Myanmar
National Education Strategic Plan 2016/17-2020/21
(NESP)
Appraisal Report

27 February 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of acronyms used in the document

ADB	Asian Development Bank
BEPP	Basic Education Partnerships Program
CBO	Community-based organization
CCA	Child Centered Approach
CESR	Comprehensive Education Sector Review
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DAE	Department for Alternative Education
DBE	Department for Basic Education
DD	Deputy Director
DDG	Deputy Director General
DEO	District Education Ofice
DERPT	Department for Education Research, Planning and Training
DFAT	Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade
DfID	Department for International Department
DG	Director General
DHE	Department for Higher Education
DMNL	Department for Myanmar Nationalities Languages
DP	Development Partner
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
DTVET	Department for Technical and Vocational Education and Training
EC	Education College
ECD	Early childhood development
EDPCG	Education Partners Coordinating Group
EU	European Union
GIZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit
GPE	Global Partnership for Education
IIEP	International Institute for Educational Planning
ILO	International Labour Organisation
JICA	Japanese International Cooperation Agency
KG	Kindergarten
MARS	Mainstreaming Adaptation, Resilience and Sustainability

MCDQA	Management, Capacity Development and Quality Assurance
MEC	Myanmar Education Consortium
MoCRA	Ministry of Culture and religious Affairs
MoEA	Ministry of Ethnic Affairs
MoE-GPE WG	Ministry of Education – GPE Working Group
MoPF	Ministry of Planning and Finance
MoSWRR	Ministry of Social Welfare, Relief and Resettlement
NCC	National Curriculum Committee
NEPC	National Education Policy Commission
NESP	National Education Sector Plan
SEO	State Education Office
TE	Teacher Education
TEO	Township Education Office
TOR	Terms of Reference
TVET	Technical and Vocational Education and Training
UN	United Nations
UNESCO	United Nations Education Science and Cultural Organization
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UOE	University of Education
VSO	Voluntary Service Overseas

I. THE CONTEXT

I-1 The general context

1. Myanmar is not, as yet, a member of the Global Partnership for Education but has a strong desire to join. The country has been moving quite fast politically, economically and socially for the last few years. Before the recent significant changes that were signaled by the 2010 general election that installed a civilian government, an extended period of military rule spanning decades had been the norm. During that period, the civil freedoms were severely restricted with little to no effective possibility for dissenting views to be expressed.

2. As an expression of political opposition to its governance style, several rounds of economic sanctions against Myanmar were imposed and implemented by a number of influencial governments since at least the late 1980s. The major political shift occurred in the late 2000s with a new constitution that was adopted in a 2008 referendum. In 2010 a general election was held though the principal opposition party—the National League for Democracy (NLD)—boycotted it and it was disrupted in several ethnic areas. Many countries rejected the election results altogether.

3. The following general election was to be held in 2015. The intervening years saw a number of governance reforms that were greeted as meaningful steps towards a democratic state. They included the release of political prisoners—chief among them NLD leader Daw Aung San Suu Kyi—, authorization of labor unions and the relaxation of press censorship. The 2015 election was the first one to be really openly contested in the country's history. The NLD won a sweeping majority of more that 86 percent of the seats in the Assembly of the Union[1]. The new NLD-based government was sworn in in April 2016.

4. The above summary is testimony to the long march that has been achieved by the country to reach this stage where an equity-oriented education strategic plan can be appraised on the basis of international norms. Myanmar is at a very particular moment in its drive towards a more open, transparent and modern society and this is an opportunity for the international community to build on previous engagement with government and positively contribute, including in the limited sphere of education. It is with this in mind that the criteria for plan credibility have been systematically examined.

5. On the economic front, quite a big deal has been happening recently. Between 2014 and 2016 the economic growth rate remained above 7% annually. The creation in 2015 of the ASEAN Economic Zone of which Myanmar is a member and its geostrategic location between dynamic and populous China and India highlight great economic potential. Building on that potential, recent investment laws have accelerated investment and employment.

---

[1] Note though that a quarter of the seats are held by the military by law.

The International Labour Organisation (ILOSTAT) estimates the level of employment in 2017 to be 31.1 million of which 38.2 percent in non-agricultural sectors. The most important drivers for growth have been natural gas production for export and mining. While Myanmar has been a member of the UN category of "The Least developed countries" (currently 48 countries) since the beginning (early 1970s), it is projected to "graduate" from the group in the period 2017-24[2]. The year of projected full statistical pre-eligibility for graduation is 2018 with the year of projected full statistical eligibility for graduation is set to 2021. The graduation entails losing some of the international support measures (namely in development finance and trade) from developed countries and thus requires far-reaching transformations to strengthen the economy. The new government recognizes that a key factor in economic development lies in the improvement of the country's skills through education.

6. Myanmar is also a conflict-affected country. The composition of the population is between 30 and 40 percent ethnic minorities. There are more than 130 ethnic groups each with their own culture and language. The end of British colonial rule in the late 1940s brought to the fore the unintegrated ethnic-based oppositions to exclusive majority rule. Aspirations were high for wide autonomy at state level. Armed groups were formed and many among (or derived from) them are still at work today, in what some commentators consider to be the longest-running civil wars in the world. It is important to note here the great diversity in education as a consequence of this ethnic diversity and the major role played by non-state education providers in this context.

7. According to the latest Global Education Monitoring Report (2016), armed conflict is one of the greatest obstacles to progress in education. Indeed, internationally, the problem of out-of-school children has increasingly been concentrated in conflict-affected countries. Several affected countries have seen a drop in the total average years of national schooling as a consequence of such situation. Although no specific estimates can be made in the case of Myanmar for lack of data, the negative effects of armed conflict on education can be assumed to be as negative as elsewhere.

8. The signing in 2015 of a Nationwide Ceasefire Agreement (NCA) between the Central government and a number of Ethnic Armed Groups was a significant step forward. Principles of preservation of the Union as well as principles of democracy and federalism have been agreed. Although a large number of armed confrontations are reported in the conflict areas, there is an ongoing roadmap for peace that aims to sign an inclusive Union agreement and to amend the constitution in accordance with the agreement before the next general elections in 2020. These peace-building and political processes will certainly influence the pace of change in education and edu-

---

[2] UNCTAD, *The Least Developed Countries Report 2016*

cation delivery in the contested areas. At the same time this context underlines the need to pay particular attention to the national policies aimed at protecting children's rights to quality education in the conflict-affected areas.

I-2   The Comprehensive Education Sector Review

9. Following the political changes that had led to the 2010 general elections and the installation of a new government in 2011 there was a felt need to review the social sector development. A major conference was called in February 2012 to consider options for developing the education and health sectors. The conference, to which some international experts were invited, concluded with a recommendation for a comprehensive review of the two sectors.

10. In March of the same year the Terms of reference of the review of education, labelled "Comprehensive Education Sector Review" (CESR) were developed and discussed. Final authorization to embark on CESR came from the President himself in July of that year and, a month later, the official CESR offices were installed and the work started. The CESR process was designed from the beginning as a three-phase process: Phase 1 was to be a rapid assessment leading to the identification of urgent priorities and reform issues to be addressed; Phase 2 was to be an in-depth sector analysis incorporating more focused investigations; Phase 3 was to develop a costed education sector plan on the basis of the reviews. A complex network of technical, coordination and steering bodies were set up with the completion date set for June 2014 for all three phases.

11. The focal areas to be investigated were defined in the TORs as: Policy, legislation, management and financing; ECD and Basic Education[3]; Non-formal education; TVET; and Higher education, with all sub-sectoral areas covering the cross-cutting themes of access, quality and relevance, management, planning and monitoring and evaluation, and detailed financing issues, specifically relevant to that subsector. Phase 3 was to lead to the development of a strategic plan.

12. In fact, due to the complexity of the operation, Phase 3 was not completed until mid-2016, marking a two-year delay on the initial timeline. The general election in 2015 and the setting up of the new Government added to the delay in the original time line.

---

[3] It is to be emphasized that, in contrast to most other developing countries, Basic Education covers the three education levels of primary, lower secondary and upper secondary.

I-3   Approach followed in plan appraisal

13. The most recent guidelines from GPE-IIEP (*Guidelines for Education Sector Plan Appraisal*, 2015) was used in this appraisal. Use was also made of tools and considerations that were discussed and agreed during the IIEP-GPE training program that was organized at IIEP-Paris in July 2016. The appraisal criteria and tools, the steps in the appraisal process and the sources were discussed at length there. The five main criteria successively reviewed and described below are: leadership and participation; soundness and relevance; coherence; feasibility, implementability and monitorability; focus on equity, learning and efficiency.

14. The appraisal was conducted in an independent and transparent way. This consultant was external to all plan development activities and he pledged to derive his findings and conclusions from an independent analysis of all pieces of information provided. Importantly these principles were discussed and agreed with the main stakeholders of this appraisal, i.e. the MoE and the Donor partners right at the beginning of the process.

15. Once the appraisal principles were agreed, information gathering started and covered meetings, discussions and visits with the following entities (see page 4 for the meaning of acronyms):
    - Meeting with the MoE-GPE working group
    - Meeting with the EDPCG
    - Focus group meetings with nine CESR groups
    - Meeting with the Curriculum center
    - Meeting with NEPC
    - Meeting with the NCC
    - Plenary meeting with CSOs
    - Plenary meeting with Ethnic education organizations
    - Meeting with the MoE Permanent Secretary
    - Meeting with key MoE departments: DBE; DERPT; Budget; DHE; DTVET; DMNL; DAE
    - Meeting with key line ministries: Ministry of Ethnic Affairs; Ministry of Planning and Finance; Ministry of Social Welfare, Relief and Resettlement; Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs
    - Interviews with DPs: ADB; GIZ; European Union; Denmark; Myanmar Education Consortium; Australia; Japan; World Bank; UNICEF; UNESCO
    - Interviews with international and national Non-government organizations: Plan International, MARS Practitioners Network; National Network for Educational Reform; Monastic Education Development Group; Pyoe Pin; Myanmar Federation for Persons with Disabilities
    - Field visits to: a state education office, a district education office, a township education office, a basic education school, a teacher education college.

II.   LEADERSHIP AND PARTICIPATION IN PLAN DEVELOPMENT

16. Government has clearly been in the driving seat both for the CESR and the plan development. To begin with, clear terms of reference for the Comprehensive Education Sector Review that were issued in July 2012 are clear evidence of a political will to undertake such activity.

17. The TORs clearly define the objectives of the CESR and project the work in three phases exactly as they happened: a rapid assessment in Phase 1, an in-depth analysis in Phase 2 and a costed education sector plan in Phase 3. The objectives were to :

    - develop a knowledge-base on the strengths and challenges in the Myanmar education system and identify areas for reform*;*
    - support and contribute to the development of evidence-based policies, legislation and education sector improvements; and
    - develop costed education sector plans (based on the findings of the review).

18. According to the TORs, the CESR "will aim to be an inclusive, participatory process that is led by government but involves a wide range of education stakeholders. Implementation of the CESR will directly involve a range of different ministries and departments that have an involvement in education, including Ministry of Education (MoE), Ministry of Social Welfare, Relief and Resettlement (MoSWRR), Ministry of Religious Affairs (MoRA), Ministry of Science and Technology (MoST), Ministry of Labour (MoL), Ministry of Border Affairs (MoBA), Ministry of Defence (MoD), Ministry of Health (MoH), Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation (MoAI), Ministry of Cooperatives (MoC), Ministry of Finance and Revenue (MoFR), Union Attorney General's Office (UAGO). To enable government leadership of the process, a complementary programme of capacity development for government leads and participants in the CESR will run alongside CESR implementation."

19. Given that the Comprehensive education sector review lasted for an extended period of time, a new, parallel body—the Education Promotion and Implementation Committee (EPIC)—was set up by the government in the middle of Phase 2 of CESR. That was commonly interpreted as a way to accelerate implementation of some of the policies being developed.

20. This government leadership of the process did not of course preclude participation of a wide range of consultants, among other actors. In fact the number of consultants who took part in the review was rather large (around 70 in the three phases). But their findings and recommendations were systematically discussed and selectively adopted.

21. Furthermore the TORs recognized that "all education stakeholders in Myanmar, including parents, students, communities, representatives of different ethnic groups, teachers, head teachers, education offices at the State/Regional and township levels, monastic education stakeholders, CBOs, academics and others had a vital role to play in the review.

22. The 2015 Manifesto of the leading party (the National League for Democracy—in opposition at the time) had an education section that aligned with those principles, namely by saying that "We will establish early childhood care programmes » and that « We will work to ensure that every primary-age child successfully completes his or her primary-level education in school ».

23. As they are, the NESP strategies appear to have concrete foundations aligned to pre-existing commitments, laws, manifestos or longer-term plans. That includes a preexisting 30 year plan that had an objective to achieve Universal Primary Education by 2016 and Universal Secondary Education by 2031. These preexisting foundations represent a reasonable guarantee for sustained commitment to implement the chosen new strategies for extended periods of time.

24. A more recent indication of ownership is the use now being made by most MOE departments of NESP program components in budget submission documents since 2016/17. New regulations in budget submissions have been implemented requiring the MOE to break its submission down into NESP expenditures and other expenditures. Recognizing NESP as a national priority, the MoPF will favor NESP expenditures over other MOE expenditures.

25. Documentation provided by CESR groups shows that extensive consultation took place at various stages in sector analysis and plan formulation. Meetings were held in 41 districts (see Annex 2 for a full list) across the country reaching 2,050 stakeholders representatives. In one such district a meeting held on 28 June 2015 was attended by 202 people, of which: 1 government representative from the region, 21 education officers from state/region/district, 16 representative from civil society, 8 parent-teacher associations, 66 school heads, 38 school teachers, 38 university representatives, and 14 student representatives.

26. Those meetings produced more than 4,000 recorded recommendations related to: preschool, basic education, curriculum, assessment, teacher education, alternative education, TVET, higher education, quality assurance and other areas. We have detailed examples of such consultative meetings in a given district with the profiles of participants ranging from township education officers, to school head masters, to students, to university teachers and to political party representatives.

27. The one group of stakeholders that seems not to have been explicitly involved is that of non-state education providers. In a context of limited ethnic integration and multi-lingualism, these have an important role to play and, if consulted, might have added improved treatment of the diverse education needs of Myanmar children. A large scale information campaign about the NESP was launched on 23 February 2017 and is expected to further inform and involve the stakeholders across the country.

III.   Soundness and relevance of the NESP strategies

28. The education sector analysis that was conducted in the form of CESR analyzed all subsectors and most common cross-cutting educational issues, including gender, disability, urban/rural location, management, etc. An illustration of the latter is how attention to "children with disability" is mentioned in most program areas. In the process, the education sector challenges were identified in the CESR subsector reports which, also, proposed sets of policy recommendations to address them.

29. As the NESP strategies appear in their vast majority to originate in those subsector recommendations, it appears that, in the main, the NESP strategies are sound and relevant to the challenges faced by the Myanmar education sector. There are, however, issues about some specific strategies that reviewed in the below paragraphs and that lead to a few recommendations.

30. Of notice is program Component 1 in Strategy 1 under the Basic Education Access, Quality and Inclusion plan area—School census and mapping baseline. It is focused on collecting data on school infrastructure in order to facilitate the implementation of Component 2—Expansion of existing schools, upgrading of schools and construction of new schools. That component is certainly the most costly and at the same time particularly ambitious, with a target of 50 percent of existing schools with improved facilities, 30 percent of post primary schools upgraded as lower secondary schools and 7 percent of lower secondary schools upgraded as upper secondary schools. While the effective completion of the mapping baseline as early as possible will facilitate the successful implementation of several other activities in providing data for evidence-based decision making and planning, another related major program—MoE's EMIS Operational Plan for 2017/18 with UNESCO assistance—is already underway with a baseline data collection operation planned to be completed in January 2018. By leaving this program unmentioned, NESP Component 1 runs the risk of duplicating the school census.

31. However the EMIS Project has broader objectives of strengthening the entire EMIS system. For efficiency-enhancing reasons, **it is recommended to work toward alignment and harmonization between Component 1 and the EMIS Operational Plan.** This entails revisiting the project tools to ensure that they fully capture the infrastructure requirements of Component 1 and revising its timeline in order to fit the needs for developing the National School Infrastructure Investment Plan (NSIP) in Component 2.

32. The pace of curriculum development is problematic as it now stands. One of the most emblematic reforms in the NESP is to change the structure of the education system from a 5-4-2 structure to a KG-5-4-3 one. That change, in addition to the need for renewing the education content, requires curriculum reform, part of the NESP package. Four different options—schedules— were considered as to how quickly the curriculum reform should be completed. Schedules 1 and 2 for example would have the change completed

by 2021-22, i.e. within the NESP time period. On the other hand, Schedule 7 would have the completed curriculum only in 2028-29, seven years later. The four different schedules are shown in the NESP document in Table 7.1 titled: "Proposed schedules for the implementation of the New Basic Education Curriculum" without any preference indicated. **For the NESP to retain its role as a mobilizing principle and the source of a roadmap for education sector-wide reforms, it is recommended that one schedule be selected and the others removed from the plan document.** That selection should be stated as one of the first steps in the NESP roll out and documented in the implementation plan.

33. Another important issue of concern relates to the relatively high risk for Myanmar children to fall victims of natural disasters while in school. According to a UNOCHA (UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs) study, "Myanmar ranks first as the 'most at risk' country in Asia the Pacific according to the UN Risk Model. The country is vulnerable to a wide range of hazards, including floods, cyclones, earthquakes, landslides and tsunamis. The likelihood for medium to large-scale natural disasters to occur every couple of years is high, according to historical data."

34. The NESP refers to DRR (Disaster risk reduction) in one place (Basic Education Strategy 2, Program component 2 about "Expansion of existing schools, upgrading of schools and construction of new schools" stating that a National School Infrastructure Investment Plan (NSIP) will be developed and that it will be linked to standards for DRR. **Given the high stakes involved (children's lives), it is recommended that the NESP outlines in some detail the intended approach towards strengthening emergency preparedness to natural disasters affecting schools.** That approach should not be restricted to infrastructure improvements but should include school policies and regulations in coordination with the overall national bodies in charge. For example, embed disaster preparedness in teacher training and school curricula.

35. The issue of ethnic languages and of adapting language of instruction is a very important one. Thus the NESP acknowledges that "The 'language barrier' is also a significant factor for children from national ethnic groups that contributes to their dropping out of school." While the plan recognizes the importance of emphasizing learning in the mother tongue, it comes short of allowing textbooks to be translated in them.

36. The CESR Phase 2 report on languages states that: "all students should have the opportunity to study at school, to learn their mother tongue until they are fluent, to make them competent in their mother tongues when they leave school". But it adds the following mention: "Textbooks at basic primary level should be written in Burmese (if children from other ethnic races find it difficult to learn from these textbooks, they should be taught by using their individual mother tongues)."

37. Therefore the recognition in the CESR report that "By respecting and valuing the rights for every citizen of Myanmar to learn; there is a need to create

opportunities to learn in the native language of each respected race, in accordance with the demand of the ethnic groups so that the learning proficiency of children in those regions can be improved" has failed to be taken up by the NESP. As indicated in the most recent UNESCO Global Education Monitoring Report (2016), "Using the mother tongue as the language of instruction has a positive impact on learning across the curriculum, not only in languages." This includes not only for the child to be taught in his/her home language but also to have access to textbooks written in that language. Reducing the matter to the mother tongue being "classroom language" means playing down the importance of learning tools such as textbooks and others. The above mentioned UNESCO report gives an example of a "multilingual education textbook" being used in the Philippines province of Maguindanao (p. 269). **It is therefore recommended that, for pedagogical reasons and in accordance with the CESR diagnosis (see paragraph 35), access of children from ethnic background to instruction and instructional materials in their ethnic language be envisaged and that the NESP be open to translating national textbooks into ethnic languages for the first two or three grades of schooling as a minimum measure while broader federalist negotiations continue.**

38. It is important to stress that the above recommendation only refers to the domain of learning facilitation. Some of the other dimensions of ethnic equity are addressed by the NESP through "local curriculum". The local curriculum is understood as mainly aimed at "development of textbooks for teaching national races languages and booklets that reflect culture and tradition of national races groups." Thus Component program 3 of Strategy 1 (Redesign the basic education curriculum emphasizing 21st century skills) under Basic Education Curriculum NESP subsector provides for providing training programs and support for Local Curriculum Development Teams in states and regions.

39. In discussions with a number of ethnic educational organizations, they pointed out that although textbooks for teaching some ethnic languages have already been printed they are direct translations of Myanmar language textbooks, and that therefore they are unsuitable. These textbooks should be reviewed and revised with the participation of ethnic language specialists/trainers/teachers.

IV. COHERENCE OF NESP POLICIES AND STRATEGIES

41. The NESP is subdivided into 10 major areas of action with a transformational shift in each one of those areas defining the overall orientation of movement for action. These major areas (often called "subsectors" in the document) are: Preschool and kindergarten education; Basic education reforms for the 21st Century; Basic Education: access, quality and inclusion; Basic Education: curriculum; Student assessment and examinations; Teacher education and management; Alternative education; Technical and vocational education and training; Higher education; and Management, capacity development and quality assurance.

42. The total number of strategies is 27. So the first question in terms of coherence is whether these strategies are supportive of each other and do not contradict each other. Annex 3 table displays the interconnection between all strategies. It shows for each which other strategies are functionally or impactingly related to it. The resulting table is one that shows a very high interconnectivity of the strategies and zero negative internal relationships.

43. A second question is whether the strategies in each subsector are enough to bring about the impact defined in the transformational shift. It is here found that the transformational shits are defined in a visionary language whereas the strategies are expressed in more concrete terms. For example, in the area of preschool and kindergarten education, the transformational shift states that "All children get a head start on their learning pathway through accessing quality preschool and kindergarten education". That is obviously a goal for a longer-term than the NESP period. The National EFA Review document of March 2014 states that only 480,000 children were receiving ECCE services at the time. It is obviously impossible to move from a situation where 480,000 children receive ECCE to one in which "all" children are accommodated, in five years. The plan document should clearly state that the transformation shifts are longer-term objectives. **It is recommended that a qualification be added to the NESP supporting documents to differentiate the visionary transformational shifts and the more pragmatic strategies described in the document.**

44. The use of a simulation model is one of the best ways to ensure coherence in a plan document between its various parts including projected enrolments, inputs and costs. The MoE has followed that good practice, using a simulation model called EPSSim (Education Policy and Strategy Simulation) with the assistance of UNESCO. The model provides projections of school enrolments on the basis of projected age-group populations, intake ratios, school flow rates and transition rates between education levels. It then derives the amounts of costed inputs on the basis of agreed input utilization rates and current unit costs. The total costs are then compared to the expected financial resources leading to funding gap estimation.

45. In theory, the key NESP targets relating to student enrolments and related inputs (staff, learning and teaching materials and infrastructure) should be derived from the model's projections on the basis of projected enrolment

and input ratios. In this case it is clear from the model that a number of targets are set outside the model process and then entered into it. The normal operation is the other way round where projections from the model provide the targets in enrolments and related input requirements. In the reversed pattern seen here, one cannot trace the intermediate targets to any anticipated ratios as their source. And, consequently, changes in other sections of the model will not affect those targets, thus undermining the model's responsiveness. One example is the number of students entering long-term TVET courses by end of 2018/19 (Strategy 1, Component 2).

46. A supplementary annex to NESP costing is currently being developed by the MoE with UNESCO support. That document will provide a welcome updated cost framework on the basis of newer information on school data, financial resources and unit costs, from the version currently in the NESP document, dating January 2016 i.e. more than a year before NESP launch. **In addition to, or concurrently with, that updating, it is recommended that the simulation team, in close consultation with the NESP implementing departments, review the target setting system using the proper sequencing and safeguarding overall coherence. Where necessary the targets may be updated within the model**.

47. Additionally, **it is also recommended that the model be utilized to derive the targets within the NESP implementation/action plan and the M&E Framework, as it is important to ensure coherence and alignment across all NESP documents.**

48. Finally, **it is also recommended that the capacity of the MOE to autonomously use, adapt and update the model be developed as a priority**.

V. Plan feasibility and monitorability

50. As already mentioned, the NESP is made up of 27 strategies and 99 program components. As part of the plan format a results framework is designed for each subsector whereby the strategies are well-defined in their end outcomes including lists of outcome indicators. However, these outcome indicators are simply listed without target values attached. As such, the strategies are not monitorable. As regards the program components, they do have targets shown but only for the end of year 2018/19 i.e. the exact mid-year of the plan period. In particular, there are no end-of-plan targets. That makes the components particularly difficult to monitor.

51. Whether the monitoring and evaluation matrix is an integral part of the plan or a separate document, it is an indispensable part of the plan's successful implementation. As the IIEP/GPE Guidelines states: "Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) mechanisms are critical to ensuring that the plan is on track to achieving its targets. An effective M&E system should ask whether the intended activities are being carried out as designed, whether the targets of the plan are being achieved, and if not, why not. " The NESP chapters do not include such a monitoring and evaluation chapter. **It is recommended that a monitoring and evaluation matrix be developed and added as a supporting document to the NESP document. It should show for each program component a baseline value and a measurable target for each year till the final year of 2020/21. In addition, at least a few paragraphs should describe the distribution of monitoring and evaluation responsibilities.**

52. In best practice approaches an additional, more detailed, plan is developed alongside the ESP. Sometimes called "implementation plan", "action plan" or "operational plan", it outlines the detailed activities under the program components for two or three years. The main function of an implementation plan is to facilitate plan implementability by specifying detailed activities under the program components, identifying the division of implementation responsibility among Ministry entities, showing budget allocation by activities and showing the sources of funding. Further down the implementation line we usually have more detailed work plans for smaller entities and shorter periods of time. These mechanisms can also serve as a response to perceived weak capacity of the MOE departments. Indeed, a recent capacity assessment report (*Multi-Level MoE Capacity Gap Assessment and Initial Targeted Capacity Building in Myanmar*[4], 2016) concluded that " Departments lack clear understanding about vision and mission statements" and that "less than half of the respondents actually received an orientation to their roles and responsibilities when they entered the current job".

53. The current NESP package shows the NESP plan itself, the Annual Priorities plans and the Annual work plans. The Annual Priorities Plans can be taken

---

[4] Funded through the QBEP itself funded by: Australia, Denmark, European Union, UK and UNICEF. Authored by FHI360

as equivalent to NESP implementation plans if the quantitative targets are added. In their current shape, the plans usefully list the detailed activities with space provided for each of the five years to input corresponding targets. Those spaces were correctly filled in in the initial version (for 2016/17) but have been replaced with simple ticks in the current version (for 2017/18). **In order for them to play the role of implementation plans it is recommended that quantitative targets be added to the Annual Priorities Plans.** The recommendation is to continue using that earlier format. Whether the plans should be revised annually together with the Annual Department Work Plans is a matter of choice. There is no technical imperative for such frequent revisions for an implementation plan. The Work Plans, on the other hand, must be reviewed frequently (the quarterly sequencing chosen by the MOE is just fine).

54. In the same vein Chapter 14 (Financing the National Education Strategic Plan) provides for two scenarios in resource availability (high and low resources) and also two scenarios in plan implementation (high and low performance). The benefit of simulation modeling is precisely that all sorts of different scenarios can be simulated and compared in their performance and cost. Then by comparing them, one optimum scenario is decided based on the best possible performance that is compatible with available resources. That Optimum scenario then becomes the reference scenario with the other hypothetical scenarios being left out. Adjustments to the Optimum scenario remain of course possible in future plan revisions and sector reviews. **It is recommended that one firm financing Optimum scenario be adopted instead of the current four scenarios, based on the best information available on resource availability and ministry implementation capacity.**

55. The financial feasibility of the NESP is hard to estimate given the four possible scenarios allowed. In the worst case (high NESP performance and low resources) the gap would be as high as 38% of the allocated expenditures, obviously unsustainable. The proposed scenario restriction should be implemented if only to have a more meaningful estimate of the funding gap without which a plan cannot be validated.

VI.   EQUITY, EFFICIENCY AND LEARNING FOCUS IN BASIC EDUCATION

57. Student learning is very much at the heart of the NESP and is centered on curriculum reform, teacher education restructuring and student assessment improvement.

58. The focus on efficiency is mostly about reducing dropout from Basic Education. Drop out is recognized by the MoE as a major issue to be solved and special measures are planned in the NESP. For example Strategy 2 under Basic Education Access, Quality and Inclusion area is labelled "Support compulsory and inclusive education. One of its program component will pilot a program aimed at schools which are identified at high risk of student dropping out and promote interventions such are forming community committees to prevent dropout, allocating stipends to vulnerable students, providing school feeding or encouraging out of school children to re-enroll.

59. On the other hand the issue of equity in its several dimensions is the concern of many stakeholders. A first, important such dimension is about gender. While it is understood that gender analysis was part of the CESR, this could be much more strongly reflected throughout each chapter of the NESP, including the management section and results frameworks. The Ministry's recent *Multi-Level MoE Capacity Gap Assessment and Initial Targeted Capacity Building in Myanmar* (2017)[5], also notes a need for capacity development within MoE on gender[6].

60. To help build this capacity, it is suggested that MoE undertake a gender review of the NESP, perhaps with DP/GPE support, to further inform development of a complementary gender strategy and action plan going forward. The upcoming UNGEI-GPE-UNICEF 'Guidance for developing gender-responsive education sector plans' provides a useful reference guide.

61. Reference is also made to alignment with GPE's new *Gender Equality Policy and Strategy 2016-2020*

(http://www.globalpartnership.org/content/gender-equality-policy-and-strategy-2016-2020) which adopts a system-wide approach to promoting gender equality in and through education. Output 3 in particular relates to gender-responsive sector analysis, planning, and implementation, and involves building the capacity of all partners (p.13).

62. The other important dimension of equity is mainly centered on the situation of children in the ethnic and conflict areas. Because of the persistent conflicts between ethnic armed groups (see paragraph 6 above) and the Myanmar army in several places, the security situation in some places of the country is very unstable. As a consequence, in various parts of the country

---

[5] Supported by Denmark, EU and UNICEF through the 'Building on QBEP Programme'

[6] 'Almost all sampled offices report that there are no documented guidelines on culturally-relevant or gender-based approaches and programming. None of the offices have staff members employed specifically to focus on gender or cultural issues, and almost none of the offices have received training on these issues. None of the offices have conducted cultural or gender assessments, nor do they have the relevant tools for those assessments', (p.33).

entire zones are occupied by armed groups and inaccessible to government services including education. Unless the difficult conditions of children living in the conflict-affected areas are considered and addressed, hundreds of thousands of Myanmar children may be excluded from the benefits of NESP.

63. While many of them are able to benefit from services provided by non-state organizations they often face obstacles if they choose or need to transfer to another system. Transferring from those areas to the regular state system is often made impossible by an absence of recognition by the MoE of the non-state systems children are transferring from.

64. Clearly, the Myanmar Government is the duty bearer to protect the right to education for all children of this country, regardless of their ethnicity, location of residence, nationality, gender, religion, etc. Recent and less recent examples in the world show that, under some circumstances, it is possible for civil war opponents within a country to agree on a minimum education framework to protect children's chances even in the middle of political and military conflicts. This minimum may include: recognizing educational service being provided, agreement of common standards to help children transfer between systems, support in provision of textbooks, allocation of teachers to the areas, accepting teachers in the government in-service training programs, etc.

65. It should be clearly stated here that an educational plan, even the most perfect of plans, cannot solve political problems that belong in the political scene. However, because education is such a special service dealing with such a precious population category, all avenues must be explored to avoid losing a generation of children to waste.

66. Addressing these situations falls in fact under the NESP area of Management, capacity development and quality assurance, especially under Strategy 1—Strengthen and sustain sector-wide, subsector and subnational coordination mechanisms—particularly in Component 2—partnerships with states and regions. The strategy intends to enable a customized response to address the unique challenges within each state and region while recognizing that NESP reforms will not be accomplished without the support from non-governmental organizations. In order to constructively approach the situations of education in the conflict-affected areas, a first step is to properly assess service delivery in those areas as part of state/region education development plans. To do that the NESP projects implementing a rapid assessment on the model of CESR. **The recommendation is for the MOE to conduct a piloting exercise for a rapid assessment of education in a region/state in cooperation with the regional state and non-state educational stakeholders, building on previous work. Once validated, that methodology could then be replicated in other states and regions with due adjustment, including in conflict-affected areas.** On the basis of the rapid assessment state plans can be developed with clear recognition of the role of the non-state actors. Im-

portantly, prior to starting action, careful consultation and consensus building between all actors should be organized to explore options for a piloting exercise.

67. In the interim period, recognition of the contributions of the non-state organizations is crucial. **It is recommended that the value of the educational services provided by non-state organizations in particular areas be properly recognized in the NESP supporting documents and that possible avenues of support that are locally acceptable be explored and implemented.** It is to be noted that the institutional mechanism for that is stated in the NESP Strategy 2 of the Basic Education Reforms for the 21st century plan area, especially by activating the Basic Education Partnerships Program (BEPP).

68. To facilitate the above actions **it is recommended that a special fund for support of sub-national educational planning activities be set up as part of GPE funding, subject to GPE programming discussions.** Precise modalities can be determined through discussions about the respective roles of regional/local NGOs, state, district and township representatives and others in implementing that strategy. GPE procedures are flexible enough under the close supervision by the Grant Agent.

VII.   OTHER ISSUES

70. In discussions with various stakeholders the issue was raised of accuracy of the translation between the English and the Myanmar language versions of the NESP. For example, under Chapter 7 (Basic Education Curriculum), Component 3 of Strategy 2 says in Myanmar (according to knowledgeable people): "Capacity building of local curriculum developers" while in English it is "capacity development for nationalities languages curriculum development teams". Support for "local curriculum" development is quite different from support for "nationalities languages curriculum development" and it should be clarified. **It is recommended that a thorough revision of the entire translation of the document be done to ensure a perfect match between versions.**

VIII.   CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

72. After reviewing the National Education Strategic Plan of Myanmar and talking with stakeholders, the main conclusion is that the international community should congratulate the government for reaching this level of engagement and should support it.

73. To fulfill the appraisal purpose of assisting in strengthening the NESP documentation and enhancing Myanmar chances in GPE application, the following table summarizes the recommendations explained in the previous sections. Reference to the paragraphs where each recommendation is explained in more detail is also shown in the table.

Table: Summary of recommendations in their order of appearance

Sequence	Key passage of the recommendations	For more detail, see paragraph
1	It is recommended that one schedule—instead of the current four—for curriculum reform completion be selected and the others removed from the plan documents.	32
2	It is recommended that the planned baseline mapping component be fully aligned and harmonized with the MoE's EMIS Operational Plan	31
3	Given the high stakes involved (children's lives), it is recommended that the NESP outline in some detail proposed approaches towards strengthening emergency preparedness to natural disasters affecting schools	34
4	It is recommended that, for pedagogical reasons and in accordance with the CESR diagnosis (see paragraph 35), access of children from ethnic background to instruction and instructional materials in their ethnic language be envisaged and that the NESP be open to translating national textbooks into ethnic languages for the first two or three grades of schooling as a minimum measure while broader federalist negotiations continue.	37
5	It is recommended that a qualification be added to the NESP supporting documents to differentiate between the visionary transformational shifts language and the more pragmatic strategies described in the document.	43
6	In addition to, or concurrently with, the supplementary annex to NESP costing being developed, it is recommended that the simulation team, in close consultation with the NESP implementing departments, review the target setting system using the proper sequencing and	46

	safeguarding overall coherence. Where necessary the targets may be updated within the model.	
7	Additionally, it is also recommended that the model be utilized to derive the targets within the NESP implementation/action plan and the M&E Framework, as it is important to ensure coherence and alignment across all NESP documents.	47
8	It is also recommended that the capacity of the MOE to autonomously use, adapt and update the model be developed as a priority.	48
9	It is recommended that a monitoring and evaluation matrix be developed and added as a necessary supporting document to the NESP document. It should show for each program component a baseline value and a measurable target for each year till the final year of 2020/21. In addition, at least a few paragraphs should describe the distribution of monitoring and evaluation responsibilities.	51
10	In order for the Annual Priorities Plans to play the role of implementation plans it is recommended that quantitative targets be added to them as appropriate.	53
11	It is recommended that one firm Optimum financing scenario be adopted instead of the current four scenarios. It should be based on the best information available on resource availability and ministry capacity and could be revisable on a regular basis.	54
12	As a step for opening a space to the non-state providers of education in conflict-affected areas, and subject to careful consultation among all actors, it is recommended that the MOE conduct a piloting exercise for a rapid assessment of education in a region/state in cooperation with the regional state and non-state educational stakeholders. Once validated that methodology could then be replicated with due adjustment o other states and regions, including in conflict-affected areas.	66
13	It is recommended that the NESP supporting documents express recognition of the value of the non-state-provided educational services in particular areas and that possible avenues of support be expored and then implemented	67
14	It is recommended that a special fund for support of sub-national educational planning activities with participation by ethnic educational organizations be set up with GPE assistance.	68
15	It is recommended that a thorough revision of the entire translation of the NESP documents be done to ensure a perfect match between English and Myanmar versions.	70

Annexes

Annex 1: List of persons met

Name	Organization
MOE-GPE WORKING GROUP	
Dr Khine Mye	DG, DAE
Dr Zaw Win	DDG, DBE
U Ko Lay Win	DDG, DERPT
Dr Thant Sin	DDG, DAE
CESR SUB-GROUPS	
Dr May San Yee	Pro Rector, UoE
Daw Ohnmar Thein	Deputy Director, DHE, Assistant task Manager, CESR
Dr. Lily Myint	DAE, Focal person of Higher Education
Dr. Htay Yee	Lecturer, Focal Person of Higher Education
Daw Thet Htar Hlaing	Assistant Lecturer, HE Sector CESR
Daw Chaw Chaw Han	Assistant Director DAE, DAE Sector CESR
Daw Kaung Kaung Nyein	Deputy Staff officer, DAE, DAE Sector CESR
Daw Aye Thida	Lecturer, Thingune Education College, TE CESR
Daw Aye Aye Moe	Staff Officer, DAE, TE CESR
U Than Hteo Staff Officer	MoCRA, Basic Education CESR
Daw Ei Pyone Mon	Senior Teacher, Basic Education CESR
Daw Thinn Thinn Khine	Staff Office, Yangon Regional Education Office, Basic Education CESR.
Daw Nyo Nyo Saw	Department of Labour, Stat Officer, TVET CESR
Daw ThuZar Tin	Assistant Lecturer, Department of TVET
Daw Ohnmar Thein	Assistant Manager, Computer Department, West Yangon University, MCDQA CESR
Daw Yee Yee Cho	Staff Officer, DERPT, MCDQA CESR
Daw Myint Myint Khing	Deputy Staff Officer, DERPT, MCDQA CESR
Dr. ThiriNaing	Associate Professor, Univesity of Computer Studies, Yangon, MCDQA CESR
Daw Pan Su Wai Kyaw	Senior Teacher, DBE, Student Assessment and Examinations CESR.
Daw Hsu Yee Htet	Senior Teacher, DBE, Student Assessment and Examinations CESR
Daw Thin Sandar Lwin	Senior Assistant Teacher, DBE, Curriculum CESR

Daw Ei Ei Khine	Office staff, Ministry of Education, Curriculum CESR
MOE CENTRAL OFFICIALS	
Dr. Zaw Latt Htun	Director, Curriculum Center
Daw Khin Thinn Phyu	Director/Training, Curriculum Center
Dr. Htay Htay Win	Curriculum center
Daw Aye Aye Nyunt	Curriculum center
Daw Ni Ni Aye	Curriculum center
Daw Khin Cho Win	Curriculum center
Dr Win Aung	Member- National Education Policy Commission
Dr. Thet Lwin	Member- National Education Policy Commission
U Saw Aung	Member- National Education Policy Commission
Dr. Myint Shwe	Chair Person, National Curriculum Committee
Dr. Khin Aye	Member, NCC
U Tin Hlaing	Member, NCC
Daw Mya Kyawe	Member, NCC
Daw Khin Mar Kyu	Member, NCC
Daw Tin Aye	Member, NCC
Dr. Aye Kyi	Member, NCC
Dr. Than Htun U	Member, NCC
Daw Khin Mar Htun	Member, NCC
Daw Lwin Lwin Soe	Member, NCC
Dr. Maw Maw Aye	Member, NCC
Dr Soe Win	Permanent Secretary, MoE
Daw Tin Tin Shu	Director, Policy, Law and Inspection and former CESR Task Manager
U Zaw Win	DDG-DBE
U Khin Aung	DD-DBE
U Toe Win	DD-DBE
U Myint Lwin	D-DBE
Daw Nant Cho Cho Nyunt	DD- DBE
Dr. Ohnmar Than	DD-DBE
Dr. Kyaw Win Soe	DD-DBE
U Win Thankt Zaw	SO-DBE
U Khin Maung Htwe	DD-DBE

Daw Khin Thuzar Aye	DD-DBE
Daw Khin Khin Gyi	Director, Budget
Dr Aung Aung Min	DDG, DHE
U Min Aye Ko	Deputy Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Ethnic Affairs
U Aung Naing	AD - DAE
Dr. Thant Sin	DDG, DAE
UThant Sin Htun	DAE
Khing Maung Htwe	DAE
Daw Khin Pyone	DD curriculum and equivalency, DAE
Dr. Daw Myint	Quality assurance and M&E, DAE
Daw Chaw Chin Han	Head of life skill department, DAE
Dr. Zaw Myint	Director General, DMNL
MOE SUBNATIONAL OFFICIALS	
U Myint Lwin	Director, SEO, Nay Pyi Taw
U Lonn Zaw	Deputy Director/Inspector, SEO, Nay Pyi Taw
Daw Thi Thi Hla	Deputy Director/ICT, SEO, Nay Pyi Taw
U Tun Myint Aung	Deputy Director, SEO, Nay Pyi Taw
Daw Yin Min Su	Assistant Director, SEO, Nay Pyi Taw
U Htu Htun U	DDG inspection, DEO, Dhakhina District
U Kyaw Soe Win	ADD admin, DEO, Dhakhina District
Daw Aye Myint ADD	ICT, DEO, Dhakhina District
U Kyaw Htun	HR Officer, DEO, Dhakhina District
Daw Thida	Head Mistress, High School No. 1, Pyimana Township
U Kyaw Min Naing	Deputy Township Education Officer, Pyimana
Daw Shwe Shwe Toe	Principal, Thingangyun EC
Daw Than Than Htay	Head, Practicing school, Thingangyun EC
Daw Cho Cho Than	Head Mistress, Nanattaw Branch High School, Loikaw
U Tun Yi	State Education Officer, Kayah
U Saw Eh Doe Wah	District Education Officer, Loikaw
Daw Dorothy Ngin	Township Education Officer, Loikaw
LINE MINISTRIES OFFICIALS	
Daw Naw Win Mar Oo	Director, Social sector finance, MoPF
Daw Aye Thida Hlaing	Social sector finance, MoPF

Daw Hinn Ei Wei	Social sector finance, MoPF
Daw Chan Mya Oo	Social sector finance, MoPF
Dr San San Aye	Acting Director General, MoSWRR
Daw Le Yee Win	Deputy Director, MoSWRR
U Kyaw Linn Aung	Deputy Director, International Relation, MoSWRR
Daw Ei Ei	Deputy Director, International Relation, MoSWRR
U Ba Aye	Deputy Director General, MoCRA
U Aung San Win	MoCRA
U Kyaw Yin	MoCRA
U Shwe Win	MoCRA
Min Aye Ko	Deputy Permanent Secretary, MoEA
U Win Naing	Deputy Director General, MoEA
L. Tu Ming Gawng	DDG, MoEA
EDUCATION DONOR PARTNERS/CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS	
Mr Chris A. Spohr	Principal Social Sector Specialist, ADB Myanmar Resident Mission
Andrea Cole	DFAT
Laura Brannelly	DfID
Ambassador Peter Lysholt Hansen	Ambassador of Denmark in Myanmar
Henning Nohr	Development Counsellor, Denmark Embassy
Elisabeth Pirnay	Program Manager/Social Sectors, EU
Trevear Tilton Penrose	Senior Education Expert, EU
Yumiko Yamakawa	Basic Education Advisor, JICA
Kumiko Iwasawa	Project Formulation Advisor, JICA
Yoko Yamoto	Coordinator for Economic Cooperation, Embassy of Japan
Satoko Shimada	Third Secretary, Embassy of Japan
Dr. Jeanette Burmester	Head of Project, GIZ
Naing Yee Mar	Education Specialist, GIZ
Loy Rego	Volunteer Technical Advisor, MARS
Daniele Panzeri	Partnership Program Director, MEC
Amanda Seel	Senior Education Adviser, MEC
Aung Ko Oo	Monastic Education Development Group
	Myanmar Federation for People with Disabilities
Khual Tawna	Program Manager/Resilience, Plan Internatonal

Aye Aye Tun	Pyoe Pin
Katy Webley	Director/Programme Development, Quality and Advocacy, Save the Children
Ms. Hawng Tsai	Director, Thinking Classroom/NNER
Min Jeong Kim	Head of Office, UNESCO
Dagny Margrete Fosen	Teacher Education Specialist, UNESCO
Nicole Starkey	Education Analyst, UNESCO
Annika Lawrence	Research Analyst, UNESCO
Sandar Kyaw	National Programme Officer, UNESCO
Mitsue Uemura	Chief/Education Section, UNICEF
Jane Davies	Education Specialist, UNICEF
Malar San	Education Officer, UNICEF
Ben Williams	Programme Manager (Education), VSO
Marie-Helene Cloutier	Senior Economist, The World Bank
	Yaung Zin Teacher Development Group
ETHNIC EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS	
	Mon National Education Committee
	Language Social Development Organization
	Wa Education
	SJN Church Based Education
	Kayan New Generation Youth
	Pa O National Organization/PDN
	Kachin Education Foundation
	World Education

Annex 2: List of districts where consultations were held

	District	Number of participants
1.	Bago	81
2	Dawei	35
3	Hakha	30
4	Hpa-an	98
5	Hinthada	26
6	Kyaukse	74
7	Kyaing Tong	25
8	Lashio	59
9	Loikaw	85
10	Laputta	13
11	Magway	151
12	Madalay	23
13	Minbu	71
14	Myintgyina	3
15	Mawlamyine	63
16	Monywa	27
17	Maubin	72
18	Myeik	7
19	Myingyan	127
20	Myaungmya	69
21	Naypyitaw	37
22	Nyaung-U	22
23	Pathein	11
24	Pakokku	121
25	Pyinoolwin	3
26	Pyay	17
27	Pyapon	95
28	Sagaing	53
29	Shwebo	65
30	Sittwe	50
31	Taungoo	62
32	Tachileik	12
33	Taunggyi	53

34	Thahton	133
35	Thayet	30
36	Tharyarwady	3
37	Yangon(East)	19
38	Yangon(North)	16
39	Yangon(South)	11
40	Yangon(West)	86
41	Yamethin	12
Total		2050

Source: MOE

Annex 3: NESP (2016-2021) strategies and their inter-connections

NESP subsectors	*NESP Strategies*	*Other NESP Strategies functionally or impactingly related*
4- Preschool and kindergarten education	4.a- Strengthen governance and co-ordination of preschool services	4b; 4c; 4d; 5a; 5b; 5c; 6a; 6b; 6c; 7a; 7b; 7c; 9a; 9b; 9c; 13a; 13b; 13c;
	4.b- Expand access to preschool services for children in rural and remote areas	4a; 4c; 4d; 5a; 5c; 6a; 6b; 6c; 9a; 9b; 9c; 13a; 13b; 13c;
	4.c- Improve preschool quality to better prepare children for primary school	4a; 4b; 4d; 5b; 5c; 6a; 6b; 6c; 7a; 7c; 9a; 9b; 9c; 13a; 13b; 13c;
	4.d- Implement quality kindergarten education	4a; 4b; 4c; 5b; 5c; 6a; 6b; 6c; 7a; 7c; 9a; 9b; 9c; 13a; 13b; 13c;
5- Basic education reforms for the 21st Century	5.a- Strengthening policy, legislation and systems	4b; 4c; 4d; 5b; 5c; 6a; 6b; 6c; 7a; 7c; 8a; 8b; 9a; 9b; 9c; 10a; 10b; 10c; 11a; 11b; 11c; 12a; 12b; 12c; 13a; 13b; 13c
	5.b- Strengthening partnerships	4b; 4c; 4d; 5a; 5c; 6a; 6b; 6c; 7a; 7c; 8a; 8b; 9a; 9b; 9c; 10a; 10b; 10c; 11a; 11b; 11c; 12a; 12b; 12c; 13a; 13b; 13c
	5.c- Advocacy and communication	4b; 4c; 4d; 5a; 5b; 6a; 6b; 6c; 7a; 7c; 8a; 8b; 9a; 9b; 9c; 10a; 10b; 10c; 11a; 11b; 11c; 12a; 12b; 12c; 13a; 13b; 13c
6- Basic Education: access, quality and inclusion	6.a- Enable universal access to free basic education	4a; 4b; 4c; 4d; 5a; 5b; 5c; 6b; 6c; 7a; 7c; 8a; 8b; 9a; 9b; 9c; 10a; 10b; 10c; 11a; 11b; 11c; 12a; 12b; 12c; 13a; 13b; 13c
	6.b- Support compulsory and inclusive education	4a; 4b; 4c; 4d; 5a; 5b; 5c; 6a; 6c; 7a; 7b; 7c; 8a; 8b; 9a; 9b; 9c; 10a; 10b; 10c; 11a; 11b; 11c; 12a; 12b; 12c; 13a; 13b; 13c
	6.c- Improve school quality through a national school-based quality assurance system	4a; 4b; 4c; 4d; 5a; 5b; 5c; 6a; 6b; 7a; 7b; 7c; 8a; 8b; 9a; 9b; 9c; 10a; 10b; 10c; 11a; 11b; 11c; 12a; 12b; 12c; 13a; 13b; 13c
7- Basic Education: curriculum	7.a- Redesign the basic education curriculum emphasising 21st century skills	4a; 4b; 4c; 4d; 5a; 5b; 5c; 6a; 6b; 6c; 7b; 7c; 8a; 8b; 9a; 9b; 9c; 10a; 10b; 10c; 11a; 11b; 11c; 12a; 12b; 12c; 13a; 13b; 13c
	7.b- Build the professional capacity of curriculum development teams	4a; 4b; 4c; 4d; 5a; 5b; 5c; 6a; 6b; 6c; 7a; 7c; 8a; 8b; 9a; 9b; 9c; 10a; 10b; 10c; 11a; 11b; 11c; 12a; 12b; 12c; 13a; 13b; 13c
	7.c- Implement the new curriculum through strengthened curriculum management, dissemination and monitoring and evaluation systems	4a; 4b; 4c; 4d; 5a; 5b; 5c; 6a; 6b; 6c; 7a; 7b; 8a; 8b; 9a; 9b; 9c; 10a; 10b; 10c; 11a; 11b; 11c; 12a; 12b; 12c; 13a; 13b; 13c
8- Student assessment and examinations	8.a- Improve assessment and examinations	5a; 5b; 5c; 6a; 6b; 6c; 7a; 7b; 7c; 8b; 9a; 9b; 9c; 10a; 10b; 10c; 11a; 11b; 11c; 12a; 12b; 12c; 13a; 13b; 13c

	8.b- Strengthen co-ordination, management and monitoring	5a; 5b; 5c; 6a; 6b; 6c; 7a; 7b; 7c; 8a; 9a; 9b; 9c; 10a; 10b; 10c; 11a; 11b; 11c; 12a; 12b; 12c; 13a; 13b; 13c
9- Teacher education and management	9.a- Strengthen teacher quality assurance and teacher management	4a; 4b; 4c; 4d; 5a; 5b; 5c; 6a; 6b; 6c; 7a; 7b; 7c; 8a; 8b; 9b; 9c; 10a; 10b; 10c; 11a; 11b; 11c; 12a; 12b; 12c; 13a; 13b; 13c
	9.b- Improve the quality of pre-service teacher education	4a; 4b; 4c; 4d; 5a; 5b; 5c; 6a; 6b; 6c; 7a; 7b; 7c; 8a; 8b; 9a; 9c; 10a; 10b; 10c; 11a; 11b; 11c; 12a; 12b; 12c; 13a; 13b; 13c
	9.c- Improve the quality of in-service teacher professional development	4a; 4b; 4c; 4d; 5a; 5b; 5c; 6a; 6b; 6c; 7a; 7b; 7c; 8a; 8b; 9a; 9b; 10a; 10b; 10c; 11a; 11b; 11c; 12a; 12b; 12c; 13a; 13b; 13c
10- Alternative education	10.a- Strengthen co-ordination and management	4a; 4b; 4c; 4d; 5a; 5b; 5c; 6a; 6b; 6c; 7a; 7b; 7c; 8a; 8b; 9a; 9b; 9c; 10b; 10c; 11a; 11b; 11c; 12a; 12b; 12c; 13a; 13b; 13c
	10.b- Expand access through multiple AE pathways	4a; 4b; 4c; 4d; 5a; 5b; 5c; 6a; 6b; 6c; 7a; 7b; 7c; 8a; 8b; 9a; 9b; 9c; 10a; 10c; 11a; 11b; 11c; 12a; 12b; 12c; 13a; 13b; 13c
	10.c- Strengthen the quality of AE programmes	4a; 4b; 4c; 4d; 5a; 5b; 5c; 6a; 6b; 6c; 7a; 7b; 7c; 8a; 8b; 9a; 9b; 9c; 10a; 10b; 11a; 11b; 11c; 12a; 12b; 12c; 13a; 13b; 13c
11- Technical and vocational education and training	11.a- Expanding access to TVET for various target groups including ethnic and disadvantaged populations and people with disabilities	5a; 5b; 5c; 6a; 6b; 6c; 7a; 7b; 7c; 8a; 8b; 9a; 9b; 9c; 10a; 10b; 11a; 11b; 11c; 12a; 12b; 12c; 13a; 13b; 13c
	11.b- Strengthening the quality and relevance of TVET	5a; 5b; 5c; 6a; 6b; 6c; 7a; 7b; 7c; 8a; 8b; 9a; 9b; 9c; 10a; 10b; 10ca; 11a; 11c; 12a; 12b; 12c; 13a; 13b; 13c
	11.c- Strengthening TVET management	5a; 5b; 5c; 6a; 6b; 6c; 7a; 7b; 7c; 8a; 8b; 9a; 9b; 9c; 10a; 10b; 10c; 11a; 11b; 12a; 12b; 12c; 13a; 13b; 13c
12- Higher education	12.a- Strengthen higher education governance and management capacity	5a; 5b; 5c; 6a; 6b; 6c; 7a; 7b; 7c; 8a; 8b; 9a; 9b; 9c; 10a; 10b; 10c; 11a; 11b; 11c; 12b; 12c; 13a; 13b; 13c
	12.b- Improve quality and relevance of HEIs	5a; 5b; 5c; 6a; 6b; 6c; 7a; 7b; 7c; 8a; 8b; 9a; 9b; 9c; 10a; 10b; 10c; 11a; 11b; 11c; 12a; 12c; 13a; 13b; 13c
	12.c- Expand equitable access to higher education	5a; 5b; 5c; 6a; 6b; 6c; 7a; 7b; 7c; 8a; 8b; 9a; 9b; 9c; 10a; 10b; 10c; 11a; 11b; 11c; 12a; 12b; 13a; 13b; 13c
13- Management, capacity development and quality assurance	13.a- Strengthen and sustain sector-wide, sub-sector and sub-national co-ordination mechanisms	4a; 4b; 4c; 4d; 5a; 5b; 5c; 6a; 6b; 6c; 7a; 7b; 7c; 8a; 8b; 9a; 9b; 9c; 10a; 10b; 10c;11a; 11b; 11c; 12a; 12b; 12c; 13b; 13c
	13.b- Strengthen education sector management structures, systems and tools	4a; 4b; 4c; 4d; 5a; 5b; 5c; 6a; 6b; 6c; 7a; 7b; 7c; 8a; 8b; 9a; 9b; 9c; 10a; 10b; 10c;11a; 11b; 11c; 12a; 12b; 12c; 13a; 13c

	13.c- Strengthen the capacity of education managers to successfully undertake education reforms	4a; 4b; 4c; 4d; 5a; 5b; 5c; 6a; 6b; 6c; 7a; 7b; 7c; 8a; 8b; 9a; 9b; 9c; 10a; 10b; 10c;11a; 11b; 11c; 12a; 12b; 12c; 13a; 13b
14- Financing the NESP		