

## Foreword

### Emerging Landscape of Ideas around GRA: Notes on Going Forward

#### Introduction

This is the third and final version of the set of thematic papers on the Global and Regional Activities (GRA) program led by the Education for All (EFA) Global Partnership for Education's (GPE) Secretariat's Global Good Practice Team (GGP), resulting from the first and second rounds of consultations in June-August of 2011. It summarizes the results of those two rounds, the state of the discussion, and also provides some background history on the GRA that seems to have been missing from the perceptions of some commentators, and how the activities are integrated with each other and with the other priorities of the GPE Secretariat as endorsed by its Board of Directors.

#### Background on the GRA

The GRA program was approved in November of 2010 by the GPE Board of Directors, as a partial successor to the EPDF (certain aspects of EPDF activities, such as direct support to overall ESP development, are not included in GRA, but are included in GPE plans and can be funded). According to the approval document, the program will function under the unified Education for All Fund. The GRA program will provide support for initiatives and programs that address the three thematic areas and demonstrate their ability to enhance the capacity of country and international/regional level institutions to support GPE country partners to meet their education goals.

Global and regional initiatives are intended to address the following development objectives:

- Strengthen capacity of country and regional level entities to develop, implement, and/or monitor specific technical aspects in sustainable national education sector programs.
- Enhance understanding of key priorities through research and practice and increase the impact of investments in education, drawing on innovations, evidence, and global good practices in these areas.
- Improve knowledge sharing between and among GPE partners through the systematic provision of services and products that enlighten, engage and energize partners to apply new knowledge and evidence-based good practices to resolve education challenges.
- Improve Partnership accountability by strengthening availability and quality of data.
- Strengthen South-South networks and partnerships.

The three thematic areas set out in the Board approval document for the GRA program cycle 1 (2011-2013) are:

- Learning outcomes
- Out-of-school children
- Education financing

According to the approval document, eligible activities to be funded by the program are:

- Research and dissemination
- Technical workshops
- Development of innovative partnerships and networks
- Technical assistance
- Study tours
- Interventions to inform scale up

### **Summary of Thematic Papers and the Role of GPE Partners**

*Out of School.* This paper concerned itself with gaps in Data, Policy, and Management (or Implementation) in terms of identifying and counting children, assessing the reasons for non-enrolment and non-attendance, addressing out of school issues via improved policy-making and sector planning, and, finally, by developing more effective models of implementation to address issues related to getting children into school and keeping them there. The overall aim is to provide improved tools and guidance as well as documented examples of good practices in all these issues.

*Quality and Learning Outcomes.* This paper noted the need for an entry point into quality, and argued that early literacy (soon followed by mathematics) represents a good entry point for two reasons: a) because it is chronologically and pedagogically fundamental to accessing all other forms of knowledge at later points in the school system, and b) because in improving learning in these areas one can provide entry points or object lessons in how to improve other subjects, later in the system. The paper called for small amounts of knowledge compilation, and larger amounts of knowledge dissemination based on existing knowledge and experimentation.

*Finance.* This paper called for work in a) improved reporting and monitoring of finance flows, including analysis of efficiency and equity issues, b) tools for assessing fiduciary risk in the sector, particularly in view of sector and general budget support and other modalities deemed to be more effective than projects managed by donors and NGOs, c) experiences with types of financing that can more directly stimulate or support results, d) development of integrated funding approaches for equity in education, and e) innovative financing sources.

The three thematic papers have been revised through a consultative process with GPE partners, seeking to enrich the understanding of the thematic areas and to determine an agreed way for the GRA program to help move the out-of-school, education financing, and quality agendas forward.

The papers provide a framework for activities to be developed with members of the GPE partnership, and do not attempt to catalogue the out-of-school, education financing, and quality issues. Elements of the discussions may remain unaddressed, since these thematic papers are only meant to create an overall framework for action, but this does not mean that any specialized considerations cannot be integrated in the activity proposals by partners (or handled later). In fact we hope they will be, as proposals are elaborated in the coming period.

### **GPE and Implementation**

Given the vastness of the issues, the mandate of the GPE Secretariat, and the requirements of specialization, it is clear that the GPE Secretariat cannot “implement” solutions to these issues. There are plenty of partners, including developing country partners, who are already doing a great deal of work in these areas. The GPE Secretariat, through the GRA activities, hopes to create an opportunity for all partners to take systematic re-look at how these issues relate to each other, and expand the dissemination of knowledge and experiences that can further achievement in these areas.

At the same time, it should be clear that even in partnership, GRA is not meant to directly finance implementation activities. There are other aspects or windows of the Education for All Fund that are aimed at supporting actual implementation, ESP development, the operation of LEGs, etc. Whenever, acting in concert with particular partners, the GPE Secretariat itself can give a short-term boost to a particular area that has gone un-attended, we believe someone has to step in and provide that boost. In most cases the GPE Secretariat will stimulate others; in a limited number of cases we will kick-start a relatively specialized or small area, in the hope of turning it over to others as soon as possible.

Thus, most (90% to 95%, probably more) of the implementation of this work is expected to take place through transfer agreements from the GPE Secretariat to various Supervising Entities who have the fiduciary controls needed to supervise funding usage. At the same time, actual implementers may be countries, NGOs, the Supervising Entities themselves, etc. The Secretariat expects that there may be some “orphaned” areas (areas that no partner has expressed an interest in actually working on, though partners have said the area is important) that will need singling out in a more direct way by the Secretariat itself, perhaps through small consultancies. It may well be that this can be done through sources of funding complimentary but not part of the GRA window.

While the GPE Secretariat hopes to stimulate others in certain areas, and also to encourage clear agreements as to what results are expected, similarly GPE does not intend to issue competitive requests for proposals (RFPs), nor does it see itself as a “client” with “suppliers.” It seems that the term “RFP” used in round 1 of consultations had sent the wrong message, so as of round 2 we use the term Requests for Results Partnerships (RRPs) for the documents with which we hope to elicit proposals for partnerships around key results. Formal relationships with the Supervising Entities will still need to exist, of course.

## **Selected Comments from Stakeholder Consultations 1 and 2**

During the first phase of the consultation process, two aspects of the whole process have become increasingly clear: a) areas that were missing in the original formulation, which partners have pointed out and b) partners pointing out their history and ongoing willingness to address some of these areas as well as pointing to other experiences. This section summarizes those reactions. Only main lines of discussion, common to several commentators, are summarized here. More specific comments were too numerous to summarize succinctly, but have influenced the overall tenor of the GPE Secretariat response. These have found their way to the concept notes for round 2 of consultations, and into these final papers, most often in the language used throughout. We created new activities or sub-activities in cases where there were comments in common to many partners, especially if the comments clearly implied a “proposition” with regard to a concrete activity that could be said to be missing from the GRA.

*In round 1, missing areas or general comments noted by various commentators* included the following, in no particular order. Some are oriented at substance, others at process. Some of these areas were indeed noted in the Concept Notes, but perhaps in too muted a fashion, so they are re-stated here as comments.

1. Naïveté with regard to the political economy and institutional aspects of change or lack of change (e.g., in why certain OOS issues are not addressed in countries’ plans, why learning outcomes are so hard to improve, etc.). As well as reform implementation. This was mentioned by many partners and in regard to a variety of areas. This was perhaps one of the most remarked-upon issues.
2. Lack of tie-in to curricular definition of early literacy in countries, in a practical manner, and with possible “hooks” to assessment and learning materials, in an integrated fashion, in the quality area.
3. Need to further emphasize and support country-based planning processes, and to work within the context of country plans and policy dialogue as much as possible. In all areas.
4. The need for both systemic frameworks for quality and broader sense of quality. Focus of learning outcomes on early literacy is too tight. Mostly in quality area.
5. In quality, the whole issue of attitudes, value and culture as motivators of behavior and determinants of quality, especially when it comes to teacher motivation.
6. Promotion of single approach as a solution to key problems, particularly in early literacy, is not sufficiently cognizant of others’ efforts and the variety of approaches others have tried. Similarly, it has been noted that collaboration amongst agencies proposing solutions ought to be encouraged, to the degree possible, as opposed to dependence on a single organization for all of one area.
7. More emphasis on the local (school or village), especially on the use of data for localized management and accountability, not just policy-setting. Mentioned mostly in the context of OOS. Could tie into concept of political economy, already noted.
8. With regard to some of the concept notes and reviewers who reviewed only one, some of their concerns are actually noted in other concept notes that they may not have reviewed (e.g., the issue of pro-poor financing as a way to deal with OOS or Learning Outcomes is dealt with in the Finances concept note; it was dealt with already, but it has now been made more explicit).

9. Limited recognition of and/or linkage to on-going efforts and initiatives by partners already addressing the identified gaps. Here it is important to note that the GRA does not intend to duplicate but to support the efforts of members of the GPE partnership, while contributing to linking together various efforts for a more comprehensive global approach. The concept notes generally aim to fill gaps in knowledge and practice, but not to be a catalogue of good practices. That will come later, as part of the work itself. For now, however, if a partner feels a set of available knowledge products or practices are so well-evaluated and definitive that further work is not at all necessary, then this would be an important thing to note.

In the *second* round a whole set of additional comments were submitted. We have taken careful note of as many of these as possible and have made many changes in the papers. Many of the comments were very detailed or specific, and generated specific but relatively minor changes. Here we summarize some major comments, which have also been addressed in the main text of the paper, but which are worth highlighting. Furthermore, the set of issues brought up in the 2<sup>nd</sup> round of consultations, appropriate as they all are, was so vast that it is simply practically impossible to include them all in what is, after all, a general thematic paper pertaining to the issue of quality and learning outcomes. To include them all would probably double the length of what are already long papers. Furthermore, many commentators have also noted that the task already seems daunting and too long (while, often, at the same time, asking that their particular issues be considered). *The only solution to this problem, it seems to us, is to keep things relatively general at the level of the thematic papers, and then to negotiate or discuss the specifics when we proceed to developing agreements with particular partners.* That said, the following general points were made by more than one commentator, that is, they seemed to be “common cause” rather than the concern of one particular commentator.

1. More attention should be devoted to country-to-country (South-South) and, in general, peer-to-peer exchanges, particularly for matters where practical knowledge matters most, and where the issue is scale-up of experiences that already have been largely proven. In other cases there is more of a need to distil lessons of experience and pilots, and disseminate them. Thus in workshops and other learning events there is both a need to exchange lessons and a need to share good practices derived from analysis of experiences across a variety of countries and from recent research.
2. It is important to encourage collaboration amongst partners rather than competition, and (to the degree reasonably feasible) not to create the impression that any one partner has a lock on the key knowledge about a particular issue, while acknowledging that in certain specialized areas there is indeed a preponderance of ability in some particular partners, and also that there are existing international mandates for that partner to be the lead agency in certain technical areas.
3. Time frame too short for certain activities. This is acknowledged but is a management issue rather than a technical issue, and will be explored. The possibility of conceptualizing the activity as lasting 4 years, but with a proviso that their actual funding would take place only if there is successful replenishment after 2011, was mentioned.
4. Re-emphasize need for country-led or demand-led interest, not supply-led interest. The plan is that the review of the proposed results agreements between various partners and GPE will contain specific requirement of “proof of country interest.”
5. Some commentators, particularly those with an interesting in a cross-cutting theme such as management, have asked that their theme be included in every “technical” sub-theme. This is

something easier done in practice than in theory. If we tried to do this for every possible cross-cutting theme, when the papers are organized around technical areas (or for every technical area if the paper were organized around cross-cutting themes) then the papers (particularly the quality paper) would become impractically long and also very repetitive and even more tedious than it already perhaps is. We think this is best dealt with in practice, as partners work through these ideas in concrete situations.

6. Some commentators have shared a deep and at the same time extremely varied set of projects and experiences they have carried out. We have read all of these comments and descriptions, but it is not always easy to think of ways to further support such hugely varied experiences through a mechanism such as the GRA. Instead, it seems to us that GRA can support multilateral agencies who are compiling general quality frameworks to make sure that the practical experiences of many bilateral and multilateral projects find their way into these general frameworks. GRA could make the resources available to do this, to the degree possible, and to the degree that resources can make a difference.
7. Commentators (on the quality paper) have emphasized the fact that learning outcomes are affected by environmental conditions and also the supply resources, not just by pedagogical and management practice, teaching skills, etc., and that in that sense the approach implied by this GRA activity was overly focused on the pedagogical. At the same time, many noted that quality is not just about learning outcomes. On the other hand, it is important to note that if the idea is to create a speedy response that can create a sense of emerging optimism, it is logical to start with something clearly doable. We are convinced that the most urgent and remediable issues, with most promise of both fast and lasting impact, are indeed the ones related to classroom practice and learning materials, and that GPE needs to *start* with an impact here, and with some emphasis on these issues. Nonetheless, the critique is valid and therefore must be responded to. There are two issues: equity and appropriateness of funding/resourcing, and non-pedagogical or non-school factors. The issue of equity in funding and resourcing is dealt with in the Education Financing paper. Certain supply-side issues are also dealt with in the Out of School thematic paper. Other than that, it is difficult to know what to do with this topic. In certain cases, to the degree that the impacts are well-known, and to the extent that GRA cannot pay for implementation in any case, then the main thing one can do is encourage advocacy and accountability pressure so that governments and donors pay appropriate attention to these concerns. Since advocacy, accountability, and political economy issues were included as a specialized area of activity, then, by definition, advocacy around non-pedagogical issues was already considered. However, to acknowledge the importance of this entire area, and to handle the broad issue of non-pedagogical impacts on quality or learning, we have added a new activity, in which partners could focus on non-pedagogical factors related to school environment.

### **Partner Interest**

Partner interests have been expressed in various aspects of the GRA agenda, based on the various partners' work histories and comparative advantage. These are presented in tabular format. In discussion with individual partners, we hope to further refine these interests. The table is presented in alphabetical order. Some agency commentators made extremely diverse, in depth, and very engaged comments. However, they did not always express ways in which they themselves could proactively engage in a follow-up. We have read the intensity and engagement of comments as suggesting some

institutional interest in follow-up (e.g., in being a Supervising Entity in at least some aspects of their comments) but that is, in some cases, only an assumption on our part. In other cases, partners were quite “propositional” and therefore their interest was more likely to be digestible and presentable in tabular form. In general, our summaries below are very telegraphic statements of groups’ interests, as we cannot reproduce the richness of everyone’s comments in a table. All comments are posted on the webpage as noted, and, also, each thematic paper now reflects commentators points more completely, particularly when commentators were “propositional.” This table thus does not summarize partners’ technical or intellectual comments; it looks only at partners’ “propositional” comments.

It is important to note, in reading the table below, that according to the terms of the paper approved by the Board in 2010 and the governance documents for the Education for All Fund, only institutions that are official development agencies *and* are represented on the Board of GPE are able to directly access GRA funds: “‘Supervising Entity’ means any GPE Multilateral Agency Partner or any GPE Donor Country Partner designated to receive Transferred Funds and supervise an Activity, as approved by the GPE Board of Directors” (governance document for Education for All Fund). Thus, CSOs looking to partner with GPE in carrying out these activities need to come under the umbrella of an SE. However, these partnerships between CSOs and SEs would have to emerge out of discussions between the CSOs and SEs, as GPE is not in a position to induce, nor does it have the power to mandate or require these sorts of relationships.

All activities and interest listed below are provisional, as it is not always clear exactly how keenly each actor prioritizes the ideas submitted. This will be sorted out in conversations between GPE Secretariat and the actors. However, it is important for actors who are interested in the same topic to think, already, about their possible collaboration. This need not imply that one is a “prime” SE. Both could be SEs. The important thing is that they coordinate their actions. GPE will play a facilitative role in that, by, for instance, providing this matrix. *But it is important for the actors to be talking to each other, as is indeed already happening in a variety of these areas.*

Countries	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In Ghana, the School Performance appraisal Meeting (SPAM) is a multi-stakeholder forum used to promote the use of data for managing enrolment and attendance. Moreover, the Ministry of Education has developed a draft complementary basic education policy (emphasizing State-Civil Society joint implementation) to address OOS children. However, implementation faces budget and cost-efficiency challenges.</li> <li>2. Honduras will be experimenting with results-based financing as part of its own policies and would welcome support and collaboration with GPE-S.</li> <li>3. Mozambique suggests the possibility of making better use of both exams and assessment systems and appreciates help in this area. Calls for common benchmarks in public exams. In general the use of public exams for quality assurance, not just filtering, is under-explored. Also express interest in measurement of more basic skills and in mother tongue and in effective remediation approaches (already included in the note on Learning Outcomes) for children falling behind and under difficult conditions.</li> </ol>
-----------	--

IBE	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Interest in helping with curricular agenda as it pertains to early literacy, and tie-in between curricular agenda and assessment and learning materials. Can bring in important academic actors.</li> </ol>
IIEP	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. OOS <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. In training and support on ESPs, ensure aspects of inclusion (may be implemented through Education for All Fund windows other than GRA).</li> <li>b. Possible role convening work on written assessment in early grades, networking PASEC, SACMEQ, LLECE, other efforts.</li> <li>c. Causes of gender inequality in learning outcomes particularly in poorest countries.</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. Finance. Interest in finance agenda, capacity-building around finance, fiduciary risk assessment, integrated approaches to funding equity, and innovative finance (with French Ministry of Foreign Affairs). Interest in collaboration with Pole de Dakar, and UIS. Irish Aid suggested possibility of collaboration with IIEP on Finance.</li> </ol>
ILO, ILO-IPEC	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. OOS and Quality <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Interest in helping with linkages between child labor knowledge base and education (OOS) through ILO IPEC program/better connection between analysis of child labor data and education planning.</li> <li>b. Contribute to improved coherence between data collection activities of member agencies to ensure mainstreaming of the child labor issue in ESPs, upscale of existing methodologies for including more children, and to identify vital interventions to address the reasons why children work instead of going to school or why they drop out to work.</li> <li>c. Particular interest in schooling (OOS and quality) outcomes of migrant children.</li> <li>d. Contribute to the development of an operational definition of OOS and related indicators for statistical measurement purposes. Model questionnaires. In this regard, collaboration with WB, UNICEF, UNESCO and UCW could be envisaged.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>
UIS	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. OOS <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Work on data issues particularly as they pertain to OOS. Indicator definition. Particular attention to issues of absenteeism, in-and-out-of-school phenomena. Analysis of administrative data and HH surveys, linking the two if possible.</li> <li>b. Carrying on ongoing work as part of OOSCI initiative.</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. Quality <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Work on oral assessment based on existing technical experience. (Convening experts to set standards, compare experiences, etc.). Possibly other aspects of networking learning outcomes. (See UNESCO.) Repository of information on learning outcomes.</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. Finance <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Development of methodologies to improve national reporting systems on finance flows. Collaborate with WB, also National Education Account efforts?</li> </ol> </li> </ol>
UNESCO	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Quality <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Mutual mandate-setting through common commitment, and agreement generation amongst technical leaders and countries around goal 6, as a starting point.</li> <li>b. Quality frameworks and agreements to try, use, document.</li> <li>c. Institutionalizing support to quality enhancement via local knowledge providers (universities and think tanks within countries).</li> </ol> </li> </ol>

	<p>d. Consolidating lessons learned across a variety of assessments. (See UIS.)</p> <p>2. OOS and Quality. Non-formal education: analysis, knowledge-sharing, pilot. Strengthening non-formal pathways for expanding basic education opportunities for out-of-school children – integrating NFE in clear policy framework; partnership with NGOs, CSOs and local communities to strengthen and expand quality NFE; assess and document on-going NFE initiatives; support capacity development and training for NFE personnel (if policy level, this should be integrated with the overall activity on analysis of sector plans, and it is therefore suggested as a ‘supporting’ activity, if pilot activities also need to be integrated with ESPs, locally-owned).</p> <p>3. Finance</p> <p>a. UNESCO with UIS expressed its interest to carry out the development of a methodology to improve national reporting systems on financial flows.</p>
UNICEF	<p>1. OOS</p> <p>a. Interest in various aspects of data, policy, and management of OOS agenda, including measurement of causes, management of enrollment and attendance, experiences and dissemination of practical approaches to OOS. Ongoing history of OOS work with UIS under OOSCI initiative. Experience in household surveys that can identify causes. Thus, build on the efforts of OOSCI. In response to increasing demand from countries, UNICEF is developing a strategy in collaboration with its regional offices to roll out OOSCI in more countries. This will need to be done in close collaboration with the GPE in order to ensure systematic embedding of the approach in to country planning, reform and implementation process (including Joint Sector Reviews). Development of guide on OOSC. Expand practical work to more countries.</p> <p>b. Collaborate with the GPE and other partners in the development of the guide on OOSC in order to ensure the input of solid expertise. Develop a strategy for a more systematic use of the guide in country planning processes and joint sector reviews.</p> <p>2. Quality</p> <p>a. Interest in scale-up of use of Child-Friendly Schools framework as a quality assurance framework.</p> <p>b. Interests and comments expressed in mother tongue, multi-grade teaching, production of texts in mother tongue, PPPs in textbooks, and a great variety of topics that would need to be provided in integral form. This suggests roles in piloting of integrated approaches or very country-based partnerships.</p> <p>3. OOS and Quality. Developing approaches and policy development for the inclusion of children with disabilities. Collaborate on MICS disability module. Inclusion of disability issues in ESPs, JSRs.</p> <p>4. Finance. Development of integrated funding approaches for equity in education: school fees.</p>
Various bilateral agencies	<p>1. Interest in GPE Secretariat’s technical recommendations on key issues such as norms around learning outcomes (e.g., DfID, USAID).</p> <p>2. Interested in commenting on and supporting GPE via their own work in countries, convening regional efforts (e.g., AFD around PASEC and learning outcomes, as PASEC one of few experiences in early learning assessment in writing).</p>

3. GIZ has expressed particular interest in collaborating on dissemination and knowledge-sharing of particular issues, particularly in quality area and more specifically in teaching and early skills, mother tongue, ECD, teacher training and supervision, and learner assessment (in collaboration with IIEP?). Experience of former InWent is mentioned.
4. JICA has made available extensive list of good practices, learned from specific pilot projects, which can be shared in any of the three areas. Possible special interest in school grants in connection with Finance activity on Development of integrated funding approaches for equity in education. More discussion with JICA on specific types of activities (workshops, scale up of pilots, as ways of further mainstreaming the project experience?) will likely be convenient.
5. Irish Aid, similarly to JICA, cited a background of country experience and willingness to work in various GRA activities. Collaboration with IIEP specifically on Finance issues was mentioned. (See IIEP section.)
6. DfID has noted an interest in focused approaches in early learning including assessment of early skills.
7. USAID
  - a. Quality. Already modeling various bilateral projects with explicit literacy aim. Welcomes technical collaboration with GPE, DfID, AUSAID, etc. Is already modeling many of the Learning Outcomes approaches noted here, often in rigorously evaluated contexts, and their experiences will inform work going forward. GPE will find ways to support these processes particularly if/as USAID links with other donors with a very close interest such as DfID or AUSAID.
  - b. Finance. Possible interest in modeling of explicit mechanisms for incentivizing outcomes.
8. French Ministry of Foreign Affairs
  - a. Finance. Innovative-finance aspects of finance theme paper, possibly in collaboration with IIEP.
9. AFD interests in:
  - a. OOS and quality. Health factors. Eyesight, nutrition, etc. Possible research area.
  - b. Quality. Assessment systems. Collaborate in improving and sharing lessons learnt across regional assessments with focus on PASEC. In particular plans and interaction on early-grade methodologies might be of most interest to other assessments and thus collaboration in that area.
  - c. Quality. Multilingual / mother tongue. Collaboration with GPE but also other partners (GIZ, ADEA, etc.), sharing of lessons, technical support and exchanges.
  - d. Quality. Teacher practices/attitudes/behaviors. Improve dissemination of understanding of current weak impact of TT.
  - e. Finance/quality. Development of a methodology to improve national reporting systems on finance flows through Pole de Dakar (and perhaps broader issues on finance themes). Broader "sector analysis" issues, perhaps with specialization as they pertain to accountability.
10. AUSAID
  - a. All areas, including OOS, Learning, Finance, as they relate to advocacy and watchfulness, in relation to civil society, possibly in partnership with CGE.
  - b. Quality. AUSAID interest in learning outcome targets and coordinating

	<p>effort with other donors on this topic.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>11. Similarly AUSAID and CIDA seem to have particular interest in various areas and submitted many comments but it is unclear how they themselves are proceeding in ways that can link with some of these initiatives or possible role as SE partners.</li> <li>12. Finland. Interest in both OOS and Quality aspects of disability and inclusion. Collaboration also via UNICEF. Possible collaboration with Leonard Cheshire Disability. (Extension of ongoing innovations in collaboration with these various bodies.)</li> </ol>
<p>Various civil society organizations, "other"</p>	<p><i>Note that under the terms of the Education for All governance documentation, as well as the GRA definition document approved by the Board, CSOs would have to work under SEs.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CGE has signaled willingness to work on political economic and accountability issues with respect to access, learning outcomes, and finance. May need a Supervising Entity.</li> <li>2. The Brookings Institution has issued a Global Compact on Learning which itself encompasses key GPE partners (DfID, CIDA, USAID, elements of civil society constituencies, for instance), and which addresses itself at the Learning Outcomes / Quality agenda including but not limited to early literacy. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. In collaboration with others, possible work on finance agenda including National Education Accounts.</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. Various NGOs such as Save-the-Children with its Literacy Boost approach, Pratham in India, IEP in Mali (and others), have already been demonstrating approaches that tie in to the efforts noted in the Learning Outcomes concept note.</li> <li>4. Similarly various service-provision CSOs and NGOs would be interested in working in Fragile States situations to further develop experiences, leading to knowledge sharing, on improved ways to work in these cases.</li> <li>5. Education International signaled its willingness to work on the definition of out-of-school children and conceptualizing of the meaning of enrolment; development of techniques to measure out of school children. Also to play role in collaborating with ESPs at local level to ensure goals addressed.</li> <li>6. Global March showed interest in improved coherence between data collection activities of member agencies and to identify child-labor issues related to OOS. Possible collaboration with UIS or ILO. Also collaborating on CSO advocacy capacity building on goals.</li> <li>7. CONFEMEN signaled interest in assessment through PASEC, and uses of assessment in improving. More interest in focus on end-of-cycle. (See AFD entry, IIEP, UIS and UNESCO entries.)</li> </ol>
<p>World Bank</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. OOS. Linking data gap activity led by two SEs (UIS, UNICEF) with SABER which has a planned domain in inclusion and equity, but mostly focuses on benchmarking systems for monitoring inclusion, while UIS, UNICEF efforts are aimed at data and policy and management. Model of exclusion as basis for data and management. Assess applicability of various SABER tools to fragile states.</li> <li>2. OOS and Quality. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Ongoing work on impact evaluation of various kinds of interventions across all areas of GRA. Note relationship to recommendations of mid-term GPE evaluation and subsequent M&amp;E consultants regarding need for impact evaluation of GPE initiatives. (Refer to GPE M&amp;E policy</li> </ol> </li> </ol>

	<p>definition process during 2011.)</p> <p>b. The role of health and nutrition factors in both OOS and Learning Outcomes. Indicators of school health outcomes. Possible specific example starting evaluation of eye-glasses provision as cost-effective quality-enhancing move. De-worming and similar initiatives. Could collaborate with WHO. Sustainable models of integrated school health.</p> <p>3. Quality. Apply SABER work in more GPE countries in particular areas such as teacher policy, learner assessment. Assess applicability of various SABER tools to fragile states. Interest in ECD approaches. Improving on use of assessment tools for affecting instruction.</p> <p>4. Quality. Life and literacy skills assessment for youth. Highest-order goal of GPE is youth literacy yet there are no real tools for measuring it. WB has an initiative in this area which could make original methodological contributions.</p> <p>5. Finance</p> <p>a. Development of a methodology to improve national reporting systems on finance flows (SABER)</p> <p>b. Work on improved financial analysis and reporting (e.g., ongoing work on Country Status Reports).</p> <p>c. Fiduciary risk (PEFA)</p> <p>d. Development of integrated funding approaches for equity in education (SABER)</p> <p>e. Marginal Budgeting for Bottlenecks. (This could be linked to the Finance thematic paper or also the accountability section of the quality paper.)</p>
World Bank	<p>6. OOS. Linking data gap activity led by two SEs (UIS, UNICEF) with SABER which has a planned domain in inclusion and equity, but mostly focuses on benchmarking systems for monitoring inclusion, while UIS, UNICEF efforts are aimed at data and policy and management. Model of exclusion as basis for data and management. Assess applicability of various SABER tools to fragile states.</p> <p>7. OOS and Quality.</p> <p>a. Ongoing work on impact evaluation of various kinds of interventions across all areas of GRA. Note relationship to recommendations of mid-term GPE evaluation and subsequent M&amp;E consultants regarding need for impact evaluation of GPE initiatives. (Refer to GPE M&amp;E policy definition process during 2011.)</p> <p>b. The role of health and nutrition factors in both OOS and Learning Outcomes. Indicators of school health outcomes. Possible specific example starting evaluation of eye-glasses provision as cost-effective quality-enhancing move. De-worming and similar initiatives. Could collaborate with WHO. Sustainable models of integrated school health.</p> <p>8. Quality. Apply SABER work in more GPE countries in particular areas such as teacher policy, learner assessment. Assess applicability of various SABER tools to fragile states. Interest in ECD approaches. Improving on use of assessment tools for affecting instruction.</p> <p>9. Quality. Life and literacy skills assessment for youth. Highest-order goal of GPE is youth literacy yet there are no real tools for measuring it. WB has an initiative in this area, which could make original methodological contributions.</p> <p>10. Finance.</p> <p>a. Development of a methodology to improve national reporting systems</p>

World Bank	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>on finance flows (SABER).</li> <li>b. Work on improved financial analysis and reporting (e.g., ongoing work on Country Status Reports).</li> <li>c. Fiduciary risk (PEFA).</li> <li>d. Development of integrated funding approaches for equity in education (SABER).</li> <li>e. Marginal Budgeting for Bottlenecks. (This could be linked to the Finance thematic paper or also the accountability section of the quality paper.)</li> </ul>
------------	--

**Partners listed by interest in specific Finance Activities**

The table above shows partners interests sorted by partner. The one below, which should be read in conjunction with the one above, groups all the partners by area of interest. By focusing on the various partners interested in particular aspects of each activity, it is intended to help sort out areas of mutual interest and either stimulate discussion amongst partners or explain why GPE might single out particular partners for particular issues.

SE or interested partner	Activity
Activity 1: Development of a methodology to improve national reporting systems on finance flows.	AFD (through the pole de Dakar) IIEP( keen to work with UIS+ Pole de Dakar) UIS (keen to work with Brookings, World Bank) World Bank (SABER)
Activity 2: Development of a tool to assess the fiduciary risk in the education sector.	IIEP World Bank with PEFA?
Activity 3: Development of financing initiatives to link resources to results.	USAID?
Activity 4: Development of integrated funding approaches for equity in education.	AusAID (with GCE)? IIEP UNICEF (school fee abolition initiative) JICA (school grants) World Bank (SABER)
Activity 5: Development of an approach for implementing innovative financing for education	EFA International coordination team IIEP + French Ministry of Foreign Affairs

## **Way Forward**

The Secretariat will provide the Board a priority list of the thematic activities, list of potential SEs, and estimates for the funding requests. At the November meeting, the Board will be requested to approve a funding envelope for the GRA based on the success of the replenishment. If a decision on the priority list (within the envelope) cannot also be decided at that time, then a special virtual decision meeting will be held pending EQRs of the RRP.

Based on the expressions of interest and ongoing conversations, the Secretariat will proceed to issue Requests for Results Partnerships (RRPs). Once the RRP are issued, the Secretariat will schedule EQRs for each of the proposals received to ensure they are results-oriented and will identify the specific outputs and outcomes that the consultations indicate the Global Partnership for Education should support. Expert panels will be commissioned to undertake the reviews and provide concrete ratings and recommendations on which RRP to support and to what extent. When the EQR process is completed, the Secretariat will review the comments from the EQR expert panels, request clarifications and/or adjustments in the proposals, as appropriate, and then proceed to issue Transfer Agreements.



## Global and Regional Activities Program

### Thematic Area: Education Financing

Version 3: Final

September 2011

## Table of Contents

1. Background .....	1
2. Proposed Activities .....	2
Activity #1 Assessment and improvement of national reporting system on financing flows ....	3
Activity #2 Development of a tool to assess the fiduciary risk in the education sector .....	6
Activity #3 Development of financing initiatives tightening link of resources to results.....	7
Activity #4 Development of integrated funding approaches for equity in education .....	9
Activity #5 Development of an approach for implementing innovative financing for education	11

## 1. BACKGROUND

Education represents a substantial, if not the largest share of public expenditures in many low-income countries. Governments in those countries made significant efforts over the past decade to increase their national budgets for education. The 2011 Global Monitoring Report shows that education spending as a share of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) increased from 2.9% in 1999 to 3.8% in 2008 in low-income countries. But it is widely agreed that levels of domestic financing and external funding are not the only pressing issue when it comes to provide equal educational opportunities to all children.

The concerns addressed in this paper are (a) how to make domestic education finance systems more effective to ensure efficient, equitable and transparent education spending in GPE developing countries; and (b) how to make external funding more effective in terms of consistency with national education priorities and how to increase its predictability, specifically through innovative financing. But also, how to develop methods to induce results through external funding, i.e., results-based funding. The paper suggests five priority activities and approaches for filling the existing knowledge gap in these areas. The identified activities are in support to achieving GPE's objectives and to achieve sustainable progress over the years on the indicators agreed to in the GPE Results Framework.

***Efficiency of public expenditures.*** The issue of efficiency addresses the use of resources allocated to an education system as regard to its cost-effectiveness. In other words, what is the value for money? What can be observed in terms of expenditures in relation to enrolment, gender parity and long-term learning achievements for children? Are there wastages in terms of public expenditures, and how can they be identified and dealt with? Although in some countries insufficient domestic funding levels remain a major challenge, in others, sub-optimal use and allocation undermine the efficiency of education expenditures. Some countries achieve better results with less money than others with a higher volume of available funding. But also countries with similar levels of public spending for the education sector achieve very different results.

The efficiency of public expenditure in education is dependent on the efficiency of public expenditure in general. It cannot be isolated from the larger public expenditure context. In the education sector, efficiency depends on the available education sector data to inform the decision making process and transparent monitoring of the flow of funds. It also depends on structures of demand or social pressure, within the society (and in the interaction between the local society and external agencies) for efficient spending. This may relate to pressure from civil society or pressure from one state institution on another. However there are also instances where the local values may result in resistance to the most effective strategy.

**Equity of resource allocation.** In many low-income countries governments do not make equitable allocation decisions, in particular with respect to the following variables: geographic, social and gender disparities. Inefficient allocation of resources becomes evident in the disparities between urban and rural areas, for example regarding investments in school infrastructure, which limits the chances (especially for girls) to go to school. This is usually a result of a lack of incentives for teachers to work in the rural areas and a bad budget decision to not make rural schools more attractive places to work, or of the lack of transparent, fair, and enforced staff allocation mechanisms. Concerning the social disparities, the 10 percent most educated in low-income sub-Saharan African countries benefit from 43 percent of public spending on education. The public education finance mechanisms and structures a government applies should promote equal educational opportunities. This aspect also relates to the measure of the private costs for schooling. Parents, and especially poor parents, pay a significant share of the costs in primary education, especially in rural and remote areas. Parents, for example, make direct investments for their children's education when they decide to establish a community school in the absence of the state providing a public school, or one the parents consider good enough. Furthermore, if school fees have been largely abolished in the past decade, hidden costs, either direct or indirect, remain important for families, as well as opportunity costs. Household cost-barriers to education continue to constitute a, if not *the*, major barrier to education access, especially within the present context of chronic economic and food crises. There is a need to maintain the focus on such barriers and on the continuing creeping of multiple costs and burdens on poor families for the education of their children.

**Sufficiency of resources for education.** This issue concerns the amount of funding, domestic and external, and whether or not it is sufficient for implementing the set education policies. A couple of questions relate to this issue: What is the funding gap and how does the government plan to fill it? Do existing plans provide information on credible multi-year financial resource requirements for educational development? What is the role of the private sector and external donors in the financing of education?

External resources are an important way of financing the education sector in low-income countries. However, we need to ascertain the extent to which donors have effectively delivered on their financial commitments. In addition at the country level, external support, when delivered, remains disconnected from the budget planning and is broadly unpredictable. In this respect, innovative financing mechanisms, which are supposed to be more sustainable and more predictable, will have to be thoughtfully investigated.

## **2. Proposed Activities**

The following sections will present the knowledge and activities gaps in the field of the education financing in the GPE partnership. These activities concern regional and global issues in the sector and need to be addressed by partners to ensure accelerated results.

If effectively undertaken, these activities could put policy makers in the field of education in a position to implement five processes: i) to know what the costs of education are and to analyze them, ii) to be able to design funding policies and define the role of each stakeholder, iii) to anticipate financial consequences of education reforms or development objectives, iv) to articulate policy, planning and management and v) to be able to follow-up and monitor policy objectives.

**The five proposed activities in this paper are:**

- 1. Development of a methodology to improve national reporting systems on financing flows.**
- 2. Development of a tool to assess the fiduciary risk in the education sector.**
- 3. Development of financing initiatives tightening resources to results.**
- 4. Development of integrated funding approaches for equity in education.**
- 5. Development of innovative financing mechanisms to increase financial resources in education.**

**Activity # 1 Assessment and improvement of national reporting system on financing flows**

GPE countries are responsible for developing and implementing an education sector plan (ESP), comprehensive or interim. The government works with the Local Donor Group and Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) to ensure efficient monitoring of the implementation of the plan through local capacity-building and Joint Sector Reviews conducted with government officials.

The development of an ESP requires having a clear understanding of challenges and issues of the education sector. One of the most critical information gaps concerns the financing flows in the sector; including issues of efficiency and equity of public expenditures. As discussed above, an increase of the financial resources for the sector is not sufficient to achieve better results either in access or in student learning - and to decrease inequality. It is important for the government to produce good quality data on financing flows in the education sector in order to understand how funds are disbursed, who are disadvantaged in access to funding, where are the potential source of leakages and savings and what could be done to improve the cost efficiency and effectiveness. This will also help identify the unit costs by expenditure item for both recurrent and capital expenditures.

However, the production of complete statistics on education financing and expenditure is the weak point of many education statistical information systems. Education Management Information Systems (EMIS) rarely provide information on education cost and financing. The reason for the weakness of the statistics on education financing and expenditure comes from the weak capacity, governance and accountability of many education systems, compounded by the complexity of the financing mechanisms of schools, with various partners contributing

to it and on the fact that the knowledge on financial data is split between various places, and the flows arrive in many forms and from many sources within the Ministries, including, of course, often in-kind form. Thus, data on what schools spend are often hard to obtain.

A costing exercise, using a projection model, is one way to estimate the financial requirements of the sector development and also to identify alternative scenarios for the evolution of the sector in the future. This exercise should be undertaken in close cooperation with the Ministry of Finance (and include other ministries involved in education), with the support of the local donor group, to ensure financial affordability and consistency with the overall budget planning process; as well as any existing EMIS. This process should lead to the production of a Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) for the sector approved by the Ministry of Finance.

<b>Proposed activity #1:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The GPE Partnership should ensure that all GPE developing country partners can implement good reporting on financing flows. This should: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Be consistent with the technical capacities of the individual country, especially fragile states and include capacity development measures;</li> <li>✓ Enable an overall estimation of the resources (public, private and external) available for the sector including at the decentralized, local, and school levels;</li> <li>✓ Identify the inefficiencies in the resource allocation and utilization;</li> <li>✓ Analyze the equity of the resource allocation;</li> <li>✓ Enable the Ministry of Education to develop a costing of the ESP that will lead to the development of an MTEF when the Ministry of Finance already uses a programmatic approach for the national budget;</li> <li>✓ Enable the Local Education Group to monitor the resource allocation and execution (especially at the local and school level) during the implementation of the ESP mainly through the Joint Sector Review Reports;</li> <li>✓ Ensure that teacher unions and other civil society organizations are involved in every step of the process;</li> <li>✓ GPE Countries should be encouraged to publish key education finance statistics in their annual yearbooks along with other education statistics. This increases transparency and makes the data available to all national and international stakeholders (civil society, members of parliament, etc) and at the same time increases the expertise of national staff in education finance data.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Type of activity</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research and basic knowledge.</li> <li>• Technical workshops and knowledge dissemination.</li> <li>• Technical assistance.</li> <li>• Intervention to inform scale up.</li> </ul>
<b>Link with Results</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Output 1: GPE partner countries develop and implement sound sector</li> </ul>

<b>framework indicators</b>	policies in education.
<b>Proposed approach #1:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal for activity #1 should be based on the existing tools already in place in the sector such as: country status reports, public expenditure reviews, public expenditure tracking survey, cost projection models. It should take into account the project undertaken by the World Bank on benchmarking: System Assessment and Benchmarking for Education Results (SABER). It could involve civil society organizations interested in the tracking of public expenditures.</li> <li>• The proposal should be tested in at least 5 GPE developing countries where partners will develop or update their ESP in the coming two years (2012-2013).</li> <li>• The proposal should take into account that the GPE Partnership wants to improve the accountability at the global level to ensure that GPE partners reach their commitments. UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS) has the mandate to collect and disseminate data on education. The reporting developed at the country level will have to allow dissemination of the financing data at the global level through UIS.</li> </ul>
<b>Expected Deliverables #1:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An approach for assessing the quality of reporting on education financing flows.</li> <li>• A package of capacity building for improving reporting on education financing flows.</li> <li>• A pilot intervention in at least 5 countries which will consist in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Implementing capacity development, policy dialogue, and planning support activities to foster the implementation of improved financial analysis particularly in the context of ESP development, and its understanding by the local education group;</li> <li>✓ Targeting capacity building with civil society to enhance their understanding of financial issues and their capacity to demand accountability;</li> <li>✓ Joint capacity building for improving relationships between Ministries of Education and Ministries of Finance and/or Planning.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• A series of international/regional workshops with representatives of donors, government, and civil society to build capacity and share experiences.</li> <li>• The development of Education Sector Annual Financial Performance Reports which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ provide essential timely information on education financing to identify key achievements and critical problems;</li> <li>✓ allow government, donors and communities to have a common detailed understanding of how much is spent and where;</li> <li>✓ hold government at a national level and below to account for expenditure that is less than required or promised, or is inefficient</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	even if sufficient.
<b>Timeframe #1:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The work will start in January 2012 and deliverables will be operational by the end of June 2013.</li> </ul>

## Activity #2 - Development of a tool to assess the fiduciary risk in the education sector

The implementation of activity #1 will lead to an improvement of the information on the execution of the budget. However, a specific analysis may be required to better assess the fiduciary risk at the country level. It will help the donor partners to choose the optimal modality for delivering aid.

The existing Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability (PEFA) Program enables to assess the fiduciary risk at the national level. It aims at strengthening the ability of partner countries and donor agencies to: (i) assess the condition of country public expenditure, procurement and financial accountability systems, and (ii) develop a practical sequence of reform and capacity-building actions.

<b>Proposed activity #2:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The GPE Partnership should ensure that GPE developing country partners can implement a tool to assess the fiduciary risk in the education sector. This tool will have to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Be consistent with the international criteria for fiduciary risk analysis;</li> <li>✓ Identify the capacity development needs for implementing fiduciary risk analysis and for lowering fiduciary risk;</li> <li>✓ Make proposals on the best modalities for delivering aid even in situations of high fiduciary risk, including for fragile states, and to recommend means of lowering fiduciary risk so that low-transactions-cost aid modalities can be implemented without unduly increased risk. The role of public transparency and accountability ought to be highlighted;</li> <li>✓ Score the fiduciary risk to enable international comparisons and monitoring improvement;</li> <li>✓ Identify the role the civil society could play to monitor and decrease the fiduciary risk in the education sector.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Type of activity</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Research and basic knowledge.</li> <li>Technical workshops and knowledge dissemination.</li> <li>Technical assistance.</li> <li>Intervention to inform scale up.</li> </ul>
<b>Link with Results framework indicators</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Indicator 3: Variation between education sector plan allocation and actual budget expenditure in GPE countries.</li> </ul>
<b>Proposed approach #2:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The activity should be tested in at least five GPE developing country partners that will develop, update or implement an ESP in the following two years. Some of the countries should be judged likely to have high fiduciary risk ex</li> </ul>

	<p>ante, and some should be judged to have lower risk. Some should be relatively more fragile states, others may be less. So, the performance of the approach should be assessed in a variety of conditions. The activity needs to be explicitly and concretely aimed at improved ESPs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An adaptation of the PEFA methodology to the education sector should be investigated.</li> </ul>
<b>Expected deliverables #2:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An operational tool to assess the fiduciary risk in the education sector. This tool will have to be flexible and implemented in various environments such as fragile states and/or weak technical capacity.</li> <li>• A pilot intervention in at least 5 countries which will consist in testing the tool, implementing capacity development activities to allow the implementation of this tool and its understanding by the local education group.</li> <li>• A series of international/regional workshop with representatives of donors and government to present the new methodology.</li> <li>• A write-up documenting lessons learned, ready for further dissemination.</li> </ul>
<b>Timeframe #2:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The work will start in January 2012 and the deliverables will have to be operational and validated by the GPE board by the end of June 2013.</li> </ul>

### **Activity #3 - Development of financing initiatives tightening link of resources to results**

It is GPE's core mission to empower its partner countries to achieve results linked to the broader MDG agenda and to its own education development goals. There are initiatives that put results in the focus of development financing and there is a need to learn and share among the partners the knowledge and experience of what works best under which country circumstances. The GPE Partnership offers a platform to share this specific knowledge.

GPE has shifted from an input-oriented approach to a results framework as the main mechanism for tracking progress and determining success of the in-country programs it supports. It is critical to promote approaches to link the GPE results/objectives stated in the GPE Results Framework with financing levels to enforce accountability within the GPE Partnership.

Existing results-based mechanisms that link results with external financing are (a) output-based aid approach implemented by the AusAid, DfID, World Bank and others, (b) conditional cash transfers (among others World Bank), (c) cash-on-delivery proposed by the Centre for Global Development, and (d) general and sector budget support implemented by many agencies in various countries. Work on output based aid for delivery of basic services has been promoted through the Global Partnership on Output-Based Aid.<sup>1</sup>

The purpose of this activity is to provide evidence regarding what mechanisms work best to link resource investment with defined educational results.

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.gpoba.org/gpoba/>

<b>Proposed activity #3 :</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The GPE Partnership should promote effective and adequate use of results-based financing mechanisms. This activity will have to:</li> </ul> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Compare existing mechanisms and modalities that are results-focused with regard to country circumstances such as quality of national systems, donor dependency, degree of government ownership, available capacities, etc.; this will include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Giving specific attention to needs and circumstances of fragile states;</li> <li>• looking at similar mechanisms in other sectors and learn from their experience;</li> <li>• analyzing contexts and processes in which results-based financing mechanisms were implemented;</li> <li>• identifying the pros and cons of each mechanism also based on consultations with partner country governments and Local Education Groups who have experience with results-focused financing mechanisms;</li> <li>• identify the implications of such mechanisms on country ownership and donor behavior (including increased aid predictability);</li> <li>• looking at how results-based financing links with the aid effectiveness principles;</li> <li>• specifying the risks and difficulties of each mechanism;</li> <li>• point out clearly the challenges and limitations of results-based financing mechanisms; and</li> <li>• Identify required capacities of a country to successfully meet the requirements of a results-based financing mechanism and give recommendations how to build these capacities.</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. Based on the comparison make a proposal on what the most effective results-focused mechanisms (if necessary suggest modifications) are for the education sector and propose how to implement them in GPE countries.</li> <li>3. Outline the expected implications on the Education for All Fund.</li> </ol>
<b>Type of activity</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research and basic knowledge.</li> <li>• Technical workshops and knowledge dissemination.</li> <li>• Technical assistance.</li> <li>• Intervention to inform scale up.</li> </ul>
<b>Link with Results framework indicators</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Indicator 2: GPE countries meeting their GPE (re)endorsement target.</li> <li>• Indicator 7: Paris Declaration Indicators in the education sector.</li> </ul>
<b>Proposed approach:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk review and evaluation of existing studies, reports and technical papers in the field of output-based / results-based financing mechanisms in the education sector at the global and national level by multilateral and bilateral donors such as the World Bank and DFID but also with partner country governments, analyzing strengths and weaknesses of each mechanisms in specific contexts.</li> <li>• Based on a review of evidence, three pilot projects will be tested in GPE partner countries.</li> </ul>

<b>Expected deliverables:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comparison of different existing results-focused financing mechanisms with recommendations on how to use them in the education sector, taking into consideration different country circumstances such as fragile states.</li> <li>• A methodology / project paper presenting the practical conditions and steps to implement results-based financing in education.</li> <li>• Convene and facilitate an international workshop with representatives of donors and government to present the methodology.</li> <li>• Three pilot projects will be tested in GPE partners countries based on consultations with the partner country government and the Local Education Group.</li> </ul>
<b>Timeframe :</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The work will start in January 2012 and the methodology will be presented by the end of June 2015.</li> </ul>

#### **Activity # 4 - Development of integrated funding approaches for equity in education**

To be equitable, education systems need to allocate additional resources to address poverty, social barriers and the integration of students with disabilities. Promoting equity in education requires appropriate analysis and integrated funding approaches that are sustainable and able to be applied over the medium and longer terms to effect meaningful changes.

Equity analysis needs to consider public and private sectors of schooling. This is especially important in countries with a significant share of children enrolled in private schools (or where the poor are overly represented in private schools).

The proposed activity could focus on five (5) different countries with different equity challenges (remote communities, ethnic minorities, students with disabilities, gender imbalances, large income inequalities, or education systems known to be very inequitable) and use seed funding as well as capacity development activities to support medium to long term structural changes in education funding. These changes in the use of domestic and complementary donor funds can sustain meaningful improvements in the commitment and use of resources for equity improvements. It could study countries, even if middle income, which have actively set up pro-poor funding such as Chile or South Africa.

The proposed activity should support the development of appropriate diagnostic tools that cover areas such as the following:

- ***Funding for poor and remote areas*** to ensure that adequate resourcing goes to highly needy areas. Unit costs for providing education in remote areas are often much higher than other locations because of lower pupil-teacher ratios and the need to provide boarding facilities, school feeding programs and housing for teachers. Average expenditure per student in remote areas is less than or equal to the national average usually indicates an inequitable resource allocation. This issue concerns also ethnic and linguistic minorities, since additional cost of multilingual education could be substantial. In addition, it is critical to improve the teachers' working and living

conditions and to come up with incentives which can help attract male and female teachers to and retain them in rural, remote and other needy area.

- **Non-salary shares of expenditure** for poor and remotes areas is very important because these are usually the least able to provide private sources of funding for classroom materials, equipment and school maintenance.
- **Targeted funding for students with disabilities** helps track the annual amount of operational expenditure and capital investment that is available to meet the specific needs of this group.
- **Formula based approaches** should apply the above considerations in a manner that is as transparent and predictable as possible.

<b>Proposed activity #4 :</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The GPE Partnership should ensure that GPE developing partner countries can implement diagnostic assessment and integrated funding approaches for equity in education, which will have to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Be consistent with the ESP and budget approach of each country; Identify the capacity development needs for implementing an integrated funding strategy;</li> <li>✓ Propose an assessment tool for rapid diagnostic assessment of the financing status for education equity and associated funding gaps;</li> <li>✓ Make a proposal on the best modalities for integrated funding approaches, including for fragile states, and to recommend means of enhancing the sustainability and domestic ownership. The role of public transparency and stakeholder support ought to be highlighted. These may include funding formulas.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Type of activity</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research and basic knowledge.</li> <li>• Technical workshops and knowledge dissemination.</li> <li>• Technical assistance.</li> <li>• Intervention to inform scale up.</li> </ul>
<b>Link with Results framework indicators</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Indicator 2: Percentage of endorsed ESPs that include effective strategies to achieve equitable access and that target children with special needs and the prevention and mitigation of the effects of HIV/Aids.</li> </ul>
<b>Proposed approach:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The activity should be tested in at least five GPE developing county partners. Countries will develop or update education equity assessment tools relating educational participation, education outcomes and processes to financing for education. The assessment should consider not only the quantum of funds but also the equity impact of the allocation and use of funds;</li> <li>• Based on the equity assessment and funding gap analysis, countries will develop and then implement an integrated equity funding</li> </ul>

	<p>strategy;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some of the participating countries should be judged likely to have high fiduciary risk ex ante, and some should be judged to have lower risk. Some should be relatively more fragile states, others may be less. All of the countries should have significant difficulties to enroll poor children especially in remote and rural area. So, the performance of the approach should be assessed in a variety of conditions. The activity needs to be explicitly and concretely aimed at improved ESPs.</li> </ul>
<b>Expected deliverables:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An operational tool to assess equity in education and adequacy of existing resourcing strategies in the education sector;</li> <li>The design of integrated equity funding models that lodge targeted funding strategies within mainstream government education financing including the possible of use of funding formulas or similar mechanisms that alter the incidence of public spending in a clear and quantifiable way;</li> <li>A pilot intervention in at least 5 countries which will consist of testing the diagnostic operational tool and equity funding models, implementing capacity development activities to support design and implementation of this tool by the local education group;</li> <li>A series of international/regional workshops with representatives of donors and government to present the new methodology; and</li> <li>A document detailing lessons learned, ready for further dissemination.</li> </ul>
<b>Timeframe :</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The works will start in January 2012 methodology will be presented by the end of June 2015.</li> </ul>

#### **Activity #5– Development of an approach for implementing innovative financing for education**

Though there is no internationally agreed definition of innovative financing, and definitions can vary from an actor to the other, it is generally admitted that innovative financing efforts have four characteristics: a) they complement traditional ODA, b) they are sustainable, predictable and stable, c) they involve the public sector at some point and d) they involve cross-border resource transfers.

The international Task force on Innovative Financing for Education met for the first time in May 2010 in Paris. The meeting brought together some twenty-five countries and organizations. The main objective of the Task Force, which is part of the Leading Group on Innovative Financing for Development, is to increase the financial resources available for education by identifying new ways of raising funds. In this sense this activity is different from others considered in the broad rubric of “education finance”: this activity relates directly to innovative *sources* of funds. Naturally, there is some overlap with other finance activities, as some innovative sources of finance may insist that the funds be transferred only in particular ways, if they are to find the funds. For example,

innovative financing sources may be much more results-oriented than more traditional funding sources and may be relatively impatient with highly bureaucratic mechanisms of funds transfer, though, at the same time, their definition of “results” may be more flexible than that used in more traditional mechanisms.

The other objective of Innovative Financing for Education, as explained in the report produced by the Task Force<sup>2</sup>, is to raise awareness among the general public on the importance to achieve the goal of Education for All. Nowadays, indeed, education is not as high in the international development agenda as it used to be one or two decades ago, and is facing increasing competition from media-friendly sectors such as health or climate change. Given the centrality of education and its impact on development outcomes, such an approach appears necessary.”

In its report, the Task Force on Innovative Financing for Education also stated out that a close link should be made between innovation in financing and innovation in Education: “Innovative financing should help bring innovation at all levels: at the international level in the financing and delivery architecture, but also at national level through educational reforms, and at local level through teacher training and pedagogical improvements.”

The GPE Partnership should support the discussion in this field to ensure that education is at the top of the agenda of innovative financing.

<b>Proposed activity #5:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop an approach for implementing innovative financing for education. This activity will have to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Support the next phase of the Education for All Fund replenishment that will take place in 2013;</li> <li>✓ Go with a communication strategy to raise the profile of education and GPE in particular. Suggest a marketing narrative for the education sector according to different kind of funders;</li> <li>✓ Suggest an adaptation of the partnership organization to attract new funders whose contribution could be smaller but the impact on the profile of education may be consequent;</li> <li>✓ Work with different partners to investigate ideas and participate in the implementation of sustainable mechanisms.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Type of activity</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research and basic knowledge.</li> <li>• Technical workshops and knowledge dissemination.</li> <li>• Technical assistance.</li> <li>• Intervention to inform scale up.</li> </ul>
<b>Link with Results framework indicators</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Output 2: Adequate and sustainable domestic and external financing for education in GPE countries is mobilized.</u></li> </ul>

<sup>2</sup> [http://www.leadinggroup.org/IMG/pdf\\_Innovating\\_in\\_Financing\\_Education\\_BAT.pdf](http://www.leadinggroup.org/IMG/pdf_Innovating_in_Financing_Education_BAT.pdf)

<b>Proposed approach #4:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk review of existing literature.</li> <li>• Discussion with GPE partners – donors who have the political mandate and space to push the innovative financing agenda forward, and NGOs/ CSOs (such as GCE) who are an important lobby and advocacy voice on this field – to inform this activity. Other potential sources of financing should be investigated: private philanthropies, corporate social responsibility funding, possible direct fund-raising for education in special segments of capital markets, tapping of public-private partnerships (of various degrees of formality) as a source of capital. The activity should also include lessons learned from other sectors such as health.</li> <li>• Approach at least three potential funders (validated by the Secretariat) interested by the sector and reach a financial approach or to understand the constraints to reach it.</li> </ul>
<b>Expected deliverables #4:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A detailed road map to approach funders for education.</li> <li>• To test this road map with at least three funders to be part of an existing mechanism by 2013.</li> </ul>
<b>Timeframe #4:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The work will start in January 2012 and the deliverables will be operational by 2015.</li> </ul>