well-coordinated provider support, Myanmar’s current reforms aim to addressing gaps on availability and use of results data – and to align to the SDG indicator in the medium term**

In **Myanmar**, the government is also increasing the focus on learning outcomes, after much progress in improving access\(^\text{13}\). Gross enrolment rates have grown in recent years, with very high gross enrolment for primary education, and enrolment in secondary education raising from 45.5% to 64.1% since 2005; with equal male-female enrolment rates for all grades, and higher enrolment rates of women in universities (19% female students vs 13% male students) (UNESCO UIS, 2019\(^\text{12}\)). While progress in expanding access to education was encouraging, inclusion across the territory, drop-out rates before end of middle school and learning outcomes are still an issue (World Bank, 2018\(^\text{14}\)). Concerns about quality and effectiveness of education provision were reflected in the parliamentary approval of the National Education Law in 2014, and its subsequent amendments (MoE 2016).

To improve measurement of learning outcomes, Myanmar is reforming student assessments and examinations as one of the main focus areas of the **National Education Strategic Plan** (NESP) 2016-21. The strategic plan includes increasing developing classroom and school monitoring mechanisms, supported by enhanced staff capacities and underlying information systems (MoE 2016: 37).\(^\text{14}\) The Early Grade Reading Assessment (EGRA) and the Early Grade Math Assessment (EGMA) will be rolled out nationally, with the support of the Global Partnership for Education. This will allow MoE to centrally track achievements regarding Grade 5, Grade 9 and end-of-high school completion exams, and to perform national sample-based assessments. Such assessments are expected to provide useful evidence about the level of student achievement nationally. Yet, it is not clear whether data from sample-based assessments will provide internationally comparable data that can be used to track 4.1.1. Other concerns include the risk of fragmentation of proficiency measures\(^\text{15}\) as well as linguistic limitations that can affect the Early Grade Reading and Math Assessments in a country with around 90 minority languages.

The ten providers supporting Myanmar’s education sector are articulated by sector-wide coordination mechanisms, relying on programme-based approaches that help promote certain degree of harmonisation in measurement practices.\(^\text{16}\) The UN Resident and Humanitarian Coordinator manages the

---

\(^{13}\) Responsibilities for all education stages are concentrated in Myanmar’s Ministry of Education, with shared responsibilities with other ministries for early childhood care, and for technical and vocational training (MIMU, n.d.\(^\text{25}\)). Specifically, MoE oversees over 47,000 schools in basic education, enrolling 9.3 million students.

\(^{14}\) The end outcomes of these reforms (by 2021) include enhanced capacity of teachers and managers to successfully implement the National Assessment Policy and procedures, and strengthened coordination, management and monitoring by education personnel involved in assessments and examinations.

\(^{15}\) At the moment, there are multiple learning outcome measurements being used or in consideration, including: Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes (ASLO), EGRA/EGRA, Southeast Asia Primary Learning Metrics (SEA-PLM), Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), Secondary School Subsector (SES) assessment system.

\(^{16}\) Updated information on the sector coordination arrangements, division of labour, joined-up approaches to sector diagnostics and monitoring, can be found at the integrated monitoring platform: www.themimu.info/sector/education
Myanmar Information Management Unit (MIMU), which maintains a common database with various indicators from different sources (MIMU, 2018[7]). The MIMU database includes data on: literacy rate; proportion of the population with access to a primary/secondary school; primary/middle/high/secondary school enrolment ratio; primary school completion rate; proportion of pupils starting grade 1 who reach grade 5; and number of primary/middle/high school students. The most recent data available ranges from 2010-2016. However, as the assessment of learning outcomes in Myanmar is work in progress, as of 2019 the provider-supported MIMU database does not contain indicators related to learning yet.

Myanmar is creating positive conditions for an increased use of harmonised measurement of results around learning outcomes, supported by the government’s on-going reforms, its sector and statistical strategies in the education sector, and by the coordinated behaviour of providers operating in the sector. Nevertheless, reliance on an international SDG-based comparable indicator is still a (far) end goal, and development co-operation investments in building sustainable statistical capacity in the education sector are very limited.17

**Visualising the results chain for 4.1.1 in Ethiopia and Myanmar**

This section presents the available data against development and development co-operation indicators in each case study country and summarizes provider corporate results reporting practices. The two figures below use the OECD Results Community’s three-tiered results framework to present available results data that the research team was able to source18 for SDG and SDG-similar indicators in Ethiopia and Myanmar that are linked to indicator 4.1.1.19 Indicators from the above tables for which results data from 2015 or more recent years were available were included on the figures.

With the exception of some enrolment rates, results data were not available for most national development and sector plan indicators in Ethiopia. In Myanmar, the national development plan was not available for analysis and the education sector plan does not include indicators, thus no results data were reported by Myanmar beyond the MIMU data mentioned previously.

In addition to the country-level results data illustrated below, the African Development Bank, Asian Development Bank, EU, France, Germany, the UK, the US, and the World Bank Group (WBG) publish aggregate global results at the corporate level in annual reports or online results databases for at least one indicator linked to SDG 4.1.1.

---

17 The extensive portfolio of recent education projects reviewed for this report shows limited presence of activities or funding to build national capacity to gather and analyse education statistics, particularly those related to learning outcomes. Instead, most interventions focus on measuring the outputs and outcomes that can be attributable to the intervention (e.g. “number of children that have been schooled as a result of the project”). In general, Myanmar has received limited ODA for national statistical capacities, which have remained within the US$ 250,000-900,000 range per year since 2008, save for a one-off surge in support of the 2014 census. Germany represents a notable exception in the right direction, in approving a US$ 2.3 million grant in 2017 to support statistical capacity to strengthen SDG measurement in Myanmar.

18 Based on extensive web-research and follow-up with individual providers.

19 Additional draft results data were provided to the research team by Finland, but as these data are not yet finalised or publicly available, they have not been included in this document.
Ethiopia Development Co-operation in Education

Goal 4: Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all

Government
Sector Budget, 2016 USD

Education Budget

902 Primary and Secondary

2,373 million

$ DEVELOPMENT FINANCING FOR SDG 4

Provider Support
Accumulated ODA commitments for the period 2014-2017 (USD)

TIER 3
Norway
Japan
Finland
Korea
UNDAF
Italy
UK
Primary & Secondary
Education, Total

Provider Results
Development co-operation results data

TIER 2
United States
Germany
World Bank

649 million

TIER 1
466

National Results
Contribution to country results

74% students in grade 8 perform at a basic proficiency or above in English

68% students in grade 8 perform at a basic proficiency or above in Math

Multi-donor pooled fund aligns to national results data

1.2 million children supported to gain a decent education (2015-2018)

4 million learners received primary level reading interventions (1.8 million girls and 2.2 million boys) (2017)

15% of learners demonstrated reading fluency and comprehension of grade level text at the end of grade 2

Ethiopia: SDG 4.1.1
SDG data for policy-making

Providers: SDG 4.1.1
SDG data from Ethiopia for corporate results frameworks

GLOBAL SDG INDICATOR

4.1.1 Proportion of children and young people: (a) in grades 2/3; (b) at the end of primary, and (c) at the end of lower secondary achieving at least a minimum proficiency level in (i) reading and (ii) mathematics, by sex
Myanmar Development Co-operation in Education

Goal 4: Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all

Government
Sector Budget, 2016 USD

Education Budget

- 729 Primary and Secondary
- 968 million

National Results
Contribution to country results

- 5.1 million students enrolled in primary schools (2015/2016)

Data on proficiency in mathematics and reading by sex are not available


development financing for SDG 4

Provider Support
Accumulated ODA commitments for the period 2014-2017 (USD)

Tier 3
Japan
15
146 million

Tier 2

Tier 1

Japan
15

Australia
26

Germany
32

Denmark
30

Finland
16

UN
7

193,000 students are receiving stipends (54% f) (2016-2018)

84.75% of people aged 15-24 are literate (84.41% f and 85.12% m) (2016)

29% of final year upper secondary education students passing the matriculation exam (31% f and 28% m)

66.64% primary completion rate (69.63% f and 64.20% m)

70.92% lower secondary completion rate (76.61% f and 65.15% m) (2015)

Myanmar: SDG 4.1.1
SDG data for policy-making

Indicators national/sector results frameworks do not match SDG 4.1.1

Providers: SDG 4.1.1
SDG data from Myanmar for corporate results frameworks

Indicator included at country level do not match SDG 4.1.1

Global SDG Indicator
4.1.1 Proportion of children and young people: (a) in grades 2/3; (b) at the end of primary; and (c) at the end of lower secondary achieving at least a minimum proficiency level in (i) reading and (ii) mathematics, by sex
3. Conclusions and recommendations

The negotiations and definition of SDG 4 placed greater emphasis on educational quality given the progress achieved by 2015 in increasing access to primary education worldwide. The global measurement of SDG 4.1.1 builds on existing international assessments of proficiency and learning outcomes and seeks to incorporate national assessments, where appropriate, in a global scale aligned to the international assessments. A complex SDG indicator was required to adequately assess and compare internationally progress on reading and math skills for boys and girls over the educational cycle. This is done at three different points in time (i.e. early grades, end of primary school, end of secondary school), and the SDG indicator requires six different sub-measures to be fully estimated. Currently, 137 countries are able to report against SDG 4.1.1.

While international assessments and standards to measure learning outcomes exist, adoption of the related SDG indicator is still weak at country level. While Ethiopia and Myanmar are setting processes to be able to align to and monitor SDG 4.1.1, both countries are yet to adapt their national and sector results frameworks, and to overcome the limitations of their monitoring and statistical systems. Current key results indicators still have greater emphasis on schooling access and continuity – a MDG 2 legacy –, but sector reforms and planned activities in both countries seem to emphasise greater focus on learning outcomes in the medium term.

This report also shows that development co-operation providers are lagging behind in aligning to SDG 4.1.1, at both corporate and country level frameworks. In working in education sector results, providers are currently using a variety of indicators that are not adequately aligned to the SDG indicator, and only partially aligned to the two partner countries’ national results frameworks (at outcome level) and its monitoring/statistical systems. Sector co-ordination mechanisms and dialogue platforms with both partner governments are well-established, and some cases of programmatic approaches are helping in aligning and using partner countries’ results indicators; yet, providers’ specific sector priorities and results-based management practices have resulted in heterogeneous measurement approaches, which can benefit from greater harmonisation around SDG 4.1.1.

Data availability, coverage and quality are issues for all partners in both country cases, making difficult to use the results data for policy-making and resource allocation. Availability of disaggregated data is particularly critical in large multi-ethnic, multi-linguistic countries with difficult geographical features – particularly for service delivery administered at local and subnational levels. Yet partner governments may have political disincentives to expand data coverage or produce disaggregated data that could lead to societal grievances. And many of the assessed providers, despite their significant investments in the education sector, have not prioritised investments in building statistical capacity in the education sector beyond the boundaries of their interventions, contributing to fragmentation and inefficiencies in results measurement and use.

Current efforts by partner country governments and providers to prioritise education quality dimensions at strategic level, coupled with the pending transition from MDG to SDG indicators, can serve to motivate
sector-wide dialogue around results and joined-up measurement approaches to generate the level of data disaggregation on learning outcomes that is particularly required in countries with rich ethnic and linguistic diversity, and with significant regional disparities.

To that end, providers could consider the following suggestions:

**At partner country level:**

- Providers could pool efforts to support partner country efforts in implementing the cross-national assessments necessary to produce internationally comparable data for indicator 4.1.1.
- Providers should consider ensuring that indicators monitoring student proficiency measure achievement at the same educational levels as indicator 4.1.1 and/or the partner country’s national development plan/education sector strategy.

**At corporate level:**

- Providers should consider including indicators to measure student learning and proficiency in corporate and country-level results frameworks whenever possible – speeding up the transition from the MDG to the SDG agenda in the education sector.
- However, providers should ensure that a national or cross-national learning assessment is in place and able to produce robust data for the subject and grade level of interest, before including a learning/proficiency indicator in their country-level results framework.
- As a rule to prevent proliferation of indicators, and where this aligns to the partner country approach, providers should consider using and harmonising around the thematic/complementary indicators for SDG target 4.1 (see page 2) in both corporate and country-level results frameworks.
4. References
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Annex 1: Country Profiles

ETHIOPIA
COUNTRY PROFILE FOR SDG 4

Country context

With a population of 105 million and a population growth rate of 2.6%, Ethiopia currently ranks as Africa’s second most populous country behind Nigeria. Growing at an average annual rate of 10% over the past ten years, Ethiopia is one of the fastest and most consistently growing economies in the world. Employing 85% of total workforce and accounting for 90% of all exports, agriculture remains the country’s largest economic sector. With 85% of the total population living in rural areas, Ethiopia is one of the least urbanized countries in the world (182/194).

Despite recent democratisation efforts, Ethiopia still ranks 128 out of 167 in the latest democracy index. Political power and governance is largely decentralised, with the nine regional states being responsible for almost all types of public service delivery. In 2018, the newly elected Prime Minister Abiy Ahmed launched a campaign of political and economic liberalisation and sought to end the disputes with neighbouring Eritrea.

GDP per capita growth

7.56% (2017)

GDP per capita, PPP 1,899 (rank: 165/181) (2017)

26.7% of the population is living below the poverty line ($1.90 a day)

Population 104,957,000 (2017)

Education Snapshot

- In recent years Ethiopia has heavily increased its expenditures to the education sector as a share of total government expenditure (12 percentage points since 2000) and currently ranks as the country with the highest education expenditures as a percentage of total government expenditure (27%).
- While its recent economic success partially translates into educational improvements, Ethiopia still remains one of the most educationally disadvantaged countries in the world.
- Despite having increased its literacy rate by more than 22 percentage points since 1994, Ethiopia remains amongst the 15 countries with the lowest rate in the world, with an adult literacy rate of just 49%.
- While ranking among the top African countries for net primary school enrolment rates (85.4%), the country still scores relatively low for secondary enrolment (35.1%).
- Despite significant improvements, females and rural populations remain disadvantaged in their access to education, with 77% of all illiterate adults being female.

ODA at a Glance

Net ODA received in 2017 4,118 (USD million) 5.1% of GNI

Top 7 Providers (USD million)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Amount (USD million)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World Bank Group</td>
<td>1,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Institutions</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Development Fund</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Fund</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ODA by sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Amount (USD million)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian Aid</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Population</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Assistance</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Infrastructure</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other social infrastructure</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Government Strategy

National Development Strategy

With its second Growth and Transformation Plan (GTP II), the Ethiopian Planning Commission outlines a five-year development plan (2015–2020) to realise the country’s vision of becoming a lower middle-income country by 2025.

To serve as a foundation to the sectoral plans, the GTP II builds on 9 pillar strategies, the 6th of which relates to education and aims at "accelerating human development and technological capacity building and ensuring its sustainability." The plan further stresses the importance of education and skill development for the country’s economic growth, and for turning the growing labour force into an important driver of industrialisation.

The National Development Strategy includes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Priorities</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Incorporation of the SDGs into national frameworks

Ethiopia has largely mainstreamed the SDGs into national planning and monitoring processes, and is working towards deeper integration of SDG indicators.

Alignment:
- The GTP II builds on the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and integrates the SDGs at the output and outcome level.
- An SDG Needs Assessment is currently taking place and will serve as a baseline for the first SDG report in 2019.
- In 2017 the Ethiopian government undertook a Voluntary National Review of its progress towards the SDGs, including a section on the integration of SDG 4 in the GTP II.
- The lack of alignment and compliance of sub-national institutions to national frameworks often poses a challenge to national monitoring and reporting processes.

Measurement:
- The Ethiopian Central Statistical Agency (CSA) together with the support of UNFPA, Italy, the UK and the US will undertake a national census, which will also include a number of SDGs.
- Measurement still faces significant challenges with regards to data quality, reliability, availability and capacity challenges.

Use:
- Data mostly flows upwards to serve planning and reporting on a national level, but only very little data is being utilised for analysis and evidence-based management on a sub-national level.
- All levels are still in need of further capacity development for the analysis and use of data.

National Strategy for Education

Under the Education Sector Development Programme (ESDP), the Ethiopian government seeks to achieve sectoral improvements in the following six areas:

- **Capacity development for improved management**: Ensure that the management of the education sector is both efficient and effective in delivering quality education services to all students.
- **General education quality**: Improve the quality of general education with a focus on core foundation skills in early grades.
- **General education access and equity**: Provide all children with access to nearby institutions in which they can complete the full eight years of primary and two years of general secondary education.
- **Adult and non-formal education**: Provide adult and non-formal education with a focus on creating and sustaining a literate environment.
- **Technical and Vocational Education and Training**: Increase the quantity and quality of effective and accredited TVET and increase its relevance in terms of the adopted courses and technologies.
- **Higher education**: Increase the enrolment capacity of higher education institutions by establishing new universities, strengthening existing ones, and by addressing disparities in the participation of disadvantaged groups.

ODA for Education in Ethiopia by Provider (average annual disbursements over the period 2015-2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>(in USD million)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World Bank Group</td>
<td>61.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>5.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>5.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provider assessed in this Report
Country context

After decades of isolation and moderate development, Myanmar is currently undergoing a period of unprecedented political and economic transformation. With its resource abundance, large working population and geographical location at an important crossroad in Southeast Asia, Myanmar has the potential for great economic growth and development. After the military ceded power in 2010, Myanmar has been slowly moving towards economic liberalisation and greater democratic consolidation. Since the beginning of the transition in 2010, the country has seen an increase in annual net inflows of foreign direct investments of 62.1% and an increase of 78.4% in annually received Official Development Assistance. Over the past two decades, Myanmar has also achieved success in diversifying its economy away from a largely agriculture-based economy to a more balanced portfolio composition (agriculture 24.8%, industry 35.4% and services 39.9%). Despite its encouraging steps in recent years, Myanmar nonetheless ranks second lowest for GDP per capita in Southeast Asia, and the country still faces looming governance challenges, including ethnic conflict, ongoing reforms and climate-related disasters.

---

GDP per capita growth

5.78% **(2017)**

GDP per capita, PPP


6.4% of the population is living below the poverty line ($1.90 a day)

Population **53,371,000** **(2017)**

---

Education Snapshot

- Following various public sector reforms in 2011, the government of Myanmar has attached greater importance to the education sector, which resulted in a significant increase in the access to and quality of education.

- With an adult literacy rate of 76% and a youth literacy rate of 85%, Myanmar compares similar to other lower middle income countries (averages of 76% and 89% respectively).

- While primary school enrolment rates are relatively high (98%), additional effort is required to increase secondary enrolment rates (currently at 64%).

- Despite a stark increase from 5.4% in 2011 to 10.2% in 2017, Myanmar still allocates a considerably smaller percentage of total government expenditures to education than other low & middle income countries (average of 16.6%).

- While a gender gap of 8 percentage points still exists for adult literacy rates, Myanmar has made significant progress in promoting gender parity in education, with youth literacy rates and net school enrolment rates being almost equal for male and female youths.

---

ODA at a Glance

Net ODA received in 2017 **1,542** USD million (2.3% of GNI)

---

Top 7 Providers (USD million) vs. ODA by sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top 7 Providers</th>
<th>Economic Infrastructure and Services</th>
<th>Other Social Infrastructure</th>
<th>Production</th>
<th>Humanitarian Aid</th>
<th>Multisector</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Health and Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>443</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Fund</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Institutions</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Government Strategy

National Development Strategy

The Myanmar Sustainable Development Plan (MSDP) provides a long-term vision (2018-2030) for a “peaceful, prosperous and democratic country.” The MSDP is structured around three Pillars, five Goals, 28 Strategies and 251 Action Plans.

Five development goals in the MSDP:
1) Peace, National Reconciliation, Security and Good Governance
2) Economic Stability and Strengthened Macroeconomic Management
3) Job Creation and Private Sector-Led Growth
4) Human Resources and Social Development for a 21st Century Society
5) Natural Resources and the Environment for Posterity of the Nation

Goal number 4 includes strategy 4.1, which aims to “improve equitable access to high quality lifelong educational opportunities.”

The National Development Strategy includes:

- Development Priorities
- Targets
- Indicators

If targets and/or indicators are missing, can these be found in sector strategies and plans instead?

Incorporation of the SDGs into national frameworks

Alignment:
- The Myanmar Sustainable Development Plan (MSDP) broadly aligns its five goals and 28 strategies to the SDGs.
- To provide comprehensive guidance for development assistance, the government has launched the Myanmar Development Assistance Policy in 2018, which includes a chapter on “the SDGs in the context of the Economic Policy of the Union of Myanmar.”
- A national indicator framework for the MSDP is currently being developed and will closely be linked to the SDGs.
- The lack of coordination between line ministries and central agencies partially impedes the alignment between the MSDP and the sectoral plans.

Measurement:
- Since early 2018 a new statistical law mandates the collection of data across government.
- In 2017 Myanmar’s Central Statistical Organisation produced an SDG baseline report.
- 34% of the indicators in the most recent National Indicator Framework (NIF) are SDG indicators. The aim is to increase this percentage to 50% for the next NIF.
- While the quality of data is considered to be good, there is a need for more and better accessible data.

Use:
- The government still largely lacks the required capacity to analyse the data that it collects.

National Strategy for Education

With its National Education Strategy Plan (2016–21), the government of Myanmar commits to achieving “Improved teaching and learning, vocational education and training, research and innovation leading to measurable improvements in student achievement in all schools and educational institutions.” To achieve this goal, the government aims to realise transformational shifts in the following nine areas:

- Preschool and kindergarten education: Ensure accessible and quality preschool and kindergarten education.
- Management, capacity development and quality assurance: Managers at all levels to apply evidence-based decision making and to demand accountability for improved teaching and learning.
- Higher education: Provide students with access to world-class higher education systems.
- Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET): Broaden the access to TVET to more learners.
- Alternative Education: Provide quality-assured, certified and nationally credentialed alternative education programmes.
- Teacher education and management: Support teachers to develop and apply interactive classroom teaching and learning methods.
- Student assessment and examinations: Improve students’ learning achievements by implementing a quality assessment system.
- Basic education curriculum: Ensure that all school children develop knowledge, skills, attitudes and competencies that are relevant to their lives and to 21st century development needs.
- Basic education - access, quality and inclusion: Ensure that all children can access, progress through and successfully complete quality basic education.

ODA for Education in Myanmar by Provider (average annual disbursements over the period 2015–2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>(in USD million)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank Group</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>4.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Institutions</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADB</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provider assessed in this Report
Annex 2: Indicator tables

The tables presented in this section are based on detailed ‘indicator inventory’ spreadsheets which have been compiled for each case-study SDG (tracking indicators and any data against them). The spreadsheets are based on extensive web-based research and consultation with development co-operation providers and partners, as well as verification in the field. The objective was to identify SDG-aligned or SDG-like indicators used by partners and/or providers, and any data against these. A detailed set of criteria or rules were used for identification of indicators which were considered SDG-aligned or SDG-like. The spreadsheets are considered a working document, but there is potential to make the inventories publically available. The secretariat is therefore grateful for validation of and feedback on the data presented here. Links are provided to the source of the indicator in the left hand column.

At corporate level, all DAC member and multilateral development bank providers which are known to have adopted standard indicator sets, and have indicators in the relevant sectors, are included. At country level, the following providers are included:

- The United Nations via United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) indicators; UN agencies were included in aggregate rather than each individual UN agency being considered separately – except for Myanmar, where there is no current UNDAF. Instead UNICEF indicators and results were included. UNICEF is an active provider in the education sector.
- The World Bank Group and relevant regional multilateral development finance institution (i.e. African Development Bank or Asian Development Bank as applicable)
- The case study donor focal point
- The top three DAC providers of aggregate bilateral ODA disbursements to the partner country in that sector in 2016
- The top three DAC providers of aggregate bilateral ODA disbursements to the partner country in that sub-sector in 2016, if different from above (e.g. for indicator 4.1.1, the top three providers of bilateral ODA in the primary and secondary education subsector in Ethiopia in 2016)
- Additional DAC bilateral providers are included for analysis even if they are not one of the top three providers of bilateral ODA to the partner country in that sector/sub-sector if the provider has prioritised that sector in their development co-operation strategy for that partner country. For example, although Norway is not one of the top three providers of bilateral education ODA in Ethiopia, it is included for analysis, because Norway has prioritised the education sector in their development co-operation strategy for Ethiopia. This approach allows for inclusion of smaller providers who are relatively active in a particular sector and partner country, despite their lower ODA outflows.

20 Defined as a standardised set of indicators used by development co-operation providers to monitor results. They are typically used for three tiers of results frameworks: (1) development results; (2) development co-operation results; (3) performance information. Standard indicators at Tier 2 typically aggregate project-level results in a way which enables communication of results achieved across multiple projects, countries and regions (Engberg-Pedersen, 2018[12])
**Indicator 4.1.1:** Proportion of children and young people: (a) in grades 2/3; (b) at the end of primary; and (c) at the end of lower secondary achieving at least a minimum proficiency level in (i) reading and (ii) mathematics, by sex

| Table A1: SDG 4.1.1 Provider corporate SDG-aligned and SDG-similar indicators |
|---------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| **Provider** | **Corporate Outcome Indicators (Tier 1)** | **Corporate Output Indicators (Tier 2)** |
| Australia<sup>22</sup> | Number of boys and girls that complete their primary and secondary education | Number of additional girls and boys enrolled in school |
| Canada | Number of boys and girls that complete their primary and secondary education | N/A |
| European Commission<sup>*</sup> | Completion Primary education completion rate (M/F) Lower secondary education completion rate (M/F) Proficiency Literacy rate of 15-24 year-olds (M/F) | Number of children enrolled in primary education with EU support (M/F) Number of children enrolled in secondary education with EU support (M/F) |
| France | Number of children enrolled in primary and secondary school (primary/secondary) | Number of children completing primary school through programs financed by AFD |
| Germany<sup>*</sup> | N/A | The number of children and young people who have received a better quality education as a result of GIZ’s contribution |
| Japan<sup>22</sup> | N/A | The number of children benefiting from support for education improvement |
| New Zealand | Enrolment Net enrolment ratio in primary education (M/F) Net enrolment ratio in secondary education (M/F) Proficiency Children meeting regional test levels at grade 6 for literacy (No., %, M/F) Children meeting regional test levels at grade 6 for numeracy (No., %, M/F) Proportion of children and young people, in the Pacific: at the end of primary education achieving at least a minimum proficiency level in reading and mathematics (new indicator as of 2018) | N/A |
| South Korea<sup>*</sup> | N/A | Number of students who completed the education program (girls, disabilities, out-of-school children) |
| Switzerland-SDC | N/A | yy children (<15 yrs) gained access to quality basic education (M/F) xx persons (>15 yrs) gained access to quality basic education (M/F) Out of these, zy children (9-15 yrs) received basic education combined with vocational skills development (M/F) |

<sup>21</sup> Received via email – citation needed
<sup>22</sup> Unpublished
Indicator 4.1.1: Proportion of children and young people: (a) in grades 2/3; (b) at the end of primary; and (c) at the end of lower secondary achieving at least a minimum proficiency level in (i) reading and (ii) mathematics, by sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Corporate Outcome Indicators (Tier 1)</th>
<th>Corporate Output Indicators (Tier 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Number of children supported to gain a basic education (M/F; pre-primary/primary/secondary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Enrolment Learners enrolled in primary schools and/or equivalent non-school based settings Learners enrolled in secondary schools and/or equivalent non-school based settings Retention Students progressed to secondary school Proficiency Children in primary grades with improved reading skills as assessed through tools such as ASER, EGRA, etc.</td>
<td>Primary or secondary school learners from underserved and/or disadvantaged groups benefitted from education assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Development Bank</td>
<td>Enrolment in education (% F)</td>
<td>People benefiting from better access to education (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Development Bank</td>
<td>Gross lower secondary education graduation rate (% M/F)</td>
<td>Students educated and trained under improved quality assurance systems (No., M/F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>Primary school completion (% ages 15-19, bottom 40%) Primary school completion gap to average (ages 15-19)</td>
<td>Students reached (female)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A2: SDG 4.1.1 Government of Ethiopia SDG-aligned and SDG-similar indicators

**Indicator 4.1.1: Proportion of children and young people: (a) in grades 2/3; (b) at the end of primary; and (c) at the end of lower secondary achieving at least a minimum proficiency level in (i) reading and (ii) mathematics, by sex**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>National Development Plan Outcome Indicators</th>
<th>National Development Plan Output Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enrolment</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Kindergarten enrolment rate (M/F)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 1 gross enrolment rate (M/F)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 1 gross/net enrolment rate (M/F)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary school first cycle (1-4) gross enrolment rate including AEB (M/F)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary school first cycle (1-4) net enrolment rate (M/F)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary school second cycle (5-8) gross/net enrolment rate (M/F)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary school (1-8) gross enrolment rate including AEB (M/F)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary school (1-8) net enrolment rate (M/F)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary school (1-8) gross enrolment rate for underserved regions (Afar, Somali)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gross enrolment rate for grade 9-10 (M/F)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gross enrolment rate for grade 11-12 (M/F)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total number of students admitted to preparatory school (11-12) (ratio of girls)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completion</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary school 1st cycle 4th grade completion rate (M/F)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary school 2nd cycle 8th grade completion rate (M/F)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary school (1-8) completion rate (M/F)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 1 dropout rate (M/F)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 8 repetition rate (M/F)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary school 1st cycle (1-4) repetition rate (M/F)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary school 2nd cycle (5-8) repetition rate (M/F)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Education Sector Plan Outcome Indicators</th>
<th>Education Sector Plan Output Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Enrolment</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 1 net enrolment rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 1-4, including ABE, gross enrolment rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 1-4, including ABE, net enrolment rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 5-8 gross enrolment rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 5-8 net enrolment rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 9-10 gross enrolment rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 9-10 net enrolment rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completion rate to grade 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Union</td>
<td>Outcome Indicators</td>
<td>Output Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agenda 2063</td>
<td>Enrolment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enrolment rate for childhood education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary school education enrolment rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of population receiving quality education at all levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proficiency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Literacy rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table A3: SDG 4.1.1 Provider country assistance strategy indicators SDG-aligned and SDG-similar Indicators (Ethiopia)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Country-Level Outcome Indicators (Tier 1)</th>
<th>Country-Level Output Indicators (Tier 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Finland | Enrolment  
Net enrolment rate in primary grades (5-8) (M/F)  
% of girls among students at first grade of secondary education (9th grade)  
Net enrolment rate in grades 5-8 in Afar region (M/F)  
Retention  
Grade 1 dropout rate (M/F)  
Survival rate to grade 5 (M/F)  
Quality  
Increased number of schools meeting inspection standards and upgraded from low performing (level 1) (level 1/level 2/level 3 or 4)  
Teaching effectiveness index (level 1/level 2 schools)  
Proficiency  
% of students attaining basic or above competency in national learning assessments in grade 4 (reading) (M/F)  
% of students attaining basic or above competency in national learning assessments in grade 8 (English) (M/F)  
% of students attaining basic or above competency in national learning assessments in grade 10 (English)  
% of students attaining basic or above competency in national learning assessments in grade 12 (English) | N/A |
| Norway | Completion  
% of students in supported educational institutions who complete primary (M/F)  
% of students in supported educational institutions who complete lower secondary (M/F)  
No. of students in supported educational institutions who complete primary (M/F)  
No. of students in supported educational institutions who complete lower secondary (M/F)  
Retention  
% of students enrolled in supported learning institutions that remain in the learning institution the following year (M/F)  
No. of students enrolled in supported learning institutions that remain in the learning institution the following year (M/F)  
Proficiency  
% of students in target educational institutions achieving minimum proficiency level in reading in grade x (M/F)  
No. of students in target educational institutions achieving minimum proficiency level in reading in grade x (M/F)  
% of students in target educational institutions achieving minimum proficiency level in mathematics in grade x (M/F) | No. of students enrolled in target educational institutions |

23 Unpublished.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Country-Level Outcome Indicators (Tier 1)</th>
<th>Country-Level Output Indicators (Tier 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>No. of students in target educational institutions achieving minimum proficiency level in mathematics in grade x (M/F)</td>
<td>No. of children supported to gain a decent education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| UNDAF           | **Enrolment**  
Gross enrolment rate at pre-primary (M/F)  
Primary education completion rate (M/F)  
Net enrolment rate at primary and secondary education by gender (M/F, primary/secondary)  
**Proficiency**  
% of grade 4 students who score 50% or above the composite scores in NLA (M/F)  
% of grade 8 students who score 50% or above the composite scores in NLA (M/F)  
% of grade 10 students who score 50% or above the composite scores in NLA (M/F) | Standardized competency based continuous assessment system for general education in place  
Number of clusters implementing competency-based continuous assessment system in their catchment schools/areas  
Number of out of school children accessing primary and secondary education  
Proportion of emergency affected children supported to continue their education |
| United States   | **Completion**  
Grade 8 graduation rate (M/F)  
**Retention**  
Percentage of students who drop out of school  
Dropout rates at each grade (M/F)  
Survival rates to grade 5  
Survival rates to grade 8  
**Proficiency**  
Performance on NLA exams  
Nationwide literacy rates at the end of grade 2  
Nationwide literacy rates at the end of grade 3  
Nationwide literacy rates at the end of grade 4  
Regional achievements in literacy in grade 2  
Regional achievements in literacy in grade 3  
Regional achievements in literacy in grade 4  
Proportion of students reading English with fluency and comprehension after x years of English language instruction  
Percentage of learners demonstrating reading fluency and comprehension of grade level text at the end of grade 2 | Learners received primary level reading interventions (M/F)  
Standardized learning assessments supported |

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Country-Level Outcome Indicators (Tier 1)</th>
<th>Country-Level Output Indicators (Tier 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African Development Bank</td>
<td>Enrolment&lt;br&gt;Primary net enrolment rate&lt;br&gt;Female primary completion rate&lt;br&gt;Completion&lt;br&gt;Rural primary completion rate (grade 8)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>Enrolment&lt;br&gt;Primary net enrolment rate&lt;br&gt;Gross enrolment rate for secondary school (grades 9-10)&lt;br&gt;Completion&lt;br&gt;Increased primary completion rate&lt;br&gt;Proficiency&lt;br&gt;Percentage of students attaining basic competence in grade 4 reading in English&lt;br&gt;Percentage of students attaining basic competence in grade 4 mathematics&lt;br&gt;Percentage of students attaining basic competence in grade 8 English&lt;br&gt;Percentage of students attaining basic competence in grade 8 mathematics (Aligns to national data)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A4. SDG 4.1.1 Government of Myanmar SDG-aligned and SDG-similar indicators - National Indicators

Indicator 4.1.1: Proportion of children and young people: (a) in grades 2/3; (b) at the end of primary; and (c) at the end of lower secondary achieving at least a minimum proficiency level in (i) reading and (ii) mathematics, by sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner country</th>
<th>National Development Plan Outcome Indicators</th>
<th>National Development Plan Output Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>All children have access to, progress through and successfully complete a quality basic education (strategic outcome 4.1.3)</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Education Sector Plan Outcome Indicators</th>
<th>Education Sector Plan Output Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>All children, boys and girls, access primary, middle and high schools &lt;br&gt;Students complete primary, middle and high school level &lt;br&gt;Drop-out students are supported to re-enrol and stay in school &lt;br&gt;Significant improvements experienced by students in their school and classroom learning environment &lt;br&gt;Improved student learning achievement through implementation of the revised basic education curriculum</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A5. SDG 4.1.1 Provider country-level assistance strategy indicators SDG-aligned and SDG-similar Indicators (Myanmar)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Country-Level Outcome Indicators (Tier 1)</th>
<th>Country-Level Output Indicators (Tier 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Number of students receiving stipends (% girls)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Enrolment &lt;br&gt;Gross enrolment rate of students entering lower secondary school (M/F, state/region with the highest and lowest rate) &lt;br&gt;Net enrolment rate of students entering lower secondary school (M/F, state/region with the highest and lowest rate) &lt;br&gt;Completion &lt;br&gt;Primary school completion rate (M/F, state/region with the highest and lowest rate)</td>
<td>Number of regions where measuring and reporting on early grade learning achievement takes place &lt;br&gt;Number of students receiving payment through the MOE led stipends program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26 MSDP – National Indicator Framework to be completed in 2019  
27 ibid  
28 From draft Performance Assessment Framework  
29 Unpublished.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Country-Level Outcome Indicators (Tier 1)</th>
<th>Country-Level Output Indicators (Tier 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Asian Development Bank**    | Completion  
Share of youth aged 16-18 years in poor households having completed at least lower secondary education (M/F)  
Share of workers aged 18-22 having completed at least lower secondary education (M/F)  
Proficiency  
Proportion of final-year upper secondary education students passing the matriculation exam (M/F) | Students benefiting from a $100 million loan to reform secondary education (girls) |
| **World Bank**                | N/A                                                                                                      | Students who have received stipend payments (% female)  
Nationally representative assessment for early grade reading performance (ERGA) in primary schools |
| **UNICEF**                    | Completion  
Primary completion rate (by disaggregated data)  
Lower secondary completion rate (by disaggregated data) | Increased capacity to actively support inclusive quality education to keep children in school, helping them transit and complete quality and inclusive primary and lower secondary education.  
Increased capacity to provide out-of-school children aged 10 to 18 with alternative education at primary and lower secondary levels, and continuous learning to children in emergencies. |
Annex 3: Background and methodology for the project

Background

Since 2015, the Results Community has explored ways to build a more co-ordinated approach to results-based management, which supports harmonisation of indicators and promotes ownership by partner countries. Analysis has focused on how a shared commitment to achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) can translate into increased use of the goals, targets and indicators as a common results framework for both providers of development co-operation and partner countries. This work led to a policy paper and a guidance note (Engberg-Pedersen, 2018[12]; OECD, 2018[13]) that present a menu of SDG targets and indicators that can strengthen providers’ results frameworks, facilitate data collection and use, and offer improved platforms for dialogue with partner countries.30

Participants at the April 2018 OECD/DAC Results Community workshop expressed strong interest in building on this work to further analyse how partners and providers can, in practice, use the SDG framework as a shared platform for results measurement and management. At the workshop, providers acknowledged internal pressures to report results domestically or at corporate level that can contradict commitments to harmonise their approach, and to support and align to their partners’ country results frameworks. Participants agreed on the importance of enhanced co-ordination among providers and between partners to reduce production of duplicative and overlapping results data. They also stressed the need to ensure the interoperability of results data systems from the outset (OECD, 2018[14]).

At the same time, developing countries are working to ensure their national development plans and country results frameworks reflect the SDGs which they prioritise, and that they have the capacity and resources to monitor progress. They want providers to align with these priorities in their strategies, commitments and results systems (Zwart and Egan, 2017[15]).

Recent OECD analyses have highlighted these tensions, which are both technical and political/organisational in nature, and the potential of the SDGs to serve as a framework to address some of these challenges.31 The SDG framework (SDG targets, indicators, and reporting), and the shared commitment to achieving the SDGs provide an opportunity and a basis to practically manage this tension and work towards a more co-ordinated approach among providers, facilitating increased alignment of provider results frameworks with those of partner countries.

However, more evidence and analysis are required to examine how using the SDG framework as a shared framework for results measurement and management can support enhanced co-ordination and alignment of provider results frameworks to country-led result frameworks in practice. Workshop participants advocated for further work to identify challenges and bottlenecks, and to showcase good practice of co-ordinated collection and use of SDG (or SDG similar) indicator data for results-based management. During discussion, participants suggested case studies based on selected SDG targets in selected partner countries, where national development plans have already to some extent been aligned to the SDGs, as a way to focus in; identifying challenges and developing solutions to facilitate a more co-ordinated approach to results-based management at country level (OECD, 2018[14]).

30 A menu of 42 targets was developed, based on those which were a) tier 1, b) relevant to development co-operation and c) based on outcomes. See: https://doi.org/10.1787/24140929

**Purpose and objectives of the project**

**Purpose** - to generate evidence, analysis and good practice examples of how development co-operation providers and partners\(^3^2\) can concretely use the SDG framework as an entry point for co-ordinating around, investing in and using country-led results frameworks and data which are aligned to the SDGs from both a technical/ methodological and an organisational/ political perspective.

**Objectives** - Undertake three case studies, each based on a selected SDG target/indicator (but taking the broader goal into account) to:

1. demonstrate linkages and synergies, but also challenges, around aligning providers’ results frameworks (at corporate and country levels) to the SDGs, and to country-led results frameworks that have already domesticated the SDG framework (organisational/ political);
2. explore possibilities for enhanced co-ordination and harmonisation\(^3^3\) around collection, analysis and use of results data in partner countries, including for Voluntary National Reviews (organisational/ political);
3. identify and document good practice in relation to investing in and using country-led results frameworks and data (especially administrative data), which are aligned to the SDGs, for results-based management by and between partners and providers (technical); and
4. demonstrate the potential for SDG data: i) to be collated and used as a platform for dialogue, and ii) to monitor country-level progress towards SDG targets and development co-operation contribution towards this progress (technical).

An analytic framework and research questions guide data collection against these objectives. Figure A1 provides an overview of the analytic framework.

**Figure A1. Analytic framework for SDG case study project**

**Approach**

\(^3^2\) This project follows OECD/DAC terminology, which can differ from terminology used at country level. “Providers” refers to bilateral and multilateral donors. “Partners” refers to partner country governments, and “other stakeholders” includes implementing partners, CSOs, think tanks, beneficiaries, regional bodies and others who have a stake in the development co-operation process.

\(^3^3\) It is important to note that this project is concerned with harmonisation of indicators and related measurement, rather than harmonisation of development co-operation more broadly. The project looks specifically at how increased co-ordination amongst providers and with partners might enhance harmonisation of results indicators.
Many other projects and initiatives contribute to enhanced SDG data collection and use in developing countries. This project looks specifically at how development co-operation providers can contribute to enhanced alignment, measurement and data use in the context of the SDGs. At the same time, acknowledging and benefiting from synergies and links with other projects will be an integral part of the project.

As an OECD/DAC project, the case studies take a provider perspective. However, they are grounded on, and take as their starting point, the underlying commitment made by development partners to honour country ownership of results and “further develop, support and use country-level results frameworks; progressively adapt results frameworks to reflect the targets and indicators of the SDGs; and make data on results publicly available” (GPEDC, 2016[16]).

While the project takes a deep dive into alignment, measurement and use challenges surrounding individual SDG targets and indicators, we acknowledge the important notion that the SDG goals, targets and indicators are inter-related and will take into account the implications this may have on results measurement. Moreover, while the project focuses on results frameworks and indicators, the need to align to national frameworks from the planning and programming phase is fully recognised. In particular, the fact that provider corporate policies can have a significant influence on the extent to which providers’ results frameworks are able to align with country-led results frameworks will be considered.

Finally, the project takes an “action research” approach. Action research involves actively participating in a change situation, and promoting learning, whilst simultaneously conducting research[^34]. The goal is that the fieldwork (and subsequent reporting) for each of the case studies will be useful to providers and partners and generate dialogue in partner countries. In addition, the case study approach serves as a pilot, and parts of it can potentially be replicated in other contexts.

**Case study topics**

Each of the three case studies examines (i) 1 specific SDG target and related indicator(s) (within the broader context of the overall goal) and how it is applied in (ii) 2 partner countries. In addition, (iii) one DAC donor focal point has been identified for each partner country. The three SDG targets/indicators are as follows (hereafter referred to as “case study SDGs”):

**Target: 4.1 By 2030, ensure that all girls and boys complete free, equitable and quality primary and secondary education leading to relevant and effective learning outcomes**

- Indicator: 4.1.1 Proportion of children and young people: (a) in grades 2/3; (b) at the end of primary; and (c) at the end of lower secondary achieving at least a minimum proficiency level in (i) reading and (ii) mathematics, by sex

**Target: 6.2. By 2030, achieve access to adequate and equitable sanitation and hygiene for all and end open defecation, paying special attention to the needs of women and girls and those in vulnerable situations.**

- Indicator: 6.2.1 Proportion of population using safely-managed sanitation services, including a hand-washing facility with soap and water

**Target: 7.1. By 2030, ensure universal access to affordable, reliable and modern energy services.**

- Indicator: 7.1.1. Proportion of population with access to electricity

The table A6 below sets out the case study structure and topics (case study SDGs, partner countries and donor focal points) which were selected based on consultation with donor focal point agencies and other stakeholders. Data collection started in July 2018 and includes desk-based research, quantitative analysis, consultation with key global stakeholders (e.g. SDG data custodians), and three field visits.

[^34]: See for example: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/282199978_Action_research
Table A6: Case study topics and structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study 1</th>
<th>Case Study 2</th>
<th>Case Study 3</th>
<th>Donor agency focal point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SDG 4.1.1</td>
<td>SDG 6.2.1</td>
<td>SDG 7.1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Finland MFA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>European Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>DFAT Australia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Partner country fieldwork**

**Project methodology**

The methodology consists of **four main elements**:

**A. Case study planning and inception**

This element allows time for identification of case study topics, donor focal points and other partners; development of a full work plan, including an analytical framework and research questions to guide data collection costings and timeframes; and consultations with key stakeholders and partners to confirm milestones, roles and responsibilities.

**B. Desk-based review**

For each case study, the OECD Results Team undertakes background research and analysis, which informs fieldwork and the overall evidence base. An analytical framework based on case study objectives guides the review. Key documents for review (with a focus on the case study SDGs) include:

- GPEDC monitoring data for each partner country – indicators 1a and 1b
- Partner country national and sectoral plans and reports
- Partner country results frameworks and reporting (national, sectoral, sub-national)
- Partner country UN voluntary national reviews (VNRs)
- Provider policies, plans, data strategies, results frameworks and reporting at project, sectoral, country and corporate levels
- Any documentation on data collection for case study SDGs in partner country and globally
- Any documentation/ information on donor co-ordination, donor/ partner dialogue (relating to results data collection, management and use) at country level

**C. Quantitative analysis of donor/ partner data for case study SDGs**

The quantitative analysis addresses some of the technical aspects of the project, and is undertaken in parallel to the qualitative elements (desk-based and field research). The Results Team completes data analysis based on existing data for each of the three case study SDG indicators, aiming to present indicators and available data for each indicator along the results chain as follows:

i. Global overview on progress toward indicator

ii. Analysis of progress towards the indicator in case study partner countries (national and sub-national if possible) (outcome, impact level)

iii. If possible, indicators used and available data on combined (and individual) DAC donor efforts in terms of results achieved against the indicator globally and in case study partner countries (output level - from provider standard indicator data that relates directly to the case study SDG)

iv. Data on combined ODA effort toward case study SDG globally and in case study partner country (input level – mapped to OECD CRS purpose codes)

At each level described above, assessment of methodological challenges and data gaps with regards to collating and presenting these data is documented. Overall, the analysis feeds into the wider case studies, informs the fieldwork and serves as a pilot to confirm the methodology (and its limitations), with the possibility to repeat the analyses for other targets/indicators.

D. In-country fieldwork

To explore both technical and organisational/ political elements of the research objectives from a qualitative perspective, the Results Team (in partnership with the donor focal point agency) plans and undertakes in-country fieldwork. In each country, the fieldwork is planned on the basis of the analytical framework and consists of meetings with a range of key stakeholders including partner country government officials (ministry for planning, national statistics offices, and relevant line ministries), donor focal point, bilateral and multilateral donors, CSOs, regional agencies, think tanks/ data initiatives. The fieldwork includes two styles of engagement over the week:

1. Meetings with distinct stakeholders (e.g. donors, sector co-ordination groups, officials from line ministries, UN agencies) as individuals or small groups towards the beginning of the fieldwork enables a frank exchange of views.

2. A multi-stakeholder workshop at the end of the fieldwork enables an open exchange of views on shared challenges and opportunities, and possible actions going forward (one for each case study).

Key facets to explore for the case study SDGs are set out in the analytic framework. The donor focal point provides important background information for the case-study, but also, as much as possible, helps facilitate the in-country field work (i.e. assist with identifying key contacts and providing logistical support where possible, e.g. arranging meeting rooms).

In addition, where possible, a member of the results team at headquarters of the donor focal point agency joins the fieldwork, as this strengthens the learning element of the work for the donor focal point agency and assists in drawing out the dynamics and challenges of meeting headquarters reporting requirements at partner-country level.

A fieldwork guidance note (separate document) for donor focal points provides more detail on the fieldwork methodology, roles and responsibilities.

Outputs, milestones and timeframes

The DCD Results Team will produce interim and final reporting products. An informal project steering group peer reviews all project outputs. It is envisaged that learning from the case studies will be relevant and useful to provider staff both in headquarters and in country offices, as well as to partners and other stakeholders. A detailed dissemination plan will ensure findings from the project are communicated to the relevant audiences.
Key outputs:

- Preliminary discussion paper and workshop inputs for October 2018 Results Community workshop (October 2018)
- Three technical case study reports (one for each case study SDG) – to be posted on the OECD/ DAC Results Community website (January 2019)
- Report/spreadsheet resource for each case study SDG based on quantitative analysis (April 2019)
- Final policy or working paper (and related communication products) ahead of Spring 2019 Results Community workshop/ HLPF 2019 (April 2019)