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1. Introduction

The number of children and youth living in acute and protracted crisis and conflict-affected contexts is rising. In 2014, UNHCR estimated that 51.2 million people were living as refugees or internally displaced peoples globally. Of these, 10.7 million people were newly displaced in 2014 due to conflict and/or persecution – the largest scale of displacement ever recorded (UNHCR, 2014; United Nations, 2014). About 52% of primary school age children live in fragile and conflict-affected countries, and yet 69% of out-of-school children are in these countries. Further, the UN Office for Disaster Risk Reduction estimates that 100 million children are impacted annually by disasters (UNISDR, 2011), a number expected to rise with climate change. Children and youth are experiencing humanitarian and complex emergencies, as well as conflict, on an unprecedented scale.

The effects of crisis and conflict on educational opportunities are devastating both in the short-term and over the long-term. Yet despite the need, education in crisis and conflict situations is chronically underfunded, and there is a gap between short-term approaches and the need for longer-term, systemic solutions. This has led to demands for a new mechanism or approach to financing and delivering education to children and youth affected by conflict or humanitarian emergencies. There is broad agreement that this year – the year in which new global goals for educational development are being agreed – could be a pivotal one in developing a new fund or platform.

This Issues Paper is intended to inform a series of discussions convened by GPE about a potential new platform or fund to address the educational needs of children and youth affected by crisis and conflict. In it, we review the current architecture for funding and delivery of educational services for children in crisis and conflict-affected settings, including the roles currently played by GPE. We then lay out three areas in which a new global initiative might help, and discuss basic goals and principles that might inform decisions about the creation of a new platform – including the challenges and risks associated with its development.

2. Definitions and Key Actors

In this paper we have use the term “education in crisis and conflict” (rather than the more common “education in emergencies”), in order to signal the need for solutions that are longer in duration than what might typically be understood when using the terminology of humanitarian emergencies.

Educational needs are, by their nature, not easily met by short-term intervention. This basic fact is further complicated because conflicts and crises themselves are typically not short-term or contained: they often occur in contexts of long-term instability and they frequently lead to the protracted displacement of children and youth from their original homes, schools and communities, and to long-
term destabilization of educational systems. For example, UNHCR (2013) reports that the average length of displacement from conflict is 17 years, leaving millions of children engulfed in conflict and/or in displacement for their entire childhood. There is an urgent need to look beyond the humanitarian and development divide to consider a wide spectrum of challenges that differ by cause, duration, existence of legitimate national responder (state), and whether impact is localized in one territory or spread regionally. The challenge extends to the period before crisis – for example, how to build resilience so that educational systems have more capacity to withstand crises.

Table 1: Idealized Phases of Conflict and Humanitarian Crisis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict phases</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Humanitarian Emergency</th>
<th>Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latent Build up to conflict</td>
<td>Acute Conflict Escalation of conflict – with displacement of populations or cessation of services.</td>
<td>Protracted Conflict</td>
<td>Reconstruction Rebuilding systems and peace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian crisis phases</td>
<td>Preparedness Risk mitigation and system resilience; community-level readiness and resilience</td>
<td>Acute Emergency Sudden crisis with displacement of populations or closure of services. Can be caused by disease, natural disaster or conflict. Level 3 humanitarian crises (L3) are those requiring extra-ordinary UN system mobilization Complex emergencies involve breakdown of legitimate authority and ability to act.</td>
<td>Protracted (or Chronic) Emergency Ongoing displacement and interruption of services. Often involve regional displacement of populations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Form of intervention | National systems | May work through national systems May contract service providers directly. Populations in need may be externally displaced, internally displaced or local citizens. | Varies – local system or national | National systems |

| Who acts? | Development Actors | Humanitarian Responders & Development Agencies | Gap | Dev’t Actors |

As suggested in Table 1 above, the humanitarian architecture has traditionally been narrowly focused on the ‘humanitarian emergency phase,’ with funding, coordination, and planning time delimited to high intensity events and their immediate aftermath. This architecture, however, is misaligned with

---

1 A complex emergency is defined by the IASC as “a humanitarian crisis in a country, region or society where there is total or considerable breakdown of authority resulting from internal or external conflict and which requires an international response that goes beyond the mandate or capacity of any single agency.”
the realities of contemporary humanitarian situations, which are typically protracted or chronic situations – involving populations affected by on-going crisis and conflict and/or displaced either internally or externally over a number of years. The boundary between a humanitarian crisis and broader development processes is recognized as an artificial one – driven by the existence of two different response architectures: 1) international development assistance, which is generally responsible for reconstruction and recovery phases and to a lesser degree preparedness; and 2) humanitarian assistance which focuses on high intensity events and protracted displacement of populations.

The reality of course is much more complicated and fluid than Table 1 suggests. Emergency and conflict situations can be categorized by their root cause (natural disaster, disease, conflict/political breakdown); by their intensity (acute or complex emergencies); by their duration (protracted or chronic); and by their geographical impact (localized or regionalized). Responses are profoundly shaped by the degree to which legitimate and capable local authorities exist who can (with support) act effectively in delivering services. Furthermore, phases of conflict and crisis are not necessarily linear; different types of crises can intersect; and these can vary in different regions in one country.

### 3. The Current International Architecture: Strengths and Gaps

The past 20 years have seen the sustained development of an international architecture aimed at supporting the educational needs of children during all phases of conflict and crisis. The Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE), formed in 2004, has emerged as an important platform for cross-agency development of technical tools, knowledge exchange, and capacity-building. INEE has been central to the development of the normative, Sphere-compatible INEE Minimum Standards for Education. In 2007, the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC), the United Nations’ main vehicle for coordination on emergency response, endorsed the creation of an IASC Education Cluster, which is co-led by UNICEF and Save the Children.

Funding and agency responders to education in crisis and conflict situations have also developed substantially since 2000. According to recent research, 15 agencies program the vast majority of humanitarian aid for education, with UN agencies acting in a variety of central roles: as primary fundraisers from bilateral and private sources, as direct implementers, as funders of other implementers, and as participants in UN-based humanitarian appeals and coordinating structures. In addition, bilateral and multilateral development aid is delivered to countries affected by conflict and fragility – including during phases of protracted crisis and recovery. UNICEF and UNHCR each play key roles in delivering financing during protracted crisis and recovery; and the Global Partnership for Education has also become an important financier of post-crisis recovery, with more

---

2 Although there can be a multitude of actors involved in education responses, over the period 2006 to 2013, 77 percent of donor support to education through CAPs processes went through five agencies: UNICEF (45%), WFP (15%), UNHCR (7%), Save (6%), and NRC (4%) (Avenir Analytics, 2014, p. 1). Scale, simplicity, and efficiency are critical reasons donors describe as important in their decisions to concentrate on these large agencies (Avenir Analytics, 2014, p. 33).
than 50% of its present expenditures disbursed through its partners (including UNICEF and the World Bank) to member countries categorized as fragile or conflict-affected. GPE is also a de facto funder of education during acute emergencies (again limited to its member countries), through policies adopted in 2012 and 2013 allowing governments to request up to 20% of their GPE allocation for emergency needs, or if a grant is already under implementation, to rapidly shift their ongoing GPE grants to adapt to the circumstances (see Appendix 1).

Yet despite the substantive improvements to the overall architecture for addressing educational emergencies over the past decade, major challenges persist. Recent research highlights two main coordination gaps. The first is in the early needs assessment and coordination of financing and delivery during the onset of acute emergencies. The second is in the link up between short-term emergency activities and the longer-term needs that emerge during periods of protracted crisis, or in the transition to recovery and system rebuilding phases. In addition to these are cross cutting gaps in financing and in the capacity to improve effectiveness through more objective and standardized needs assessments, better data, improved monitoring, an ability to learn from evaluation, and capacity to seed and scale innovation.

Straddling all of these gaps is the continued separation of two different international architectures for financing and delivery of services – the one for short-term and medium term humanitarian action and the other for medium- and long-term development action. Lack of coordination between the two inhibits effective responses to the longer-term educational needs of children in conflict-affected and humanitarian emergency situations.

### 3.1. Responding to the Onset of Acute Emergencies

In order to understand coordination gaps during the early and acute crisis stages, it’s important to look at the current architecture for humanitarian aid for education.

The central role for coordinating emergency response falls to the United Nations, and is managed through the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs and the Inter-Agency Standing Committee. At the global level, OCHA and IASC bring together humanitarian actors (both UN and nongovernmental) to coordinate a coherent response to any given crisis. At the national level, OCHA appoints a Resident Humanitarian Coordinator and IASC activates a Cluster to take on these coordination roles.

Clusters are sector-specific, including for education. Each sector-specific cluster is charged with creating a costed needs assessment, which is then evaluated by OCHA and IASC in relation to needs from across all sectors. These needs are combined into one appeal for specific emergencies (through the Flash Appeals and CERF appeals) and/or into annual appeals for crises under the Consolidated Appeals Process (CAP). Programs and projects implemented by humanitarian agencies represented at country level are then funded from these sources of funding. Various humanitarian agencies (including INGOs and other bilateral donors) also add their own sources of funding at the country level, independent of the UN Humanitarian Appeals process. Additional instruments – such as multi-donor pooled funds – are sometimes established to bring additional bilateral funds to specific
emergencies, including through Common Humanitarian Funds, which operate through OCHA at country level. See Appendix 2 for additional details.

The IASC Education Cluster is chaired jointly by UNICEF and Save the Children. Based in Geneva, the Cluster plays several roles:

- When a major emergency is declared within the UN system, it appoints a Cluster lead for that emergency, and establishes local level cluster mechanisms that involve relevant government Ministries, including Ministries of Education, INGOs, local NGOs, CSOs, and any other humanitarian agencies.
- The Cluster supports needs assessments and the development of proposals humanitarian funding of education. It also reviews progress in the sector at the country level through the entire Humanitarian Program Cycle (through to recovery and transition).
- The Cluster is the main educational interface within the architecture for UN humanitarian appeals. Each emergency cluster helps to coordinate needs assessments and project proposals of the humanitarian agencies at country level. The proposals then go to OCHA and the Resident Humanitarian Coordinator, who makes the final decision about what to ask for across sectors in the various UN appeals.

---

3 There are currently 5 CHFs in operation: Sudan, South Sudan, Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Central African Republic (CAR) and Somalia.
The Global-level Education Cluster plays an important role in establishing tools, standards and guidelines for educational emergency response; it supports coordination across agencies; and it also advocates across the UN system for greater attention to educational needs.

Despite the important improvements that have come with the establishment of the IASC Education Cluster since 2007, several serious problems in coordination have persisted. The Cluster is a network rather than a strong decision-making mechanism, established primarily to promote country-level coordination. Its focus covers both immediate-onset and protracted crises – ensuring coordinated and rapid responsiveness across a range of players. Through the Cluster system, decisions around funding and planning are usually structured by short-term humanitarian timelines that are not always able to consider and reflect priorities of medium- and long-term education needs and the underlying systems required to meet them.

Furthermore, the Education Cluster’s global-level resources do not allow it to play an expansive role in setting standards for needs assessment, costing of needs, adjudication of proposals for humanitarian funding within the cluster, and monitoring and tracking of expenditures, or the monitoring and evaluation of outcomes. In the absence of a consistent methodology for objective needs assessment and resource allocation, each agency has developed its own approach to needs assessment, targeting, delivery, monitoring and due diligence, and proposals for funding are not necessarily aligned. A form of “needs bargaining” occurs whereby aid agencies and donors play the game of guessing what funds are available and making estimates based on those priorities (Carfax Education, 2013; UNESCO, 2011). Thus, according to a recent study, “appeals often overstate need, whether it be for reasons of bias in perception or willful overstatement of need to ensure a greater allocation of funding” (Carfax Education, 2014, p. 33).

The Education Cluster does not have a mandate to address refugee situations and does not routinely engage the UNHCR – leading to a sometimes fragmented approach in contexts where there is regional displacement or where there are both internally displaced and regionally displaced populations in the same geography.

Finally, there are a limited number of partners who have the capacity to support the delivery of education in crisis situations – both locally and internationally. This is highlighted by the fact that between 2006 and 2013, 77% of donor support to education through consolidated appeals went to or through only 5 agencies (see footnote 3). The challenge is not only one of capacity but also of predictable financing to support such capacity. Partners need to have the capacity and skills to engage in situations where State authority may be contested or where there are armed groups; and they need technical capacity to assess and cost needs, engage local providers, and ensure delivery is monitored and tracked.4

---

4 For example across 4 countries and 114 grants to support education in conflict/crisis situations, Save the Children had fewer than 25 that were for more than a 12-month period (Dolan & Ndahutse, 2010).
In fact-finding for this issues paper, key players within the Cluster pointed out key challenges for the Cluster. This mechanism:

- Is slower than optimal;
- Tends to be weakest where regional coordination is needed to attend to needs of refugees as well as internally displaced populations (requiring negotiation with different political authorities and systems);
- Is not set up to quickly and rapidly engage local service providers (e.g. NGOs or the private sector);
- Focuses on short-term need with little capacity to engage in longer-term and systemic planning;
- Does not sufficiently leverage longer-term investments in innovation – in particular technological innovations – that could improve ability to rapidly deliver educational services.

### 3.2. Longer-Term Needs and Systems Strengthening

There is a longstanding gap between the short-term and unpredictable funding provided through humanitarian response systems and the longer-term investments and approaches needed to rebuild educational systems. At the same time, longer-term development assistance has tended to neglect countries in the transition between crisis and recovery, and is especially weak where there is a chronic or protracted conflict or emergency. The humanitarian aid architecture is simply not designed to handle educational needs during protracted crises, while development aid tends to be insufficient in volume and responsiveness to such situations.

It is important to note that many sources of finance and expertise in this area do exist – not least from UNICEF, UNHCR, the EU, bilateral donors such as USAID and DFID, and INGOs such as Save the Children, the International Rescue Committee, and Plan International. The ongoing challenge of ensuring education for internally displaced populations, for example, has been the focus of a good deal of work by key UN actors and nongovernmental organizations.

The main weaknesses in these efforts are twofold: first, they often do not align across organizations, with each managing its own stream of funding and roster of projects. Second, they are not orchestrated at the global level in such a way as to ensure that funds are available for the most serious crises. Geopolitical and other factors, rather than pure assessment of need, tend to shape bilateral aid in particular, leading to a lack of predictability and the creation of “aid orphans”.

Many key stakeholders have called therefore for a more streamlined and less ad hoc approach to education in crisis and conflict that incorporates longer-term systems-building and the transition to educational recovery. The creation of pooled funds for this purpose has seen examples of good practice in this regard – both in the work of the Global Partnership for Education through its approach to transitional plans and funding of conflict-affected and fragile states; and in the creation of new multi-donor trust funds for educational reconstruction and stabilization.
For example, the *Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Fund*, hosted by the World Bank, has shown that multi-donor pooled funds, if established in the early stages post conflict, can strengthen local accountability and contribute to political reform (World Bank, 2013). GPE’s responsive use of its “transitional funding” approach in Somalia, in which it supported a negotiated agreement for financing to the different “regional authorities,” and in the Central African Republic, where it was the first donor to engage after the 2013 coup, also suggest how important multilateral brokering and funding can be in situations of both acute and protracted conflict. However, as the cases of South Sudan and Syria suggest, the ad hoc creation of multilateral pooled funds are often slow to get started, as they need first movers on finance and coordination, and can have trouble disbursing because they do not adequately diagnose bottlenecks and propose solutions, raise finance and draw on partnership capacity (Watkins & Zyck, 2014) (Watkins, 2012).

### 3.3. The Crisis of Learning for Refugees

Another key gap in the international architecture concerns the educational needs of refugees. By definition, refugees are people who have crossed an international border due to a well-founded fear of persecution. The [1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees](https://www.unhcr.org/3b5ad7731.html) and its companion 1967 Protocol provide international norms defining who is a refugee, refugee rights, and the legal obligations of the state. Article 22 of the 1951 Convention specifies the right to education for all children, including refugees, in the following language: signatory states “shall accord to refugees the same treatment as is accorded to nationals with respect to elementary education… [and] treatment as favourable as possible… with respect to education other than elementary education.”

There is substantial evidence that the educational needs of refugee populations are not adequately addressed by the current humanitarian and development aid architectures. To understand this problem it is important to note the following key facts:

- Average duration of exile for refugees world wide is 17 years ([Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre, 2014](https://www.internal-displacement.org/ft/59210601594));
- Developing countries host 86% of the world’s refugees (an increase from 70% a decade ago ([UNHCR, 2014](https://www.unhcr.org/5a62497b2.html)); and that more than half of refugees live in urban areas, amid national populations ([UNHCR, 2009, p. 2](https://www.unhcr.org/52c19e326.html)).
- Rates of access to education for refugees vary widely from country to country (in most countries, refugees have less access to education than the local population ([Dryden-Peterson, 2011](https://www.unhcr.org/52c19e326.html))).
- Only a small portion of funding for refugee education comes through the UN humanitarian appeals process; and refugee educational needs are generally not met through development aid flows. UNHCR, UNICEF and INGOs like Save the Children and the International Rescue Committee fundraise directly for refugee education, but struggle to provide sufficient predictable finance for educational purposes.
- Recent crises (for example, Syria), highlight the fact that even middle-income countries receiving large and sudden influx of refugees can face steep hurdles in meeting educational needs – and therefore require external assistance.
• Each of these aspects of the refugee experience brings to the fore the need for host countries to plan and support refugees within their national educational systems. Yet the existing architecture is not well organized to support such national responsiveness.

The UNHCR holds the main UN mandate for refugee education, and has increasingly invested in policies and financing for education in its portfolio of activities. The launch of the new UNHCR Education Strategy in 2012 marked an increasing commitment to education. Thus while education received 4% of UNHCR’s budget in 2010, it received 5% in 2012 and 6% in 2013. Further, education sector staffing has grown: before 2012, there were 6 UNHCR staff members working on education, 3 at Headquarters in Geneva and 3 in field-based positions; less than three years later, there are 44 dedicated Education Officers, 15 on the global team, working at Headquarters and regionally, and 29 in field-based positions. There has also been a significant increase in long-term contractual staff for education, particularly in emergency contexts (Dryden-Peterson, Adelman, & Chopra, 2013). Yet UNHCR still struggles to establish strong engagement with national education policy makers, and with Local Education groups, who often see refugee education as outside their mandate.

Collaboration between UNHCR and UNICEF (which is the second largest UN player on refugee issues) offers one way of supporting greater attention to refugees in national education sector planning, especially where there is also a Local Education Group. The two agencies have recently signed a Letter of Understanding (January 2015), and are making a significant investment in guidance for developing joint plans of action for UNICEF and UNHCR at the country level. The collaboration also aims to leverage the expertise of each organization to address humanitarian-development gaps, stating that “Education services in emergency contexts [be] developed in line with strategic planning and principles of sustainability in cases where protracted displacement is likely” (UNICEF & UNHCR, 2015, p. 16).

Nonetheless, in fact-finding for this paper, there remains a strong sense that more needs to be done to finance refugee education and leverage host country responsiveness. This is true both for low-income countries and for middle-income countries.

3.4. Financing Gaps

A great deal of recent research and advocacy has focused on financing gaps as a central concern in the delivery of education to children and youth in conflict-affected and emergency settings. Yet while the need for additional financing is clear, it is important to break down the financing gap to better understand where there are specific blockages and problems.

---

5 The 2009 UNHCR Policy on Refugee Protection and Solutions in Urban Areas and the 2014 UNHCR Policy on Alternatives to Camps emphasize the integration of refugees within national systems and development planning processes, including for education. The UNHCR Education Strategy 2012-2016 advocates “integration of refugee learners into national systems and support for certified, quality education in the home country curriculum, where appropriate and feasible” (UNHCR, 2012, p.7)
Tracking financing flows for education in both humanitarian emergency and conflict-affected situations is not a simple matter. Because of different reporting systems, it is challenging to accurately account for all aid to education in specific conflict or crisis situations across the spectrum from humanitarian emergency funding to more traditional development financing. Yet in most situations (Sudan, Somalia among others) both types of funding are received to meet educational needs.

Within humanitarian aid flows alone, there are multiple funding mechanisms. Important are the Consolidated Appeals Process (CAP), Flash Appeals, and Pooled Funding including Common Humanitarian Fund (CHF), Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF), and the ERF (Emergency Response Fund). Data on these sources of humanitarian funding, collected through the UNOCHA Financial Tracking System (FTS), are commonly used to report on the state of funding for education in humanitarian situations. It is not possible to track all the level of sectoral or subsectoral spending for all humanitarian mechanisms (Carfax Education, 2014, p. 58). Even more challenging to track are un-earmarked multilateral funds, certain types of bilateral aid, and private sector funding (Carfax 2014).

Given these limitations, it nonetheless possible to suggest some broad trends in the quality and availability of financing for education in situations affected by conflict and crisis. Recent research is clear on six main points (Avenir Analytics, 2014; Carfax Education, 2014; Nicolai & Hine, 2015):

1. Education receives a very small proportion overall of all humanitarian aid.
2. Development financing for education in conflict-affected states does not meet need and is declining relative to flows to other geographies.
3. Education requests in humanitarian appeals are underfunded at larger margins than other sectors.
4. Decisions about allocation of humanitarian funding to education are not always based on concrete analysis of needs, but rather influenced by geopolitics, perceptions of fundability, and interagency negotiations.
5. Humanitarian funding is not well structured to meet specific needs: in particular it is slow to disburse, lacks predictability, and is especially weak in the continuum between high intensity crisis, and either protracted situations or recovery and reconstruction.
6. What is funded is limited. There is some evidence that education funding in humanitarian situations is primarily for infrastructure, with less emphasis on quality inputs.

Only a small proportion of humanitarian aid goes to education. Often quoted throughout agency reports is the figure of 2 percent – less than 2 percent of allocated humanitarian funds go to education (see, for example, Carfax Education, 2013; UNESCO, 2011). There has been a real-terms increase in humanitarian funding to education over the past decade, but with fluctuation over time (Avenir
As a percentage of total CAP funding, education was 1.47 percent in 2006, up to a high of 3.63 percent in 2010, to a low of 1.37 percent in 2012, and then to 1.95 percent in 2013 (Carfax Education, 2014, p. 12). The idea of doubling education’s share to 4 percent of humanitarian aid has been a central advocacy message over the past few years, especially by the Education Cannot Wait initiative (Carfax Education, 2013). This 4% target is not based on, nor justified by, a costing of needs.(Avenir Analytics, 2014).

**Development Aid for Education in Conflict-Affected and Fragile States is Inadequate and Falling.** One of the challenges identified in recent systematic reviews of research is the ability to map gaps in finance to achieve education for all children affected by conflict and crisis. Most analysis focus either on humanitarian assistance or on development funding but do not map these together – even though both kinds of financing are typically present in crisis and conflict situations. Regardless of this gap, what is clear is that development aid to fragile and conflict-affected states is falling, particularly for basic education.

**Education requests are underfunded at larger margins than other sectors in humanitarian appeals.** More important than the percentage of all aid allocated to education is the extent to which funding requests within education have been met. Analysis points to the underfunding of educational needs. Overall, education receives only 38 percent of the funding requested for the sector (Avenir Analytics, 2014, p. 1). While the percentage of CAP requests filled across sectors is relatively stable around 60 percent from 2006 to 2013 (with a low of 59 percent in 2012 and a high of 69 percent in 2009), the percentage of the education requests filled varies between 24% (2012) to 45% (2010 and 2011) and 50% (2008). Education has been consistently funded at a lower level than overall CAP funding requests (Carfax Education, 2014, p. 14). On average from 2009-2014 protracted crises accounted for 71% of all education requests in humanitarian appeals and captured 68% of all available funding to education (Nicolai & Hine, 2015).

**Decisions about what to fund are influenced by factors other than strong analysis of need.** There is good evidence that funding decisions are shaped by geo-political considerations (often security concerns) and that funders are more responsive to certain types of emergencies (e.g., natural disasters) than others (chronic displacement due to conflict) (Avenir Analytics, 2014, p. 41; Nicolai & Hine, 2015; Novelli, 2011; UNESCO, 2011). Recent reports also highlight the fact that needs assessments and requests for funding are based on perceptions of what is fundable (Avenir Analytics, 2014). The net result of these different influences is that the availability of humanitarian aid for education is often uneven: in 2006-2013, five countries received 49% of the humanitarian assistance to education: Sudan, Haiti, Pakistan, Palestine, and Somalia (Avenir Analytics, 2014, pp. 6-7). At the same time funds for education in half of all conflict-affected countries that held appeals received less than 1% of humanitarian assistance in 2013 (Nicolai & Hine, 2015, p. x).

---

6 There are quite staggering spikes in aid that coincide with major natural disasters such that the years of most constant dollars aid to education were 2004 (Indian Ocean Tsunami) and 2010 (Haiti Earthquake). Recent reports do not address the spikes in funding as related to specific events/appeals.

7 If seen together as one crisis, the data in the Avenir 2014 report suggest that Syria, Lebanon, and Jordan would be second most at $154,957,699.
What is funded in conflict-affected and crisis situations is not always suited to educational needs. Recent analysis suggest that in humanitarian situations there is more ready support for educational infrastructure than for initiatives designed to improve quality, in particular teachers salaries (Carfax Education, 2014, p. 27; see, for example, Dolan, Golden, Ndaruhutse, & Winthrop, 2012).

3.5. An Urgent Need for Better Technical Capacity to Monitor, Plan and Improve

Perhaps because the existing humanitarian architecture is focused on meeting shorter term needs, which are assessed and rolled up from requests developed at the country level, the international community has underinvested in the creation of robust, reliable capacity to plan, monitor and learn about what works best in crisis and conflict situations.

Among those actors engaged in education in conflict and crisis, there has been important movement to develop such technical capacity to do better needs assessments, monitor outcomes and map the most reliable approaches for getting children affected by crisis a good education. The Education Cluster and INEE – along with their members and constituents including UNICEF, UNHCR, and bilaterals, among others – have led on thinking related to these issues. However, neither the Cluster nor the INEE are adequately resourced to build out global capacity in these areas; and key actors report a gap in consistent approaches to conducting needs assessments, costing needs, and monitoring what works.

4. The Call for a New Fund or Initiative: Principles, Priorities and Questions

Over the past year or more, calls for a step change in the way in which education in humanitarian emergencies and protracted crises are financed, planned, delivered, and monitored has escalated. Such calls have perhaps culminated in recent calls by Gordon Brown for a Global Fund for Education In Emergencies. In this section we raise some key questions and challenges and explore basic principles or criteria that might underpin any effort to evaluate the prospects for such an initiative.

4.1. Why do we need a global fund or platform and what might it accomplish?

As clarified above, there are three main “problems” that any such platform might address:

1) Coordination Gaps
   a. In immediate crisis planning and response.
   b. In meeting the longer-term needs of refugees.
c. In supporting education recovery and systems strengthening (including in situations of protracted crisis or conflict);

2) **Financing Gaps**: There is clearly a need for more financing, better allocated and more efficiently delivered, across a range of crisis and conflict-affected situations. Low levels of financing for education characterizes both the Humanitarian Response System and for conflict and fragile states within Development Finance. However, it is not clear that a new Global Fund or platform will be additive and generate new resources.

3) **Technical Capacity Gaps**: Ability to improve effectiveness through better data, monitoring, evaluation and investments in seeding and scaling innovation.

*Is this diagnosis of the gaps accurate and complete? What other areas need attention?*

**4.2. Is a new fund, instrument or platform required?**

With a substantial architecture for coordination already in place, one question that needs to be addressed quickly is whether a new fund or platform is required. Four sub-questions are raised for our discussion:

- *Can existing mechanisms – such as the Education Cluster and the INEE – be further reinforced to play a stronger role in needs assessment, planning, monitoring and advocacy during the early onset and response to acute emergencies?*
- *Can these existing mechanisms spearhead a step-change in the overall financing available for education - or are we confident that a newly created fund could do better?*
- *Could the creation of a new fund lead to the development of more linked up, consistent approaches to bridging the gap between short-term humanitarian response and longer-term educational needs? How?*
- *Are there other ways that a new platform or fund might drive deep improvement in meeting the needs of children and youth beyond those possible within the existing architecture?*

**4.3. What principles or criteria should guide the creation of such a platform?**

In fact-finding for this paper, a variety of principles and criteria for a new platform have been suggested. The most salient appear to be the following. Any new platform must:

- reinforce and leverage (not displace) existing effort and capacity.
- play a major role in coordination of existing actors.
- be able to link up shorter-term humanitarian efforts to longer-term recovery and stabilization, and to the development of country systems.
- address challenges in different geographies (e.g., in both low and middle income countries) and different types of conflict and emergency situations.
• respond rapidly and disburse quickly – including by setting up pooled funds.
• harness new resources (public and private).
• drive improvements in technical and operational expertise and capacity – especially in capacity to conduct robust conflict analyses, model costs and suggest value for money solutions, improve data and monitoring across programs, and seed and scale innovation.

*Are these the right principles and criteria for a new fund or platform?*

### 4.4. What risks are involved in establishing such a fund or platform?

There are many risks involved in creation of such a new platform. Key among these is the risk that no substantive financers emerge to provide additional (new) and stable funding for the new mechanism. Other outstanding risks include:
• failure to offset geopolitical earmarking and thus to find a more predictable source for “orphaned” situations, including chronic emergencies;
• fiduciary risks associated with working in fragile contexts;
• the challenge of engaging with a wide range of intermediaries in the transition from crisis to recovery;
• further fragmentation of the sector if the new platform is not established in such a manner as to leverage greater coordination, harmonization, and alignment across existing donors in the sector.

*Are there additional risks? How might such risks be mitigated?*

### 4.5. What are next steps in this discussion?

What additional analysis and information do we need to assess the viability of a new mechanism?

Who will lead on the creation of a business model and business case, and convening a conversation about this?

What key stakeholders in the humanitarian and development community need to be consulted?

How can we leverage upcoming windows of political opportunity – such as the World Education Forum and the Oslo and Addis conferences in 2015?

What kind of fundraising effort will be required?
Appendix 1: GPE’s Current Role in Crisis and Conflict

Since 2012, the Global Partnership for Education has been committed to supporting partner countries to move from situations of conflict and crisis towards recovery. Its funding modalities are designed to allow transitions from crisis to longer-term systems rebuilding, and GPE has been active in fostering bridging between the Education Cluster and Local Education Groups. GPE’s central advantage lies in its ability to build connections between emergency, protracted, and eventual recovery/reconstruction phases – as proven through the growth of its work in fragile and conflict-affected states since 2011.

GPE could play an important role in enhancing coordination, financing, and in meeting the need for better technical and operational capacity, evidence, data and knowledge-sharing in conflict and crisis situations. Yet to take on this role, GPE would need to reform its current operational platform and address key issues around heightened risks and transaction costs.

GPE’s Evolving Role in Fragile, Conflict-Affected, and Humanitarian Settings

Current consideration of support to education in conflict and humanitarian situations represents the continuation of an evolving role for GPE in fragile and conflict-affected settings (FCAS). Before GPE was created out of the EFA Fast Track Initiative (FTI) in 2011, strict eligibility requirements around full Education Sector Plans permitted few fragile and conflict-affected countries to join the Partnership. The concept of transitional or interim education sector plans in the place of full sector plans was introduced in the later years of FTI and began to be implemented in 2012. As a result, the number of fragile and conflict-affected states funded by GPE has increased exponentially since 2012, reaching 28 in 2014. Further adjustments to the needs of fragile and conflict affected states were made through the introduction of an accelerated drawdown mechanism of indicative country allocations in emergency situations. Moreover, in 2013, GPE adopted an operational framework to enable rapid adjustment of implementation modalities and GPE-financed activities in fragile and conflict-affected states. As of 2013, 52% of the total GPE funding distributions were for states affected by fragility and conflict, up from only 13% in 2010 (Menashy & Dryden-Peterson, 2015).

GPE provides rapid and flexible support for fragile and conflict-affected countries in three main ways. Importantly, these dimensions of GPE’s approach allow for the connection of humanitarian funding and long-term development strategies:

- **Transitional sector planning** is supported for countries recovering from conflict or crisis. Transitional plans place a lower threshold on data and analysis than full education sector plans, and do not necessarily cover the full education sector, but they form the basis for a coordinated approach to sector recovery by identifying priority medium term actions. They generally include a strategy for developing a full sector plan in the medium term, and form the basis of applications for implementation grant funding from the GPE fund;

- GPE provides **accelerated financing** for up to one year when GPE partner countries experience acute emergencies. Such funding can be up to 20% of a country’s indicative
allocation from the GPE fund, and can be requested by Local Education Groups when a UN humanitarian appeal has been published. It can be delivered rapidly (in approximately 8 weeks where an existing grant is not in place; or in under one month where there is a pre-existing grant);

- When civil conflict or crises unfold, and governments are not able to take on the implementation of GPE financed programs, **GPE funds can be channeled through a managing entity (rather than a supervising entity)**, to allow for continued funding of essential education services during a crisis period, or for funding to reach specific regions or populations within a country. GPE has expanded the range of eligible managing entities to include both UN and INGO partners; however its main partner to date in settings affected by conflict has been UNICEF.

- Also, when civil conflict or crises unfold during implementation of a GPE financed program, the Operational Framework seeks to guide the Local Education Group to effectively and efficiently decide whether it is necessary to move to a managing entity modality and/or whether to channel GPE funding to crisis-related activities or in other ways adjust to the situation.

At present, GPE has no formal approach to the issue of refugee education. Opportunity exists, however, for GPE to play a role, with a great number of GPE member countries hosting refugees, with overlap in priority countries for UNHCR’s education work (see below). Refugee issues are included in the Education Sector Plans of only one GPE country so far: Chad.

### Countries of Overlap: UNHCR Education Priority and GPE

* indicates signatory to the 1951 Refugee Convention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>Afghanistan</em></th>
<th><em>Dem. Rep. of Congo</em></th>
<th><em>Mauritania</em></th>
<th><em>Uganda</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td><em>Djibouti</em></td>
<td><em>Niger</em></td>
<td><em>Tanzania</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Burkina Faso</em></td>
<td><em>Egypt</em></td>
<td><em>Pakistan</em></td>
<td><em>Somalia</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Burundi</em></td>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td><em>Rwanda</em></td>
<td><em>Yemen</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cameroon</em></td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Central African Rep.</em></td>
<td><em>Kenya</em></td>
<td><em>South Sudan</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chad</em></td>
<td><em>Liberia</em></td>
<td><em>Sudan</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of technical capacity and support for better knowledge, data, and coordination, GPE supports conflict-sensitive Education Sector Planning across its countries and has engaged in various global level initiatives, acting as a founding partner in the Education Cannot Wait campaign; engaging in the Education Cluster and the INEE; and initiating dialogue on collaboration with the UNHCR (Global Partnership for Education, 2014). GPE hosts a Technical Reference Group on Education in FCAS and the GPE Secretariat has a cluster of senior education specialists with experience in conflict and crisis-affected countries.
### Appendix 2: UN Appeals Processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Funding Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flash Appeal</strong></td>
<td>Planning tool for coordinated humanitarian response for the first 3-6 months of an emergency, and for mobilizing the necessary resources from donors</td>
<td>Issued 2-10 days after onset of emergency, for up to 3-6 months</td>
<td>Urgent life-saving needs plus whatever early recovery projects can be identified</td>
<td>Eligible: UN Agencies I/NGOs Determines the allocation of the CERF, in-country pooled funding, bilateral funds, and OCHA emergency grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consolidated Appeal Process (CAP)</strong></td>
<td>Planning tool for the coordination, implementation and monitoring of humanitarian activities in chronic or complex emergencies, or natural disasters</td>
<td>Issued 3-6 months after onset of emergency, for 12 months and renewed annually as needed</td>
<td>Education projects identified at the time of the Flash Appeal, or new projects responding to evolving education in emergencies needs</td>
<td>Eligible: UN Agencies I/NGOs Basis for the Common Humanitarian Action Plan (CHAP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF)</strong></td>
<td>Fund that provides the initial injection of funds for the most urgent life-saving projects in the Flash Appeal or CAP, to cover the time lag between issuance of appeals and receipt of commitments and funds from donors. Complements Flash and CAP (developed simultaneously)</td>
<td>Complementing FLASH: initial 6 months Complementing CAP: Calendar year</td>
<td>For rapid response and under-funded emergencies: <strong>time-critical lifesaving activities only</strong> (no recurrent costs, no capacity-building)</td>
<td>Eligible: UN agencies only (Education: UNICEF as CLA, or other UN cluster partners such as UNESCO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OCHA Expanded Humanitarian</strong></td>
<td>Fund that provides rapid, flexible, small-scale funding to address</td>
<td>Short-term projects up to 6 months in</td>
<td>For natural disasters and complex conflict-</td>
<td>I/NGOs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

9 According to the *Education Cluster Coordinator Handbook*, “Education Clusters have successfully secured CERF funding by establishing that education can be a ‘life-saving’ and ‘life-sustaining’ intervention for funding psychosocial support for teachers and children, as well as temporary learning spaces which provide protective and life-saving environments.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Funding Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response Fund (ERF)</td>
<td>gaps in the CAP for humanitarian aid, and to enable the scale-up of response and recovery interventions, particularly by international and national NGOs that are not eligible for direct funding through the CERF</td>
<td>duration</td>
<td>related crises: To supplement the response for identified humanitarian priorities within the context of the Consolidated Appeal Process (CAP)</td>
<td>Has education component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Humanitarian Funds (CHF)</td>
<td>Funding coordination for multiple donors providing early, strategic and predictable funding to priority needs as identified in the CAP, sometimes as an expansion of the ERF</td>
<td>Long-term commitment</td>
<td>Primarily in complex and protracted crises Has education component</td>
<td>Eligible: UN agencies I/N NGOs Managed through OCHA and in-country management agents Currently set up for CAR, DRC, Sudan, South Sudan, Somalia, and Afghanistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Donor Trust Funds</td>
<td>Funding coordination for multiple donors pooling their resources, with the intention of supporting national humanitarian, recovery, reconstruction and development priorities. They are a useful additional source of funding after the acute response stage and help to reduce the burden of seeking, and reporting on, funding from multiple sources.</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>National humanitarian, recovery, reconstruction and development priorities</td>
<td>Managed by UNDP; requirements vary from one country/project to the next</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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