

ICON-INSTITUTE GmbH & Co. KG Consulting Gruppe

Ockham Institute for Policy Support







improvements, persistent short-term funding commitments by most donors poses challenges for the longer-term planning of GEM Report activities. Considerations of environmental sustainability, such as reduced printing and online events have overall lowered the GEM Report's carbon footprint. At the same time, physical attendance of the GEM Report team members at launch events and meetings are considered as necessary. Environmental considerations resulting from GEM related travel needs could be reassessed and balanced against the benefits to the envisaged change process.

The GEM Report and its products are widely respected, authoritative, deemed relevant, and have influenced partners' work. They provide valuable insights into global education progress, with regional reports and interactive tools breathing new life in education communities. Potential remains for more targeted dissemination and streamlining these tools for specific audiences. Interviewed stakeholders hold differing opinions on the importance of the thematic versus the monitoring aspects of the GEM Report. For a number of stakeholders, moving closer towards 2030 calls for increased focus on the monitoring aspects to help hold all relevant partners to account for their commitments towards 2030.

The mandate does not call explicitly upon the GEM Report to improve policymaking or countries progressing towards the SDGs. The GEM Report provides an institutional framework for discussions and reflections and provides the data to feed such discussions. Improved policymaking is however fully dependent on the countries themselves and to some extent on organisations that support them. This being said, there are expectations, especially among some donors, that the GEM Report contributes more directly to policy change. Hence, the expectations need be managed carefully. The unique value added of the GEM Report in the busy field of international education policy community is not its ability to influence national policies – which could divert it away

products, while also attracting additional donors, also put pressure on the GEM Report staff, who have seen the amount and variety of work across these publications increase substantially.

By 2023, the concerns about the GEM Report's long-term sustainability remain unresolved, with heavy dependence on short-term funding, and consequent implications on long-term planning.

On the basis of its conclusions and the suggestions from engaged stakeholders, the evaluation developed the following four recommendations:

While the evaluation team recognises that the thematic parts of the global report are highly valued, with only seven years from 2030, the monitoring part could receive more prominence in the global report and other products so as to increase an overall sense of urgency in relation to progress towards SDG 4. The GEM Report could more actively take up its mandate to help hold countries and stakeholders to account for their commitments. This could mean to move beyond passively publishing the data available on the indicators, but building on the mechanism that allows countries to set their own priorities and agree on which indicators they are monitored (in line with steps already taken together with UIS on the benchmarking). This would also better link the monitoring and the policy part

countries. This work is not limited to building partnerships, it should also strengthen the communication, active outreach, and follow-up activities to keep partners working in countries engaged. Through enhanced cooperation with such organisations, the GEM Report will be able to complete its envisaged change process, and as such make its contribution to moving countries in the direction of SDG 4 (noting that such movement remains outside the GEM Reports' accountability). The following action could be considered:

- 1) Further strengthen operational partnerships with organisations active in the countries (i.e., UN Country teams, UNESCO and regional organisations) and involve them already in the preparation of reports and in planning activities after the reports are published and mobilise them to engage in discussions at country/regional level.
- 2) Further strengthen the communication and outreach activities to keep all partners, at global, regional and national levels engaged in the GEM Report related discussions so that they bring the messages to the ministerial and programmatic levels.

: The evaluation found that the mandate of the GEM Report is still highly relevant and coherent to what can be expected from the GEM Report. However, it seems to lack the power to position GEM Report well in the changing landscape. A reflection on the mandate in this changing landscape and reaffirmation of the position of the GEM Report in the wider infrastructure related to SDG 4, could help to strengthen the recognition by international organisations and countries of the GEM Report as a global public good. This reflection could inform the development of a new strategy prioritising the sustainability of the GEM Report in terms of requiring long-term financial commitments from those organisations that acknowledge that the GEM Report is a global public good of the GEM Report.