



TECHNICAL MEETING MINUTES Tokyo, April 24-25, 2008

FTI donors and members of the Steering Committee met in Tokyo on April 24-25, 2008 to discuss emerging issues which are most relevant to the FTI partnership and to agree on a list of issues summarizing the key messages for all stakeholders that would be fed into the upcoming high-level meetings in 2008. The meeting agenda can be found in Annex 1. The meeting was chaired alternately by the two co-chairs, Japan and the Netherlands. The full list of participants can be found in Annex 2.

Introduction

Takehiro Kano (*FTI co-chair, Japan*) welcomed the participants and provided an overview of the agenda, stating that a discussion on Fragile States would be added to the Thursday afternoon session on information updates. The discussion on Fragile States would then continue on Friday during the morning break out session on key topics.

Session 1: Promoting a holistic approach to education development within the FTI Framework

Presentations:

Steven Obeegadoo (*UNESCO*) gave a presentation on the successes and risks of EFA, the importance of promoting a holistic approach, and new areas for dialogue on policy and funding (cf. FTI website: “Beyond Primary Education_ADEA”).

Keiko Mizuno (*Japan*) gave a presentation on facilitating capacity development for achieving quality EFA and on how to maximize the total impact for capacity development in the education sector by looking at the complementarities of different aid modalities (cf. “Facilitating Capacity Development for Achieving Quality EFA”).

Temby Caprio (*Germany*) presented the FTI Capacity Development Guidelines focused on the implementation of education sector plans in low-income countries (cf. FTI website: “Capacity Development Guidelines”).

Discussion:

CSO partners commented that although African leaders had made efforts to achieve EFA, the G8 donors had not lived up to their side of the global compact. There had been an advance in primary schooling but not on the full EFA agenda. It was necessary to look at early child development, adult literacy and a full 9 year basic education school cycle. The challenge was to achieve scaled up predictable funds for education. In addition, ADEA was encouraged to examine the impact of contracted teachers, and declining teacher salaries on education. It was also important to take into account the needs of people and children in nomadic areas. CSO partners in developing countries voiced the challenge of receiving documents solely in English and asked that meeting documents be translated, and that donors do more to assist civil society organizations in the work they did at the national level.



Donor partners acknowledged the difficulty for the G8 donors of increasing their focus on education, given the many competing issues vying for resources (e.g., climate change, food crisis, health). Nonetheless, donors agreed on the importance of advocating for firm commitments on the delivery of education and for promises to be kept for predictable funding. Aid effectiveness and an agreed division of labor among donors were seen as vital in addressing the needs of the poorest.

Donor partners stressed the importance of developing coherence around the FTI, seeing a good opportunity for integrating tools, within the funding mechanisms, available to countries interested in applying for endorsement. It was recommended that FTI provide countries with an incentive for applying, rather than proposing the way for them, with local education groups seen as in the best position to determine resource use. A bottom-up approach needed to be emphasized, where the process reflected the needs of the community.

Developing country partners commented on the need to scale up aid to countries and increase the predictability of funds. More resources should be going towards post-primary education. It was necessary to build skills and prepare those youth who were dropping out of school. Plans through secondary schooling (a competency-based approach) should be supported. A balance needed to be found between supporting primary and secondary education. Within the FTI, and in order to achieve this balance, some resources should be allocated to moving a secondary education agenda forward. The importance of lifelong skills development was noted, as was the importance for countries to plan for capacity development on the basis of country-specific realities.

Donor partners mentioned the need to focus on implementation problems, and to reinforce two messages to the G8: (i) the centrality of education to the broader development agenda and (ii) the G8's own past commitments and the need to deliver on these commitments regarding external financing.

The catalytic role of teachers was emphasized. The importance of incentives was underlined, particularly with regards to having teachers go through training or for communities to support schools. Linked to this, teachers should be accountable to local communities.

Partners further noted that given the high prices for food and fuel, it should be expected that students would attend less school and that achievement would be affected by this. Since 80% of the ultra poor live in Africa, the impact of the food crisis should be analyzed and solutions should be found. School construction should be scaled up and consideration should be given to removing school fees and putting food programs into place.

Session 2: Strengthening Country Level Processes

Presentation:

Felicity Townsend (*European Commission*) presented an update on the work of the SCLP Task Team (cf. FTI website: “SCLP Report”). Several recommendations were put forward for endorsement. Presentations on the work of the SCLP Task Team, as well as its recommendations, were also made at the Steering Committee and the Catalytic Fund meeting.

Discussion:

Donor partners stressed the importance of ensuring that the endorsement process leads to plans that are country-driven and relevant, with sufficient flexibility to take country contexts into account. Since both a PRSP and an ESP are required for endorsement, it was proposed to provide greater emphasis on the linkages between the two. It was also seen as important to have CSO involvement in this process. Donor partners pointed out a complementary process being undertaken in which endorsed plans were being reviewed by looking at gender, HIV, and children with disabilities. Results on this review were mixed; therefore an analytic tool was being developed to ensure more consistent treatment of these issues. The draft tool provides a framework for considering these issues, including exclusion, within the context of developing plans and/or reviewing existing plans. Donor partners also commented that the process pre-supposed that the local education group was an established entity, while in reality, this varied from country to country. The local donor group did not have the capacity to fully support this process in every situation. Consideration should be given to fit the different UN agencies into the process. This would allow a more integrated approach to contribute to better defined and more concrete outcomes.

CSO partners commented on the importance of the local education group, including CSOs. The FTI partnership was called upon to ensure coordinated donor support to CSOs to allow them to fulfill the role the donors wanted them to perform.

Developing country partners noted some existing challenges in the process chart. There was an impression that many processes would be done separately from each other, with little partnership during the development of the plan. There was an assumption that once a plan was endorsed, both Headquarters and in country staff were in agreement, whereas this was not always the case. There was concern regarding who would be doing the external review. If the FTI Secretariat was strengthening its review of the pre-endorsement, questions were raised as to why it was necessary to go through another external review. It was seen as important to define a mechanism to strengthen the processes, in light of problems faced locally, without reducing country ownership. CSOs should participate in consultations, through a joint process with the local education group.

Lunch session: Filling the data gap

Presentations:

Ko-Chih Tung (*UNESCO/UIS*) gave a presentation of the main issues linked to the data gap, including the availability of data, as well as its accuracy, timeliness and relevance. The presentation showed the work that UIS is doing, with countries and other key partners, in trying to address some of these issues, as well as options for actions to be taken (cf. FTI website: "...").

George Ingram (*Education Policy and Data Center, Academy for Educational Development*) gave a presentation on sub-national data in Africa (cf. FTI website: "Sub-national Data").

Luc Gacougnolle (*FTI Secretariat*) gave a presentation on the possible creation of an inter-agency network for the improvement of education data (cf. FTI website: "Creating an Inter-Agency Network").

Session 3: Mobilizing Additional Resources for Education

Panel session moderated by Nicholas Burnett (UNESCO):

Greg Loos (*USAID*) presented on the need for multiple resources to close the full range of existing gaps (cf. FTI website: "Resource Mobilization").

Robin Horn (*World Bank*) spoke of the need for all donors and partners to collectively agree on harmonization, and of the challenge of IDA providing general budget support in certain countries.

Desmond Bermingham (*FTI Secretariat*) spoke of the importance of maximizing different sources of funding and of the importance of predictable funding.

Smita Singh (*The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation*) shared various ideas on promoting innovation (i.e., progress-based aid) and of private sector involvement (cf. FTI website: "Funding for Innovation").

Discussion:

Developing country partners expressed concern that the progress-based aid approach would not provide support to education systems until results had been achieved. Such an approach might be effective, however, for improving curriculum development or teacher training programs. Regarding sector budget support, many countries liked such support because it allowed for better accountability and transparency in the use of the funds.

Donor partners suggested that the key challenge was not innovation, rather predictable financing. The need for ODA promises to be kept was reaffirmed. It was also suggested that a more appropriate incentive structure could be developed in order to encourage countries to do better and donors to behave differently.



CSO partners agreed that predictability was the most important issue. The FTI Secretariat was encouraged to do more to ensure that resource gaps were filled. It was also seen as important to address the apparent trend that endorsed countries receiving Catalytic Funds have a decrease in IDA support—maintenance of or increases in IDA funding levels were seen as an integral part of the post-endorsement process. Regarding the possible creation of an innovation fund, it was suggested that a financing window through the EPDF might be appropriate.

Session 4: Information Updates

Update on Fragile States:

Nora Fyles (*Canada*) gave a presentation on education and financing strategies for interim status countries (cf. FTI website: Fragile States). The Steering Committee was being asked to endorse the following recommendations: (i) expansion of the FTI to include an interim status designation for fragile states; (ii) financing for interim status FTI countries through a mechanism to be agreed; and (iii) a process by which the Fragile States Task Team would further develop the financing mechanism(s) for presentation and decision at the FTI Steering Committee Meeting in Oslo.

Discussion:

CSO partners emphasized the importance of this initiative and urged the Steering Committee to endorse the process going forward. Aid should be given to Fragile States progressively, with careful attention to measuring the impact of aid on children.

Donor partners commented that linking a plan to the Poverty Reduction Strategy Plan was unrealistic and that it was necessary to consider how institutions could function in spite of fragility. Some partners noted the perception that FTI mechanisms were becoming overly complicated, and cautioned against creating new structures or new windows. Managing the risk in these countries was important, as well as ensuring the quality of the plans. A risk assessment should be conducted early in the preparatory process.

Update on the External Evaluation of FTI:

Joe DeStefano (*Secretary/Manager & Co-ordinator, FTI Evaluation Oversight Committee*) presented a progress report on the work of the Evaluation Oversight Committee (EOC). The EOC finalized a draft Terms of Reference for the EOC, and an issues paper for comment at the Tokyo meeting. Once they had received comments on the issues paper, the EOC would then proceed to draft the Terms of Reference for the evaluation. EOC representatives would be conducting interviews throughout the week of FTI meetings in Tokyo, in order to collect the opinions of different FTI stakeholders. Donors had currently committed just over US \$700,000 to cover the costs of the evaluation. The available financing for the evaluation would determine the number of countries that could be included in the evaluation, and how quickly the data/information could be gathered. A draft timeline was presented, with the implementation of evaluations and a preliminary report to be available in the last quarter of 2008 in time for the partnership meeting in Oslo. The



evaluation could then continue for 9-10 months in 2009, with a second report at the end of the first quarter of 2009 and a final report by September 2009.

Update on the Japan G-8 & TICAD meetings:

Takehiro Kano (FTI co-chair, Japan) provided an update regarding the work of the TICAD IV informal cluster group on education as a platform for advancing towards the MDGs, in particular MDG 2 and 3. The TICAD IV informal cluster group on education had consulted with a broad number of stakeholders in the TICAD process and had developed a paper. The focus of the document was ownership by African countries, and country level processes. The cluster group felt that in looking at policy recommendations it was important to look at South-South exchange and to explore ICT learning and mobilizing the private sector. An emphasis should also be given to certain countries challenged by fragility. Steering Committee members were invited to attend the Foreign Minister's speech at the International Symposium on April 23rd to hear how Japan was preparing for the TICAD meeting.

Update on the E-9 Ministerial meeting:

Nicholas Burnett (UNESCO) presented an update on the E9 Ministerial meeting held in Indonesia (current chair). The focus of the meeting was on improving teacher education and teacher training as a means of reforming the whole education system. The countries present made a commitment to improving teacher conditions as well as reorganizing their entire platform as a way of exchanging knowledge and best practices and as a way to promote South-South exchanges amongst themselves and smaller southern countries. The next meeting will be held in Nigeria in 2010.

Update on the UNESCO High Level Group meeting:

Nicholas Burnett (UNESCO) also gave a presentation on the High Level Group meeting scheduled for December 16-18, 2008. An International Advisory Panel would be meeting on April 25th to discuss the possibility of a single meeting of the High Level Group (HLG) and FTI, attempting to make the HLG more high level by separating the Ministerial and Technical part, and acquiring more specific commitments from the meeting by building on the Global Monitoring Report as it related to governance, finance, and inclusion. The objective would be to obtain commitments on finance, quality, teachers and fragility. The sequence of the meetings remained the same, with a meeting of the Working Group scheduled to meet in Paris before the HLG, on November 13-14, 2008.

Update on the MDG Africa initiative:

Olav Seim (UNESCO) presented an update on the initiative, which was launched by the Secretary General, to respond to the fact that Africa was at risk for not achieving all the MDGs. Different thematic groups had been set up to address each goal. The education thematic group was chaired jointly by UNESCO, UNICEF and the World Bank. The main objective of these groups was to identify the critical pathways for getting Africa to achieve the MDGs. The groups were coming up with recommendations that would be presented to the Africa Initiative Steering Committee, as well as a business plan for implementing the

recommendations. The business plan for the education thematic group was currently being finalized, and FTI and the financing gap were prominent topics in this report.

Update on the Accra High Level Meeting on Aid Effectiveness:

Kaviraj Appadu (*Sweden*) presented an update on the work of the Roundtable 8 in the Accra High Level forum on Aid Effectiveness, scheduled for September 2-3, 2008, and co-chaired by Honduras and Sweden (cf. FTI website: “Accra Roundtable”). The objective of Roundtable 8 was to make recommendations that would feed into the document being prepared by UNESCO for submission. A website hosted by Honduras would soon be launched for receiving inputs.

Session 4: Key Topics (Break out groups)

Group 1: Raising the quality of education and measuring learning outcomes (**Valeria Sakharova**, *Russia*, and **Lene Buchert**, *UNESCO*)

Recommendations to Plenary:

- To carry out a desk review on approaches to conceptualizing and measuring quality education. To undertake an analysis of the range of quality indicators in national education plans
- Quality is not sufficiently addressed within the national ESPs and existing FTI indicators on quality are weak. There is a need to identify non-prescriptive indicators for learning outcomes that should be realistic, affordable, easy to use and measurable in a timely manner

Group 2: Equity & education for all: reaching the excluded (**Olav Seim**, *UNESCO*, & **Cheryl Faye**, *UNGEI/LATT*)

Recommendations to Plenary:

- Mainstreaming is the most sustainable approach within the sector plan – implies substantial local awareness raising and capacity building
- Major focus should be given to country level capacity building
- FTI process entry point important
- Planning stage
 - FTI-endorsed tools to assist in planning
 - Draft inclusion tool to be finalized, piloted and formally adopted by FTI
- EPDF to support:
 - Country level demand for strategies, data collection, etc.
 - Cross-country learning/knowledge sharing
- Appraisal stage
 - Capacity building for:
 - Local education group (e.g., via team to help jump-start process funded by in-country donors)
 - FTI Secretariat



Fast Track Initiative

A global partnership to achieve Education For All

- External quality review to ensure inclusion – inclusion issues factored into all other aspects of appraisal process
- CF country information template to provide inclusion indicators
- Review of the indicative framework with at least one benchmark on inclusion – difficult to find one benchmark, taking into account the diversity of the issue
- External evaluation – opportunity to look at how inclusion issues addressed
- Implementation/monitoring and review stages will need further thinking

Group 3: Fragile States & education for all (Nora Fyles, Canada)

Recommendations to Plenary:

- Endorse a unified FTI process including Fragile States
- No new fund initiated, but current instruments should be enhanced so that they apply the FTI process in fragile contexts (aligned, harmonized, mutual accountability)
- Request the Task Team on Fragile States to develop a concrete proposal for the financing mechanism for presentation at Oslo

Group 4: Multi-stakeholder partnerships in education (World Economic Forum)

Recommendations to Plenary:

- All MSPE partners must recognize that governments have the ultimate responsibility for the provision of education
- Capacity building in governments to manage partnerships is critical (recognizing that this is long, hard, and un-sexy work) and the necessary resources have to be allocated
- The local education group needs to be more systematically engaged in all phases of the FTI process
- Teachers need to be part of the FTI process (consultation, communication, engagement)
- Document closely the results in Rwanda (a MSPE intervention within the FTI framework announced in January 2008), and integrate the “local education group” into this process

Group 5: Role of CSOs in FTI country level processes (GCE)

Recommendations to Plenary:

- National Civil Society Education Funds can bridge the gap and a proposal to support the creation of these should be submitted by GCE to the FTI Steering Committee/EPDF for September
- Once these are established, the Catalytic Fund should ensure support to CSEFs in each country
- Foundations and individual bilateral donors can also play a key role in supporting this work
- The FTI evaluation should include a detailed assessment of CSO involvement to date and propose ways of assessing this in the future
- Interested partners were invited to London for meetings on the Commonwealth Education Fund and issues around funding for CSOs, to be held on 10th/11th June

Session 5: Key messages

Based on the discussions held throughout the Donor Technical Meeting, partners were presented with a list of issues summarizing the key messages for all stakeholders that would be fed into the upcoming high-level meetings in 2008 (TICAD, G-8, MDG High-Level, Accra, Doha, and Oslo). Partners agreed that the FTI Secretariat would further revise the list and circulate it for non-objection. The list was subsequently shortened and revised to include the following:

1. In light of significant competition for attention among development issues, we urge the G8 to honor their current commitments to the EFA and MDG global education goals, and renew support for access to quality learning opportunities for all. The full Education for All agenda, including early childhood development, basic education and adult literacy, is key to achieving our broad development agenda contributing to sustainable economic growth, gender equality and protection against HIV & AIDS, and resilience and stability in fragile states. As developing countries make progress towards Education for All, there is an increased expectation for G8 and other donor countries to deliver on their side of the global compact. Meeting financial needs, ensuring mutual accountability and promoting aid effectiveness in education are key aspects of the education compact.
2. The FTI Partnership promotes continued focus on basic education as the foundation for all learning, as well as expanding support for post-primary education with links to skills development and employment, as part of the sector-wide approach. This will include increased emphasis on equitable access to relevant secondary education as well as technical and vocational education and training.
3. While significant progress has been achieved at the primary level in many countries, targeted attention should be given to the remaining out-of-school children, with special consideration for girls and other marginalized groups including disabled children, HIV/AIDS orphans and the poor. Children living in areas affected by conflict account for up to half of all out-of-school children and youth and pose special challenges and requirements.
4. Inadequate quality and learning in schools remain critical concerns. Support for sufficient numbers of trained teachers should be highlighted. Specific targets to train and hire 10 million new teachers by 2010 would go a long way towards meeting the shortfall in trained teachers, estimated to be 18 million teachers to reach the EFA goals by 2015.
5. The FTI group also raised concerns about the possibility that in the face of the growing food crisis, education programming could suffer. Domestically, in times of economic crisis, teacher salaries are less likely to be prioritized by national governments; and for families, school fees are often the first expense eliminated.



Schools can play a critical role in addressing the current food crisis by protecting the most vulnerable, and meeting urgent demands while also contributing to the longer-term development of education systems. The G8 may wish to encourage the global community to promote school based programming to alleviate food shortages including school feeding, food for work and other programs for school construction, and rapid recruitment and training of teachers.

6. Donors and governments must recommit to the Monterrey compact, as aid for basic education still lags behind needs and many African countries still have not delivered credible Education Sector Plans.
7. Governments and donors must continue to establish and maintain effective channels to incorporate the voices of civil society organizations into the strategies and actions aimed at Education for All.
8. The G8 has played a key role in the establishment and on-going support for the EFA-FTI. In this context, the G8 leaders may wish to support the external evaluation of the EFA-FTI as part of the ongoing effort to strengthen the effectiveness of this important global education partnership. The results of the evaluation expected in 2009 will include an assessment of donor contributions to MDG 2, as well as the progress in the areas of aid effectiveness, mutual accountability and education results.
9. In the light of urgent demands for financial support for FTI-endorsed countries, we would urge G8 leaders to express their support for increased levels of long-term predictable financing for education and to make specific reference to the establishment of a robust replenishment mechanism for the FTI trust funds.
10. We look forward to continued leadership and support from the G8 and especially renewed commitment to the full Education for All agenda.