

EDUCATION
FOR ALL:



initiatives,
issues and
strategies

Report of the meeting
of the Working Group
on Education for All
held at
UNESCO Headquarters
22-24 November 2000



For further information, please contact
Office of the Assistant Director-General for Education
UNESCO
7, Place de Fontenoy
75352 Paris 07 SP, France
Phone: +33 (0) 1 45 68 10 00
Fax: +33 (0) 1 45 68 56 29
E-mail: efa@unesco.org
Web site: www.unesco.org

The draft report was shared with all participants in the meeting of
the Working Group on Education for All. Comments and reactions on
the draft document are gratefully acknowledged.

Text prepared by ▷ Lene Buchert

Editorial co-ordination ▷ Ulrika Peppler-Barry

Editorial team ▷ Karine Brun, Wenda McNevin,
Chantal Pacteau, Susanne Schnuttgen
and Jeannette Vogelaar

Graphic design ▷ Sylvaine Baeyens

Printing ▷ EGOPRIM

Preface

The Director-General of UNESCO in his opening address to the first meeting of the Working Group on Education for All underlined that the Organization sees its mandate to co-ordinate EFA partners and maintain their collaborative momentum both as a vote of confidence and as an immense challenge. UNESCO's commitment to EFA has been expressed through numerous and varied actions taken since Dakar at the national, regional and international levels. These have focused on five core areas:

- ▷ First, to integrate EFA fully in all programme activities of UNESCO. This concerns education, specifically, but also inter-sectoral activities related to culture, communication and information, and the sciences.
- ▷ Second, to support countries in the implementation of EFA, for example in the formulation of education policies that cater to excluded groups.
- ▷ Third, to develop regional mechanisms for capacity-building and exchange between countries.
- ▷ Fourth, to champion more efficient use of resources and increased investment in basic education.
- ▷ Fifth, to sustain the EFA momentum at the global level through EFA advocacy at international meetings.

UNESCO has undertaken a series of consultations with its major partners in the EFA movement — the United Nations system, the funding and technical assistance agencies, civil society and Member States — in order to share mutual expectations, provisional ideas and draft documents. This has included discussions of three UNESCO documents that have been developed in support of the EFA movement: (i) a *Plan of Action* which attempts to mobilize and rationalize action nationally, regionally and internationally; (ii) *Guidelines for the Preparation of National Action Plans for Education for All* aiming at supporting countries in their development of national EFA plans; and (iii) a document on *Development Partner Co-operation in the Support of Education for All: Rationale and Strategies* which forms part of the discussion in this report. An electronic news bulletin board, set up specifically for information-sharing on EFA, provides regular updates on important events and achievements.

The setting up of the Working Group on Education for All represents another important mechanism to bring the EFA movement forward. As a forum for consultation and discussion among the key partners, the Working Group can play a potentially critical role in influencing the design and adoption of the strategies needed to translate expressed political commitment to EFA into concrete action. It is my sincere hope that we shall be able to forge a more consolidated Education for All movement during this coming decade than was the case from Jomtien to Dakar.

Jacques Hallak
Assistant Director-General for Education a.i.

List of abbreviations

ABONG	Brazilian Association of NGOs
ACP	African, Caribbean, Pacific Group
ADEA	Association for the Development of Education in Africa
AfDB	African Development Bank
CARICOM	Caribbean Community
CAS	Country Assistance Strategy
CCA	Common Country Assessment
CDC	Centre for Disease Control
CDF	Comprehensive Development Framework
CREMIS	Caribbean Regional Educational Management Information System
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DAM	Dhaka Ahsania Mission
DFID	Department for International Development
ECCD	Early childhood care and development
EU	European Union
FRESH	Focusing Resources on Effective School Health
EFA	Education for All
HIPC	Highly Indebted Poor Countries Initiative
HIV	Human Immunodeficiency Virus
IBE	UNESCO International Bureau of Education
ICT	Information and communication technologies
IIEP	UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning
NGO	Non-governmental organization
OCHA	Office for the Co-ordination of Humanitarian Affairs
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OIE	Organization of Ibero-American States for Education, Science and Culture
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers
Sida	Swedish International Development Co-operation Agency
STI	Sexually Transmitted Infections
UIS	UNESCO Institute for Statistics
UNAIDS	Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UN/DESA	United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNGEI	United Nations Girls' Education Initiative
UNHCR	Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNIFEM	United Nations Development Fund for Women
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WFP	World Food Programme
WGEFA	Working Group on Education for All
WHO	World Health Organization

Contents

Executive summary.....	6
I. Introduction.....	7
II. National, regional and international initiatives for Education for All.....	8
Follow-up in regions and countries.....	8
Inter-agency 'flagship' programmes.....	12
Summary of central issues.....	16
III. Implementing Education for All: issues and strategies.....	17
Achieving Education for All (EFA) through partnerships and linkages.....	19
Mobilizing resources and designing strategies for the global initiative.....	22
Monitoring Education for All goals and targets.....	25
Summary of major recommendations.....	27
IV. Mapping the future.....	29
Appendices.....	30
Appendix 1. Welcome address by Koïchiro Matsuura, Director-General of UNESCO.....	30
Appendix 2. List of participants and observers.....	33
Appendix 3. Agenda.....	37
Appendix 4. List of documents.....	39

Executive summary

The Working Group on Education for All (WGEFA) is one of the mechanisms for the implementation of UNESCO's mandate to co-ordinate the follow-up to Dakar. Its function is professional and consultative, providing a forum for exchange and discussion of the varied experiences with Education for All (EFA) in countries, regions and international organizations, and for recommending concrete actions. This report reflects the discussions and outcomes of the first meeting of the Group held at UNESCO Headquarters, 22-24 November 2000.

The major purposes of the meeting were two-fold. One was to establish a common framework of knowledge and understanding of what is happening in specific countries, regions and organizations. This was done through show-and-tell sessions with presentations by representatives of countries, regions and international organizations on their EFA activities and programmes, and in particular, on what has happened since Dakar. The other purpose was to discuss three issues which are critical for bringing the EFA movement forward and to make recommendations for action in these three areas. The issues concerned: (1) how to link EFA plans with other plans nationally; (2) how to mobilize international support for EFA; and (3) how to monitor EFA goals and targets. This was done through presentations prepared by the World Bank and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (theme 1) and UNESCO (themes 2 and 3).

The show-and-tell sessions revealed the diversity of accomplishments and actions in the different regions. Latin America and the Caribbean highlighted successful planning, evaluation and monitoring experiences. The Arab region reported the need for additional efforts by all concerned to build up basic understanding and momentum for an EFA movement and for implementation of the EFA goals. The experiences in Africa ranged from consolidated plans and commitment to little or no impact or to a realization that the starting point for Education for All has to be redefined. In Asia, the Dakar conference provided an opportunity to redirect the focus on adolescents and youth and on basic education problems. This was also the case in Georgia.

The show-and-tell sessions, in particular those of the 'flagship' programmes, revealed the need to fully accept and implement the wider Education for All concept and all of the EFA goals set in Dakar. Education must be understood as a basic human right and be seen in a changing context of globalization, poverty and exclusion. New emphases should, therefore, be put on, for example, non-formal education, skills development, learning needs of adolescents and young adults, new kinds of knowledge related, in particular, to new

information technologies, the environment and HIV/AIDS, and new universalistic values related, in particular, to democracy and human rights. Girls' education was singled out as being of particularly critical importance. The need to forge new partnerships, in particular with non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and civil society, was also underlined.

The common thread for the three substance presentations was the interpretation of and actions needed for the global initiative through which the international community is to design strategies and mobilize resources in support of national EFA efforts. The extensive discussions undertaken through a 'special interest group', in-depth presentations and thematic groups underlined contrasting views and emphases on the content of and direction for this initiative. The core contrast was whether the initiative should be narrowed to funding issues understood in terms of, for example, identification of funding gaps, increased resource mobilization and targeting of funding based on specific criteria, or whether funding issues should be set in a wider context of development co-operation, underlining not only principles of national ownership and government leadership, and the need to understand educational planning and programming in the context of wider planning processes, in particular poverty strategies and debt relief schemes, but also understanding international resource mobilization as including both technical and financial assistance, and having as its primary purpose to be supportive of national resource mobilization. In addition, the discussions revolved around more general and technical issues related to the monitoring of Education for All goals and targets, focusing both on planning and programme development and on statistics and indicators.

The key recommendations of the meeting addressed five major areas: (i) preparation of national EFA plans; (ii) UNESCO's role in EFA follow-up; (iii) the role of NGOs; (iv) financing of EFA; and (v) the potential of information and communication technologies (ICTs).

Of these, UNESCO would consider particularly the possibility to:

- ▷ establish a task force to work on financing strategies;
- ▷ provide a platform for discussion among funding and technical assistance agencies;
- ▷ organize collaboration among agencies;
- ▷ study best practices in development of plans;
- ▷ strengthen the operational aspects of the UNESCO *Guidelines for the Preparation of National Action Plans for Education for All*;
- ▷ associate the private sector with Dakar follow-up;
- ▷ create a portal on Dakar follow-up; and
- ▷ design a time-bound action plan for Dakar follow-up. □

I. Introduction

The World Education Forum in Dakar (April 2000) mandated UNESCO to co-ordinate EFA partners and maintain their collaborative momentum. The Organization sees its role as having to create synergy within the array of different opinions and perspectives among all partners involved in the follow-up process while respecting, as an intergovernmental organization, that governments are the principal authority of the movement, and while respecting also the important message from Dakar that the process must be led by the countries through their governments, national NGOs and civil society. In order to assist the Organization in its work, Koïchiro Matsuura, Director-General of UNESCO, decided to convene a Working Group on Education for All (WGEFA). This report presents the contents and results of its first meeting held at UNESCO Headquarters, 22-24 November 2000. The opening address of the Director-General to this meeting is attached as Appendix 1.

The Working Group has been conceived as an informal, technical forum for consultation and discussion among professionals who played a core role in the EFA movement leading up to the Dakar forum. This has been done in part because of the decision in Dakar not to establish new permanent structures for EFA co-ordination. Members of the Working Group cover the wide-ranging partners in the EFA movement, namely countries, regional organizations, national and international non-governmental organizations, intergovernmental and regional development banks, multinational and bilateral organizations, private foundations and private individuals. In addition to the official participants, there was a sizeable number of observers. The full list of participants and observers appears in Appendix 2. Participants in each meeting are expected to transmit its outcomes to their wider constituencies in order to ensure continuity, institutional memory and optimal progress on the ground. Widespread distribution of the meeting report through the networks of all partners serves the same purpose.

The design of the meeting reflects UNESCO's federating role in the collective enterprise that is the EFA movement and the fact that Education for All is a multi-faceted concept characterized by multiple initiatives and diversified interests. In his introductory remarks to the meeting, *UNESCO's acting Assistant Director-General for Education* underlined that the meeting should be understood as a point in a process. He stressed that the first day aimed at giving ownership of the meeting to the participants through extensive sharing of information on and concrete experiences with EFA activities in countries, regions and international organizations. The second day looked more into the future through discussion of three

core themes for the EFA movement, namely:

1. How to link EFA plans with other plans nationally;
2. How to mobilize resources and design strategies in support of national EFA efforts; and
3. How to monitor EFA goals and targets.

These issues, and particularly the second one, have been associated with what is called in the Dakar Framework for Action, the global initiative. As a lead-up to this discussion, a session was organized for a 'special interest group' which most participants and observers attended. The three themes were also discussed in more depth in three thematic groups in which observers participated actively as well. Issues raised in all of these contexts form part of Section III on Implementing Education for All: Issues and Strategies.

The programme for the meeting is attached in Appendix 3.

There were several purposes for the meeting:

- (i) First, to establish a common framework of knowledge and understanding of what is happening in specific countries, regions and organizations;
- (ii) Second, to discuss the selected three core themes as a basis to design consolidated strategies and systems;
- (iii) Third, to provide inputs to the meeting of the high-level policy group [provisionally scheduled for the latter part of 2001].

While it was agreed in Dakar to not set up another EFA co-ordination mechanism, it was decided to establish an informal, flexible high-level policy group which, under the direct authority of the Director-General of UNESCO, would have as its purpose to keep Education for All high on the political agenda nationally, regionally and internationally, and to translate stated political commitment into financial will in support of the goals and targets of Education for All.

This report aims at capturing the spirit of the Working Group meeting. In order to be informative to non-participants, it outlines in some detail all interventions made, whether as formal presentations, reactions or comments, or as recommendations or concluding statements.

Although participants were invited in their personal capacity, reference is made throughout to their institutions or countries, except for the in-depth presentations of substance papers where the names of the authors have been used. In order to enhance the readability of the report, it has been organized around common themes rather than in strict adherence to the sequence of presentations and interactions in the meeting. The full list of documents distributed in the meeting is attached in Appendix 4. □

II. National, regional and international initiatives for Education for All

One of the purposes of the meeting was to ensure information-sharing and exchange of experiences related to the development of EFA activities on the ground. This was done through presentations by participants from the regions and countries, and from international, non-governmental and civil society organizations. These presentations varied in nature. Some were general updates on what concrete steps had been taken and achievements made since Dakar, while others focused more on identified problem areas and inconsistencies between rhetoric and practice. Some discussed Education for All more globally, related to all subsectors of the education system and to most or all of the six Education for All goals stipulated in the Dakar Framework for Action.¹ Others related more specifically to sub-parts of the Education for All concept or goals or specific programmes, including 'flagship' programmes.

Follow-up in regions and countries

Arab States Region

The *Arab States Region* varies in its readiness to focus on the EFA concept and goals. While positive development has taken place with respect to some goals, in particular

increased primary school enrolment, others continue to lag behind and, therefore, require additional support and commitment from all parties concerned. Problem areas concern in particular: insufficient early childhood education; illiteracy; dissatisfactory quality of education, teachers' qualifications and internal efficiency at the primary-school level; inconsistency between needs for and spending of financial resources and educational requirements; and inadequate management of the system. In the Arab Framework for Action adopted by the Regional Conference on Education for All for the Arab States, Cairo, Egypt, 24-27 January 2000, five principles for action to ensure provision of basic learning needs have been proposed: comprehensiveness, equity, learner-friendly environment, commitment, and keeping pace with technological advancements. Focus has been put specifically on the principle of comprehensiveness which underlines that learning must be holistic, open-ended and aiming at social change and culture enrichment, and on that of commitment at all levels, globally and locally, in order to provide more innovative and equitable formulae to resolve the problem of human and financial resources of countries and groups in the greatest need.

At the first meeting for the Arab States Region, organized by UNESCO Beirut in October 2000, actions at the regional level were discussed and the need for advocacy underlined. The meeting resulted in the following concrete steps for action within the time framework December 2000 – April 2001:

1. The six goals are: (i) expanding and improving comprehensive early childhood care and education, especially for the most vulnerable and disadvantaged children; (ii) ensuring that by 2015 all children, particularly girls, children in difficult circumstances and those belonging to ethnic minorities, have access to and complete, free and compulsory primary education of good quality; (iii) ensuring that the learning needs of all young people and adults are met through equitable access to appropriate learning and life-skills programmes; (iv) achieving a 50 per cent improvement in levels of adult literacy by 2015, especially for women, and equitable access to basic and continuing education for all adults; (v) eliminating gender disparities in primary and secondary education by 2005, and achieving gender equality in education by 2015, with a focus on ensuring girls' full and equal access to and achievement in basic education of good quality; (vi) improving all aspects of the quality of education and ensuring excellence of all so that recognized and measurable learning outcomes are achieved by all, especially in literacy, numeracy and essential life-skills (World Education Forum, Dakar, Senegal, 26-28 April 2000. 2000. *The Dakar Framework for Action. Education for All: Meeting our Collective Commitments*, p. 8. Paris, UNESCO).

- ▷ To produce in English and Arabic an action-oriented executive summary of the UNESCO *Guidelines for the Preparation of National Action Plans for Education for All*.
- ▷ To organize national and regional meetings on EFA follow-up to advocate, in particular, the principles of comprehensiveness and commitment.
- ▷ To identify a lead United Nations organization for each country in the region that would assist in: (a) forming an EFA support team; (b) establishing country EFA teams; (c) preparing national EFA plans; and (d) mobilizing funds and fund-raising nationally.
- ▷ To identify a high-level regional Ambassadors' team to assist in mobilization and fund-raising according to proposed plans for specific activities.
- ▷ To launch a communication strategy through electronic and paper versions of a newsletter and through use of journalists.

The *Arab Resource Collective* supplemented the regional presentation by indicating that the role of NGOs in the EFA movement is still embryonic but that initiatives, so far, have focused on education as a right, early childhood development, linkages between education and macro-economic development, and establishing EFA as a platform. It was underlined that EFA must be understood as more than schooling, i.e. as an expanded concept based on human rights and common values. It was also pointed out that there is a need both to learn from experiences and to take ameliorative measures in light of acknowledged problems related, for example, to globalization, the spread of HIV/AIDS and civil disruption.

New ways of mobilizing the commitment to education that does exist in the region have to be found, in particular to ensure participation of all stakeholders in the movement and building partnerships. This can be done, it was suggested, through using existing regional and national 'educational' organizations and networks and through establishing special EFA coalitions that would bring all stakeholders together: for example, parents, teachers, academia, children, literacy groups, and governmental and non-governmental organizations. It was specifically proposed to link EFA with the ongoing preparation of the Children's Summit in September 2001 and to make efforts for extensive dissemination in Arabic of the main documents related to both the Jomtien and Dakar conferences and for use of these documents in workshops, seminars and educational activities in and out of schools.

In its intervention, *UNESCO Beirut* underlined that Arab countries have mainly centralized systems of education and that, so far, the EFA process has been driven by government agencies and Ministries of Education. It is critically important, therefore, to strengthen the role of NGOs and other civil society institutions and to include them in the process from the beginning. Bilateral and multinational agencies were

requested to specifically ensure that a satisfactory dialogue with and inclusion of NGOs and civil society institutions in the EFA process be established. Thematic sub-groups for the twenty-one countries in the region will be established, led by each of the partners and focusing on the key issues of early childhood education, basic education, girls' education and literacy. Capacity-building is being undertaken through a regional initiative in all Arab states that aims at enabling Ministries of Education and educational institutions to obtain timely, relevant and reliable information on all aspects of education at the national level. The purpose is to help overcome problems of data generation and use, to produce educational indicators of international standards and to strengthen the culture of use of indicators in educational policy analysis and management.

The Caribbean

In the case of the *Caribbean Community (CARICOM)*, twenty-two countries already work together in the Education for All movement. A needs assessment was prepared for the Dakar Forum and resulted in the development of a plan of action, Education for All in the Caribbean: Plan of Action 2000-2015 with specified goals and targets as well as identified dates for achievement by 2002, 2008 and 2015, respectively. The Plan of Action will be presented for endorsement by the Ministers of Education to their respective Cabinets and Parliaments and to the Conference of Heads of Government.

The Plan, which was tabled at Dakar, has seven target areas that cut across the Education for All goals and are to be monitored each by a different country and United Nations monitoring agency: (i) early childhood care and education (Guyana/United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)), (ii) primary education (Netherlands Antilles/UNESCO), (iii) education of youth and adults at the secondary-school level (Jamaica/UNESCO), (iv) enabling teachers (Saint Lucia/UNESCO), (v) use of information and communication technology in instruction and management of education (Barbados/UNESCO), (vi) involvement of civil society (Belize/UNDP), and (vii) performance and accountability of all stakeholders, national investment and resource mobilization (Barbados/UNESCO). UNESCO Kingston will co-ordinate a regional monitoring team in close co-operation with the CARICOM Secretariat, with appointed monitoring liaisons at the national level and with national advisory committees including all stakeholders.

Most countries have national education plans, but may need to realign them with the targets in the Plan of Action and in response to the commitment to EFA goals. This concerns particularly the following core areas: (i) persistent advocacy and social mobilization in favour of early childhood education and development, (ii) attention to improving quality of, in addition to access to, primary education; (iii) growing disparity

in the participation rates of boys and girls, particularly at the secondary level; (iv) programmes for out-of-school youth, in particular young males, and (iv) teaching of life-skills.

In terms of regional action, four areas have been identified: (i) to establish a Caribbean Regional Educational Management Information System (CREMIS); (ii) to establish common definitions, methods of measurement and standards for literacy linked to international standards; (iii) to develop relevant and valid indicators of quality; and (iv) to develop relevant and valid quantitative indicators. The Education for All Plan of Action and its accompanying goals will also be calibrated against goals for the whole social sector and overall development nationally and regionally. Their development depends on the mobilization of national, regional and international resources. The monitoring teams are envisaged to play an important role in resource mobilization and UNESCO is expected to continue to play a significant role in disseminating innovative experiences and practices.

Latin America

In the case of Latin America, the *Organization of Ibero-American States for Education, Science and Culture (OIE)* — an inter-governmental body consisting of nineteen Spanish- and Portuguese-speaking Latin American countries in addition to Spain, Portugal and Equatorial Guinea — relates its programming closely to the six EFA goals established in the Dakar Framework for Action. Since Dakar, the Organization has devoted time to analysis, reflection and debate on the situation of early childhood education in the region. At the biennial meeting of the Conference of Ministers of Education held after Dakar and prior to the Summit of Heads of State, Ministers committed themselves to increase funding for early childhood education, concentrating efforts on the most underprivileged sectors, promoting policies to inform and assist families, and targeting objectives to increase the number of places in school for 3-5 year olds. The Organization will launch a work plan for 2001 which, in addition to early childhood education, will include vocational training programmes with special emphasis on training for underprivileged sectors, improving the quality of the education systems and the teaching of values for active, responsible and participatory citizenship as well as institutional strengthening of education administration. Literacy programmes, which combine the teaching of literacy skills with life-skills, aimed at young people and adults, are already underway in several countries.

The Organization is, furthermore, proposing to identify concrete objectives in each programme planned for the 2001-02 biennium that coincide with those approved in Dakar, ensure monitoring of progress at the Conferences of Ministers of Education, provide support for countries

to develop EFA action plans and connect the Observatory of Ibero-American Education with the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS) as regards indicators.

In Latin America, *Brazil* has already made great strides towards Education for All through actions taken during the 1990s. In this country, education is a constitutional right, significant amounts of the public budget are allocated to education, a Ten-Year Plan for Education for All was elaborated in 1993, and legislation in 1996 instituted the Decade of Education and set dates for the formulation of national education plans. The Dakar Framework for Action was tabled for discussion among high-level political representatives at the first National Conference on Education, Culture and Sports in November 2000. Progress in educational development has been achieved through mobilization and strong collaboration between the government at all levels of the decentralized administrative structure and representatives of civil society organizations. The main concern is that current tax laws limit public expenditure. This can negatively affect financing for education which currently represents 5 per cent of GDP and which is planned to be increased to 7 per cent during the next ten years. It is expected that the Dakar Education for All goals can be not only achieved, but even surpassed.

In accordance with the Dakar Framework for Action, the National Education Plan currently under discussion sets specific goals for the next five and ten years in the following areas: guaranteeing elementary education, eradicating illiteracy, increasing pre-school, elementary school and higher education services, professionalizing education, and developing and improving systems of information and evaluation, including indicators. Similar plans are to be elaborated at state and municipal levels. One particular concern is to overcome pockets of poverty across the country and within the decentralized education system through targeted financial support for backward areas and through linkages of educational actions and programmes with actions and programmes in the areas of health and job opportunities.

In this context, the *Brazilian Association of NGOs (ABONG)* has been working actively to strengthen civil society participation in policy-making and in favour of the right to quality education as well as to disseminate the agreements signed in Dakar. ABONG stresses the need for continuous evaluation of education policies and actions taken by different actors at the national and international levels and the need for indicators. With reference to the Latin American Statement on Education for All, it emphasizes the need to focus attention on equity, fundamental human values, and strengthening of different cultures as well as to adopt the expanded vision on basic education. It sees a necessity to go beyond international loans and to focus also on solidarity in economic relations among countries.

UNESCO Santiago pointed to important work in the area of improvement of the quality of education, in particular the development of statistics and indicators, and the assessment of the quality of education. This includes defining indicators for education, supporting countries in gathering information correctly, improving the use of information in decision-making processes and assessing the quality of learning, including problems affecting students' achievement. A network is being created for collecting and disseminating best practices at the school level. Furthermore, the office and UNICEF are seeking to mobilize all partners in support of the EFA movement and to identify funding. For this purpose, kits are being developed for different target groups, for example policy-makers, technical experts and the mass media.

Africa

In contrast, the *People for Action Forum, Zambia*, lamented the lack of action and fulfilment in African countries of commitments expressed at Dakar. It underlined the need for countries to rethink the type of education that could go beyond support for basic and essential needs, promote country ownership, link formal and non-formal education, and ensure increased funding contributions by national governments balanced by increased contributions from international agencies. It argued that a pool of funding should be established immediately and be provided to countries with viable action plans. UNESCO was requested to push its leadership role nationally and regionally, find practical ways of keeping the EFA movement alive globally and develop its own time-bound plan of action.

Kenya echoed this sense of urgent need for reflection and action due to loss of earlier gains in the 1990s, in particular, because of the HIV/AIDS pandemic and poverty rooted in structural adjustment programmes. Since Dakar, a national task force has been formed, headed by the Ministry of Education and involving all levels of society in the follow-up process. In light of the deteriorating educational situation, the Ministry has decided to address the educational situation in widespread consultation with, for example, NGOs, communities, wider civil society and Boards of Governors. This is intended to lead to a new philosophy and vision of educational development taking into account, for example, the prospects of new information technologies, globalization and the HIV/AIDS pandemic. This new vision would also consider the kinds of partnerships that would function best for specific purposes, the kind of education affordable to the poor, and the kind of innovative financing that can be put in place to support educational development.

Senegal, on the other hand, has already developed a Ten-Year Education Programme and is in the process of setting up a decentralized, step-by-step implementation process with mechanisms at all levels which include representatives of all

interested parties. This work has been undertaken with technical assistance from UNESCO and UNDP in partnership with all actors. It has been set within the development of an overall macro-economic and financial framework linked to educational goals. A Memorandum of Understanding has been drawn up with all the major development partners outlining provision of technical and financial assistance.

UNESCO Dakar emphasized that partnerships were being strengthened in support of the EFA follow-up process and pointed to Senegal as a country expressing high-level commitment. In addition to Senegal, Memoranda of Understanding have been signed between the United Nations agencies and the other countries represented by the UNESCO regional office, namely Cape Verde, Gambia, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia and Sierra Leone, regarding resource provision for development of national plans. UNESCO and UNICEF are also joining forces in Central Africa.

Asia

With respect to *Asia*, a particularly pertinent problem is the education of adolescents and youth since exclusion from primary education and drop-out before completion of eight years of education is endemic in the region. *Roshni* is a civil society initiative for relevant basic education whose goal is to build bridges among the people and institutions of civil society in Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Nepal and Pakistan. Its focus is relevant basic education for adolescents and young adults through provision of appropriate learning opportunities, thereby creating a dynamic force for social change and economic development. This goal forms part of the Dakar goals, but is new compared to Jomtien. The programme components would consist of basic education, health and sanitation, inculcation of life-skills and awareness-building. Specific activities will be planned based on the needs of the participants and will rely on community participation. The initiative will be implemented in two phases during 2001-04 and 2005-10, respectively, and is expected to lead to follow-up phases.

In the case of *India*, the Education for All campaign represents the culmination of national efforts to fulfil the ideal of free education. This goal was most recently examined by the National Committee of Education Ministers which, in 1999, recommended modalities for a holistic and convergent approach for implementing universal elementary education. The focus of the Committee is the district as the unit of planning and implementation. It recommends active partnership between central, state and local governments in the quest for universal elementary education. Particular problems relate to unsatisfactory quality, social and gender inequalities, low achievement and lack of relevance of the curriculum, including lack of focus on practical skills development.

The objectives of the Education for All campaign are: that all children are in schools of some kind by the year 2003, that all children complete five years of primary schooling by 2007, that all children complete eight years of schooling by 2010, that elementary (basic) education be of satisfactory quality with emphasis on education for life, that all gender and social category gaps be bridged at the primary stage by 2007 and at elementary (basic) education level by 2010, and that universal retention shall be achieved by 2010.

The Education for All movement is based on the premise that the states have to take the initiative in implementing universalization of elementary education. In order to do so, states may have to effect institutional reforms based on an assessment of their delivery systems, a long-term financial partnership between the central and the state governments must be put in place and communities, for example women's groups, need to be involved in ensuring enrolment and retention of elementary-school children. The programme will be monitored through a community-based monitoring system that will correlate school-level data with community-based information from micro-planning and surveys.

In the case of Bangladesh, the *Dhaka Ahsania Mission (DAM)* and other NGOs are active in all of the six major areas indicated in the Dakar Framework for Action, but have a comparative advantage in terms of addressing them through non-formal and informal education. DAM both implements its own programmes and provides assistance to other organizations at national, regional and international levels through capacity-building, programme implementation, training manuals and other materials development, replication of innovative programmes and policy support. Since Dakar, the organization has implemented a number of activities related to capacity-building, basic and continuing education, improving quality of education, early childhood care and primary education, promoting gender parity, promoting life-skills programmes for youth and adults, and committing new partners to implement the goals.

UNESCO Bangkok underlined the persistency of high adult illiteracy rates, high rates of drop-out and out-of-school children, the need for community-based context-sensitive programmes in life-skills training, the need to expand the role of non-formal education and the need for reliable indicators to monitor its progress. In the region, the development of national action plans is already ongoing, new mechanisms for subregional forum meetings of national EFA co-ordinators have been set up and major regional proposals been developed.

Japan expressed appreciation, not only for the meeting, but for all the regional contributions since improved regional exchange of experiences is important to strengthen South-South co-operation. It was underlined that sector programmes were being extended in the Asian region and

that in order to support non-formal education, partnerships with NGOs must be strengthened. Japan is actively translating its commitment to EFA into action, not only in its development co-operation activities, but also as the Presidency of the G8. In support of UNESCO as the coordinating agency, Japan has set up a liaison group composed of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Education, Science, Sports and Culture and other government-affiliated agencies.

Transitional countries

In the case of *Georgia*, EFA-2000-related activities have become an incentive to refocus attention on basic education. While the population is almost fully literate and one-quarter holds higher education diplomas or degrees, quality is low at all levels of the education system. Since Dakar, a reform plan for primary and secondary education has been finalized whose implementation will depend strongly on external financing, as do the current rehabilitation efforts. It is envisaged to create a national forum for implementation of the Dakar decisions during the first half of 2001. Work on a national action plan linked to poverty reduction is already underway, focusing specifically on vulnerable groups. Implementation will be based on a step-by-step strategy and will depend on broad partnerships. It is also envisaged to link the implementation in South Caucasus of the Dakar Framework for Action with the inter-sectoral subregional programme.

Inter-agency 'flagship' programmes

Education in situations of emergency and crisis

On behalf of the Network on Education in Emergencies, *UNESCO* emphasized the increased attention to education in emergency and crisis situations in Dakar as compared to Jomtien. This reflects the fact that crisis situations caused by political instability, armed conflicts and natural disasters are increasingly constituting a structural element of the worldwide reality with an unprecedented explosion of more than 150 conflicts across the 5 continents since 1945. Education and health services constitute a transition between humanitarian action and reconstruction and development.

Inter-agency co-operation was established in 1998 based on evaluation work that was later presented at the Dakar strategy session and undertaken by UNESCO, the Office of

the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), UNICEF, the World Food Programme (WFP), the Swedish International Development Co-operation Agency (Sida), the Norwegian Council for Refugees, the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and seven NGOs. An inter-agency consultation jointly organized by UNESCO, UNHCR and UNICEF in Geneva, 8-10 November 2000, gathered representatives from WFP, UNDP, the World Bank, bilateral agencies and over twenty NGOs currently engaged in education programmes in countries in crisis. A set of guiding principles was developed and agreements reached concerning inter-agency collaboration. Four task teams were established with clear time-bound tasks in the following areas: information-sharing and networking; learning resources and supplies; follow-up of implementation of education programmes in emergencies; and formal and non-formal post-primary education. The established network, which is led by a Steering Committee, is to reinforce the co-ordination between structures for humanitarian assistance and the EFA follow-up programmes, and is expected to develop national emergency plans before December 2002.

Early childhood care and education

The *Consultative Group on Early Childhood Care and Development* (ECD) is a consortium of international organizations that support programming for young children aged 0-8 years and their families. It includes the Aga Khan Foundation, the Bernard van Leer Foundation, the Carnegie Corporation of New York, the Christian Children's Fund, the Inter-American Development Bank, Save the Children USA, UNICEF, UNESCO, USAID and the World Bank. It links with regionally-based ECD networks comprising individuals and organizations involved in programming, research, policy-advocacy, monitoring and evaluation, and with other individual organizations. ECD is understood more broadly than pre-school education. The consortium and its multiple partners work actively to identify gaps, critical issues and emerging areas of need and interest, for example related to health, social welfare, girls' education and the excluded. It collects experiences through its network in specific areas, for example, early literacy, indicators and continuing literacy development. HIV/AIDS is viewed as a major challenge.

The consortium reconfirmed its commitment to ECD at its annual meeting in May 2000 and is proposing the following lines of action in the light of identified future priority areas and challenges: (i) synthesize, critically review and share in varying forms the lessons, findings and impact of practice and research across regions; (ii) strengthen regional networking, capacity-building, outreach and activities; and (iii) strengthen and/or establish more effective links with others working in health, social welfare, community development, adult literacy and basic education.

Teachers and the quality of education

Education International presented provisional ideas for what might become a flagship programme on teachers and the quality of education. The focus was on the need for child-centred learning and the role of the teacher in achieving educational quality. This underlines the need to recognize teaching as a profession and to develop proper recruitment procedures. Quality was understood not only to produce high levels of literacy and numeracy, but also to provide increased knowledge about the needs and demands of society, including understanding of environmental problems, HIV/AIDS, and violence and threats against democracy through increased racism and xenophobia.

Quality control through increased tests and school inspections might not necessarily lead to improved quality, it was argued. Instead, school self-evaluation was advocated as a process that might bring about school improvement. Improvement in the working and pay conditions, rewards for outstanding teachers and opportunities for professional development might attract the best students to the teaching profession and therefore have an important impact on its quality as might provision of adequate resources, properly used new information technologies, properly undertaken and disseminated pedagogical research, and school meals. Teachers' unions were identified as important mechanisms through which the conditions of teachers and the quality of the teaching and learning process can be improved.

UNICEF stressed the need for a broader view of quality, adding the perspective of the link between school and community, and the need for well-resourced school environments and well-motivated teachers to achieve quality education. Although the quality of content and of teaching-learning processes is essential, so is the quality of the learners, of the learning environment and of learning outcomes, it was argued. Attention must be paid to the general physical and psycho-social-emotional environment, for example establishment of water and sanitation facilities, health and nutrition services, policies and codes of conduct on social interaction between teachers and learners, gender-sensitivity of curricula, gender equality of enrolment, completion and achievement, and focusing on schools as safe environments.

The Director of the new *UNESCO Division for the Promotion of Quality Education* questioned whether there is consensus on the concept of quality and briefly highlighted how the issue would be the focus of work in three interlinked sub-sections of the new Division which will deal with education for universal values, education for sustainable development and education for personal well-being, respectively, and be concerned with issues such as relevance, effectiveness, and adaptation to change and learning. The *UNESCO Assistant Director-General for Education a.i.* added that quality would

also be a focus area in the Divisions of Basic Education and of Educational Policies and Strategies, and that UNESCO's IBE pays special attention to quality issues related to the curriculum. While *India* underlined that the issue of quality was closely related to the role of the teacher in their new plan, *Bahrain* proposed that if professional criteria for teaching were developed, the quality of teaching might be improved.

Focusing Resources on Effective School Health (FRESH)

WHO and UNESCO elaborated on one of the aspects to achieve quality of education mentioned by Education International and UNICEF, namely the prospects of enhanced learning and educational achievement through improving the health and nutritional status of school-age children. Effective school health, hygiene and nutrition are considered to respond to new needs, increase the efficacy of other investments in child development, ensure better educational outcomes and achieve greater social equity, while also being cost-effective.

The FRESH partnership has been developed by the World Bank, WHO, UNICEF and UNESCO and was launched at the World Education Forum in Dakar. The aim is to focus on interventions that can be implemented even in the most resource-poor schools and hard-to-reach rural areas as well as in accessible urban areas that promote learning through improved health and nutrition.

The FRESH framework is the starting point for developing an effective school health hygiene and nutrition programme based on which individual countries can develop their own strategies to match local needs. FRESH has four core components: (i) health-related school policies; (ii) provision of safe water and sanitation to provide a healthy learning environment; (iii) skills-based approach to health, hygiene and nutrition education; and (iv) school-based health and nutrition services. Strategies to support their implementation are effective partnerships between teachers and health workers, and between the education and health sectors, effective community partnerships, and pupil awareness and participation.

Since Dakar, several actions have been initiated aimed at setting up collaborative mechanisms that will allow countries to prepare and implement national plans of action which incorporate school health programmes. Furthermore, concrete support is being proposed to countries in the organization of ideas and activities to identify health issues in their schools and communities, and to take steps, through the school, to improve health and learning. Specific examples are:

▷ In July 2000, WHO convened the Southern African Network for the Development of Health-Promoting Schools which

consists of officials from ministries of education and health who are responsible for planning and implementing school health programmes. They were encouraged to foster the inclusion of school health programmes in their national EFA work plans. Participating countries were Gambia, Ghana, Kenya, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia, Seychelles, South Africa, Swaziland and Zimbabwe.

- ▷ In August 2000, WHO and UNESCO completed a new set of guidelines, *Local Action: Creating Health Promoting Schools* that will be disseminated to support the implementation of the four basic FRESH components.
- ▷ In September 2000, WHO and EI secured over \$500,000 from the Life Initiative of the Centre for Disease Control (CDC) in order to strengthen teachers' capacity to implement the four FRESH components and to enable teachers to use effective skills-based school health education methods to prevent HIV/Sexually Transmitted Infections (STI) and related discrimination. Teacher unions in Botswana, Lesotho, Malawi, Namibia, Senegal, Swaziland and Zambia will receive funding and technical assistance starting in January 2001.
- ▷ In October 2000, WHO initiated a global mapping of life-skills education in order to delineate its nature and use by the various United Nations agencies and to build consensus on how to build capacities for effective skills-based school health education.
- ▷ In November 2000, WHO enabled Indonesia to carry out the first large-scale use of WHO's Rapid Assessment and Action Planning Process which is used to assess national capacity to help schools implement the four basic FRESH components.

United Nations Girls' Education Initiative (UNGEI)

UNGEI was launched at the opening of the World Education Forum in Dakar by the United Nations Secretary-General. UNICEF serves as the lead agency for a multi-entity Task Force which currently includes UNESCO, the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), UNDP, WFP, the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS), the United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM), UN/DESA, the Office for the Co-ordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), UNHCR, WHO and the World Bank. The Task Force has developed a concept paper and an accompanying action plan. Since Dakar, the Task Force has completed several major tasks, including strategy sessions in Dakar and Beijing + 5, a massive mapping exercise of existing United Nations-supported activities by country and articulation of participation criteria, support to United Nations reform processes, in particular on how to include girls' education in CCA and the United Nations Development Assistance

Framework (UNDAF), and partnership building. The immediate next steps are to develop partner work plans, secure funding, establish indicators on progress/success and identify appropriate roles for NGOs, bilateral agencies and other partners. The high-level policy group is considered to be a mechanism which could advocate girls' education, mainstream gender issues and ensure fund-raising.

The goal of UNGEI is to mount a sustained campaign to improve the quality and availability of girls' education through a collaborative partnership of different entities within and outside the United Nations system. The overall objective is the elimination of gender discrimination and gender disparity in education systems through action at national, district and community levels. The Initiative emphasizes primary education and will be closely tied to the global EFA movement and education goals of the Dakar Forum. However, it also supports the transition to secondary education, secondary education itself and other aspects of education that facilitate girls' learning.

The overall goals and strategy are translated into five strategic objectives designed to assist countries in meeting their Education for All goals and targets, and particularly in securing quality education for all: (i) building political and resource commitments; (ii) ending the gender gap; (iii) ending gender bias and discrimination within education systems; (iv) helping girls' education in crisis, conflict and post-conflict situations; and (v) eliminating ingrained gender bias that limits the demand for girls' education. Action will be undertaken at the global and country levels through combined bottom-up and top-down processes. In line with the discussions on quality of education, it was argued that future actions must focus on child-friendly learning environments, schools must be child-centred, and integrated policies and programmes must enhance the quality of learning, the learning content, the teaching-learning processes, the environment for learning and learning achievement, and must focus on young children, excluded children, children in conditions of crisis, children affected by HIV/AIDS and, above all, girls.

Education for the prevention of HIV/AIDS

In the presentation by *UNESCO IIEP*, it was stressed that there is an urgent need for preventive education against HIV/AIDS because of the impact of the pandemic, particularly on young adults, the poor and the skilled, the trained and the educated. This is reflected in the consolidated work now undertaken by the United Nations system, bilateral agencies, NGOs and the Association for the Development of Education in Africa (ADEA). It is essential to develop a global strategy as part of the UNAIDS strategy and to address the issue of AIDS in all programming exercises, for example in the context of sectorwide approaches.

In the context of education, the focus should be to strengthen the role of the schools, the teachers and learning materials in order to mitigate the impact and maximize the use of education for preventive purposes. It was considered to be particularly important to break the silence (undertake systematic advocacy efforts), to measure the impact of AIDS in order to inform policy-making (for example with respect to demand, supply, quality, management and supplementary budget requirements) and to define policies at the national level and promote strategies at the local level. Specific measures should be focused on teachers, child-friendly schools, resource centres, monitoring of successful strategies, strengthening educational capacities and mobilizing resources.

There are six types of work areas: information-sharing, prevention, implementing new interventions, capacity-building and networking, and research and advocacy. Gender-focused areas include basic education, secondary education, youth initiatives, non-formal and adult education, technical and vocational education, universities and other higher education institutions. Key modes of operation include working with ministries and communities, working in partnership with NGOs, fostering public and private partnerships, and paying particular attention to the protection of young girls and the empowerment of women.

On behalf of the UNAIDS *Inter-Agency Working Group on Aids, Schools and Education*, UNICEF presented a global strategy framework intended to highlight AIDS issues related to schools and education systems within a broader framework that will focus on young people. The strategy is to guide potential stakeholders at any level through the key issues, and encourage adaptation and local level iteration. Issues in the development of the strategy concern, amongst others, the need to reflect the range of country experiences and cross-cutting issues, and to encourage innovation, inter-sectoral collaboration and broad participation in an inclusive process. The two main tracks include, first, responding to the impact of AIDS on education, for example by looking at the relative success in some countries or to consider AIDS as integral to a broader agenda of overall education reform, and second, using education for AIDS prevention within a continuum of care and support. Effective skills-based health education, in whatever form it takes at the school level, is considered a key strategy.

In its intervention, *USAID* reemphasized the importance of all countries achieving basic education and the need for it to be made a part of all education plans. With respect to HIV/AIDS, the pandemic was referred to as an international security issue demanding strategies for each country and investment in its solution going beyond the health sector. Particular attention must be paid to resolution of conflict and other crisis situations as well as abusive child labour which promote and/or have a negative impact on the prevention of HIV/AIDS. Special measures must be taken for AIDS orphans.

Summary of central issues

There was widespread discrepancy both in the starting point to move towards the Education for All goals at the regional and national levels, in what has been achieved since Dakar, in the focus on the Education for All concept, and in the capacity to design and implement national plans which form part of wider policy frameworks. There were, therefore, also differences in the expressed relative need for technical and financial assistance. Whereas the Caribbean and Latin American regions represent cases of fully developed, integrated plans with clear implementation targets and mechanisms, the Arab region is still struggling with well-known problems that cut across the EFA goals and still has to build up understanding, support and a movement towards EFA. The cases from Africa highlight a spectrum from fully developed plans and declared commitment in the case of Senegal, to a sense that nothing is happening or that the purpose and vision of education have to be revisited in the cases of Zambia and Kenya. In Asia, focus was specifically on universal elementary education and the problem of adolescents and youth. As in the case of India, the Dakar Forum has represented an opportunity for Georgia to refocus attention on strengthening its basic education system.

With respect to the Education for All concept, the presentations and debate highlighted the need to think beyond universal primary education to the wider concept of Education for All, i.e. to understand education as a basic human right and to set it in a context of globalization, poverty and exclusion. As pointed out by, for example, *UNFPA*, *USAID* and *Portugal*, Education for All covers not only other core areas of basic education than primary education, such as non-formal education but also the need for new kinds of knowledge, in particular related to HIV/AIDS, new information technologies, environmental understandings and skills development, and the need for inculcation of universalistic values related to, for example, democracy and human rights. This demands new sets of curriculum considerations. According to *Portugal*, the situation after Dakar is particularly challenging because educational policies have to be seen in

relation to wider social policies and because the school has to be made more adaptable to societal change. Girls' education was mentioned as being of particular importance.

Another core issue was that of partnership. It appeared in the country presentations as partnership between governments and international funding and technical assistance agencies (for example in the cases of Senegal and Georgia), or the necessary partnership in decentralized systems between state and municipalities (Brazil) or central and local governments (India). The need to establish well-functioning partnerships with NGOs and other civil society organizations and the private sector was particularly forceful in the discussion. In their interventions, the *UNESCO-NGO Liaison Committee* and *Save the Children Alliance* argued strongly in favour of including NGOs already at the design stage of initiatives and of ensuring that local experiences, often achieved through NGO participation, are reflected in plans of national ministries.

Portugal expressed the need for a strong EFA campaign since the aftermath of Dakar seemed to have been even less forceful than that of Jomtien. *Anil Bordia* pondered whether the Dakar follow-up would suffer a similar fate to that of Jomtien since adequate resources for basic and primary education had not been secured. The issue of resource mobilization was also raised by *Georgia*, pointing out the severe problems in Africa and South-East Asia, and by *Japan*. *Anil Bordia*, moreover, underlined the need for urgent action and proposed to advance the deadline for completed action plans from 2002 to 2001 and to find ways to ensure a concerted movement that would bring together all actors in Education for All. *Portugal*, similarly, proposed the need for a campaign in order to increase consciousness about EFA. It was stressed by *France* that urgency had to be measured against sustainability and that different strategies had to be developed for different contexts.

These contrasting views, first, between quality development of planning and processes versus rapid action and, second, between country-based experiences, ownership and leadership versus concerted efforts of international agencies, were further highlighted in the various discussions on implementing Education for All. □

III. Implementing Education for All: issues and strategies

The purpose of the discussion of the special interest group on the global initiative was to build a bridge between the extensive general presentations from countries, regions and international organizations and the three in-depth discussions on linking EFA action plans with wider plans and strategies, mobilization of international support for EFA, and monitoring of goals and targets. The discussion should be understood in the context of §11¹ in the Dakar Framework for Action, and its supportive §10² and §12³, which call attention to the need for political will and resource mobilization by the international community in order to ensure *that no government seriously committed to achieving Education for All will be thwarted in this achievement by lack of resources* (§10). There is a need to clarify the nature of this commitment, as was stated by the *Department for International Development (DFID)*.

The discussion highlighted the contrasting views expressed in the previous discussions between, on one hand, substance issues on the content of EFA and the global initiative and, on the other, the urgency of implementing a particular understanding of the global initiative as increased resources. The *World Bank* argued the need to define a sub-set of issues which could be associated with Education for All and to create a virtual global initiative to complement work at the national level. The Bank argued, moreover, the need to identify financial gaps and different models for their solution, and to define a simple set of criteria by which to channel

resources to countries in view of maximum impact. This would be done by bringing all partners on board, while recognizing the comparative advantage of the actors on the ground. *DFID* supported this statement by underlining the need to establish a bank of principles by which to identify gaps and preconditions and bring countries on board. Similarly, *ADEA* highlighted the need to become operational or to tackle commitment in a practical way through the development of credible plans using qualifying criteria and common denominators in order to avoid arbitrariness. This highlighted the serious technical nature of the post-Dakar process, it was argued.

The *Global Campaign* indicated that, whereas the global action plan was originally associated with the establishment of a global fund to support Education for All, it is now understood as an information inventory to track progress on the ground based on implementation of viable, participatory EFA plans. There is a need to identify resource gaps and bottlenecks to the implementation of plans which again necessitates transparency, mobilization of new commitment, and development of monitoring and review mechanisms. *France* expressed support of this interpretation by the *Global Campaign* and indicated that there is a need now for visibility of the initiative, that it is important to understand the initiative as one of providing information rather than funding, and that *UNESCO's* leadership is indispensable. In this view, the role

1. 'The international community will deliver on this collective commitment by launching with immediate effect a global initiative aimed at developing the strategies and mobilizing the resources needed to provide effective support to national efforts. Options to be considered under this initiative will include: (i) increasing external finance for education, in particular basic education; (ii) ensuring greater predictability in the flow of external assistance; (iii) facilitating more effective donor co-ordination; (iv) strengthening sector-wide approaches; (v) providing earlier, more extensive and broader debt relief and/or debt cancellation for poverty reduction, with a strong commitment to basic education; (vi) and undertaking more effective and regular monitoring of progress towards EFA goals and targets, including periodic assessments.' (World Education Forum, op. cit., p. 9)

2. 'Political will and stronger national leadership are needed for the effective and successful implementation of national plans in each of the countries concerned. However, political will must be underpinned by resources. The international community acknowledges that many countries currently lack the resources to achieve education for all, within an acceptable time-frame. New financial resources, preferably in the form of grants and concessional assistance, must therefore be mobilized by bilateral and multilateral funding agencies, including the World Bank and regional development banks, and the private sector. We affirm that no countries seriously committed to education for all will be thwarted in their achievement of this goal by a lack of resources.' (World Education Forum, op. cit., p. 9)

3. 'There is already evidence from many countries of what can be achieved through strong national strategies supported by effective development co-operation. Progress under these strategies could — and must — be accelerated through increased international support. At the same time, countries with less developed strategies — including countries in transition, countries affected by conflict and post-crisis countries — must be given the support they need to achieve more rapid progress towards education for all.' (World Education Forum, op. cit., p. 9)

of the global initiative is to provide methodological support and knowledge management of experiences, develop evaluation criteria, mobilize necessary funding, and provide financial experts and contacts. While UNESCO should play the role of co-ordinator with responsibility for detailed timetabling of an action programme, all funding and technical assistance agencies and NGOs should work together in the process based on concrete proposals for specific contexts. The *European Union (EU)*, similarly, underlined the need for action plans and for agreement on elements in these plans, strengthened co-ordination, the need to link investment in the social sectors, particularly education, with poverty reduction and the need to maintain the EFA dynamics while avoiding creating confusion with already ongoing programmes.

UNICEF indicated that the question of what constitutes the global initiative still has to be resolved, and its structure and systemic nature be established. The global initiative should build on knowledge of what works and include country-by-country stock-taking of the process towards EFA based on focused, pro-active approaches and processes with accompanying tracking mechanisms — as indicated in the *UNESCO Guidelines for the Preparation of National Action Plans of Education for All*.

Another angle on the issue was the emphasis that, as stated by *UNICEF*, this is not business as usual. We need to think differently and money is not enough. EFA is a movement which has to be seen in relation to fulfilling the Convention on the Rights of the Child. This perspective was strongly underlined in the intervention by the *UNESCO Assistant Director-General for Education a.i.* who pointed out that the current EFA issues have been with us since the universal primary education conferences of the early 1960s, in particular that of Addis Ababa in 1961. EFA, he indicated, is much more than figures and the global initiative should not be limited to numbers. The implications and preconditions of EFA go along with underlying societal aims, goals and values that are strongly related to social behaviour and non-cognitive issues. The challenge, therefore, is not only to develop frameworks that fit countries with political stability and transparent modes of government, human rights and a free press, but also to know how to address EFA in countries that do not fit that framework.

USAID supported the argument that the current context demands new rules for building strategies, new rules for working with partners and the need to think 'outside the box', or to begin to also adopt new approaches that are closer to those of the private sector. This is particularly due to the fact that approximately one-third of the countries in which international agencies work can be characterized by different kinds of crisis situations (HIV/AIDS, abusive child labour and the population/ fertility problems, also referred to by *UNFPA*) which have left millions of children beyond the reach of bilateral and multilateral agencies. These extreme situations demand a

strategy designed on a region-by-region and country-by-country basis and necessarily taking into consideration the need to reach the unreached. EFA should be looked at through a wider poverty-society lens, work should ensure the active role of civil society and the private sector with governments, and the prospects of using new technologies should be seriously considered. Added to this perspective was *UNFPA's* proposal to not forget to listen to the young people themselves, those who are in school, those who go to school part of the time and those who have never been to school.

India supported the argument that the global initiative cannot be limited to an issue of financing EFA, but has to be set in a context of a larger process towards equity and quality. The political importance of education reinforces greater demand for education with consequent financial and legal demands, as exemplified by the shift from education as a development goal to that of a human right and a right of the child. With respect to financing, each country must recognize its financial needs and work towards plans that stipulate overall resource needs and identify sources for needed funding. External financing can play an important role if it supports a home-grown, inclusive development process with consequent emphasis on decentralization. Expressed national commitment must precede the external funding, which must in turn be provided in support of national plans. These proposals, according to *DFID*, highlight the need to understand partnerships in specific national contexts.

The *UNESCO Deputy Assistant Director-General for Education* underlined that thinking on the global initiative has to support that of the countries, and not be done on behalf of the countries. This point was more vigorously expressed by *Anil Bordia* in his anxiety that this so-called global initiative would become another association of funding agencies or be developed by Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)-type intellectuals or researchers and result in outside countries telling developing countries and its people what is good for them. *Bordia* emphasized the role of national and local governments in achieving EFA goals and urged that, at the international level, UNESCO take steps to transform EFA goals into a movement in which NGOs would also have an important role. Based on his widespread experience with funding management in India, Pakistan and other countries in South Asia, *Bordia* also warned against homogenization, lack of diversity and the external influence that follows with provision of funding. He, finally, said that much more thinking needs to be put into what would constitute a global action plan which, in any event, has to go beyond funding. Another anxiety was expressed by *Bahrain* indicating, with reference to the flagship projects and programmes, that we tend to address symptoms rather than underlying causes. In discussing urgent action and, for example, the necessity to include civil society organizations, we are not discussing why civil society organizations have an important role to play, i.e. we are not addressing the critical issue of weak governments and

we are not focusing on whether support for, for example, human rights movements would have a higher impact on the wider societal goals we are trying to achieve than supporting governments. *Portugal* saw a need to act on both the symptoms and the causes, and, as also indicated by *UNICEF*, to link plans indicating objectives, content, strategies and means with underlying wider structures.

By way of conclusion, *DFID* indicated, firstly, the need to still think hard about the task set at Dakar, to remember that there were other EFA partners than those present, that all actors in the movement might have to pull down their individual flags and give up their individual identities, understand the process at the country level and realize that this is not business as usual. Secondly, we have to think more deeply about resource gaps.

Further exploration took place during the presentations by the *World Bank* and *UNESCO* which represented alternative, but complementary interpretations of §11 in the Dakar Framework for Action on the global initiative. The subsequent discussions and further elaborations in the thematic groups led to further clarification on how to proceed and resulted in specific recommendations for the way forward.

Achieving Education for All (EFA) through partnerships and linkages

In the presentation by the *World Bank* and *UNDP*, *Maris O'Rourke* underlined that the Bank and UNDP have been involved with EFA as co-convenors since Jomtien in 1990, that the Bank has endorsed the six Education for All goals, has kept its promises in Jomtien and Beijing to double lending for education, increase the share going to basic education and increase the lending for girls' education, and is committed to working with all partners towards the post-Dakar targets as a global priority. She emphasized that we need to build on the key lessons from the 1990s (importance of ensuring and developing political commitment, quality, partnerships, sector policy framework, resource efficiencies, adapting education to change, cushioning of education in crises and sustaining a growing economy) and that §11⁴ and §12 of the Dakar Framework for Action are the key for the global initiative which can add value to the essential work on the ground country-by-country. The two paragraphs reflect, it was noted, the general consensus at Dakar that there is a need to recharge the EFA

initiative, garner additional resources, both financial and technical, to support individual countries' efforts to universalize quality basic education, and broaden the constituency of players providing the range of support needed. There is also widespread agreement that country governments themselves must be the focus point for pushing action forward on EFA, and that external partnerships would be necessary, but not sufficient, for success. All countries must, therefore, make EFA a priority and all agencies must use their comparative advantage and resources more effectively to ensure that no country with a viable plan will be unable to implement it for lack of external resources.

O'Rourke went on to link needed support for EFA with other existing initiatives, in particular Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs), the Highly Indebted Poor Countries Initiative (HIPC) — debt relief based on the right conditionalities being considered a key component to achieving EFA — and the Comprehensive Development Framework (CDF) which provides an opportunity to more easily implement a sectorwide approach. Work on education, she argued, should be done within the broader poverty reduction frameworks, involve heads of states and Ministers of Finance, and be fully integrated into government policy and medium-term expenditure frameworks. *O'Rourke* made specific proposals for criteria according to which countries could be judged to show commitment, including: commitment to basic education expressed in national EFA plans or their equivalent (e.g. poverty reduction strategy papers, CDFs, sectorwide approaches, CCA/UNDAFs and Country Assistance Strategies (CASS); actual or anticipated deployment of HIPC resources for basic education enhancement; satisfactory allocations of public budgetary resources to basic education; serious efforts to reach under-served groups, such as girls; and evidence of meaningful efforts to ensure/improve efficiencies in sector resource use).

O'Rourke underlined that although countries must deliver education — 74 per cent of all funding for education in developing countries come from governments, 23 per cent from the private sector in the broadest sense while external funding only constitutes 3 per cent — this must be done in partnership on all fronts among governments, civil society, the private sector and the international community. Support to countries from the international community could include: developing cross-sectoral policy frameworks, developing communication strategies, sharing good practices, brokering financial deals, improving resource utilization, targeting key interventions and critical regions, building capacity for institutional assessment and supporting appropriate use of debt relief.

In conclusion, she stated that no international funding support could substitute for national effort and that success would

4. In its presentation, the Bank added another option to the six mentioned in the Dakar Framework for Action, namely giving priority to sub-Saharan Africa, South Asia and LDCs.

depend on country-by-country action to increase EFA as a priority and to make achieving the EFA goals an integral part of the development agenda of the countries and their external partners. A three-pronged strategy was proposed: (1) developing consensus on difficult policy or technical issues that have acted as barriers; (2) conducting key non-lending activities to help countries identify gaps; and (3) developing an implementation strategy aimed at increasing the effectiveness of international assistance. To do the latter, she suggested establishing purposeful partnerships among multinationals, bilaterals and NGO coalitions based on pre-defined division of labour and tasks which each would undertake to help countries reach EFA within an overall poverty reduction framework. She underlined that it is particularly important to reach an agreement as soon as possible on a set of principles within which the global initiative would operate, criteria by which countries can join the initiative, criteria for what constitutes a national plan, how to quickly mobilize extra financial resources and support once countries have a viable plan, and how to put in place an objective, comparative evaluation and monitoring system so that regular, transparent reporting on progress, and subsequent policy dialogue and action, can take place.

Reactions

The panel discussion and general comments concentrated on several core themes which had been brought up already during the previous presentations. These related to realizing the new context within which to discuss and develop Education for All, the nature of partnership and ownership, frameworks for development co-operation, co-ordination of development partners, funding issues and national plans.

The intervention by *UNDP Mauritania* underlined some of the difficulties that continue to exist at the country level. Mention was made of how policy frameworks and sector programmes are developed by international experts, could become biased by their views and understandings of educational paradigms and could become another means of imposing conditionalities which, all in all, lead to lack of ownership by the national decision-makers. National action plans and programmes — and particularly those developed after important international conferences (such as the Dakar Forum) — are often prepared by national consultants, perhaps in interaction with international consultants, which does not necessarily make them more acceptable to decision-makers or enhance national ownership. Similarly, attempts at including civil society in policy formation processes may be ritualistic rather than truly engaging, while attempts at multi-disciplinary and inter-sectoral approaches may cause internal conflicts rather than co-operation among the various parties involved since the various constituencies are generally not integrated into sectoral, national decision-making processes.

While poverty strategies were identified as means to go further, the lack of appropriate national capacities was considered by *UNDP Mauritania* to be the overriding problem at the national level. This, according to *UNICEF*, highlights the need to push some partners into having a more active role in countries that may not be on the priority list of the international funding and technical assistance agencies. It also relates to the need to discuss the development of action plans, their processes, contents and quality, and their linkage with other plans and policy frameworks. With respect to content, there is a need to analyse gaps and causes in order to overcome the problems related to the six EFA goals. According to *Japan*, the development of national action plans is crucial to achieving progress on the ground. There is a need to establish internal processes for building consensus on the plans and there is a need for international agencies to operate in countries which have imperfect or no plans. This necessarily creates a difficult balance between power and trust in attempts to establish national ownership. *UNESCO IBE* foresaw the need for capacity-building in the development of national action plans which could be achieved across networks using different institutes.

According to *Anil Bordia* countries need to do fundamental rethinking on the impact of globalization, particularly the manner in which it would affect EFA achievement. How can the Education for All movement contribute to developing new creative strategies in order to deal with causes rather than symptoms, asked *UNESCO IBE*. The question is how we learn from good and from bad experiences, said *DFID*. Education can no longer be grappled with as a purely educational set of issues, but has to be understood within a wider poverty and development framework, according to *DFID* and *Portugal*. In fact, education linked to a poverty strategy is our last chance of working together, said *France*. According to *EU*, the fight against poverty has to form part, right from the beginning, of the whole Education for All process, of sector development programmes, and of medium-term action programmes. Sector-wide approaches must be integrated into comprehensive planning processes, such as PRSPs, said *Japan*.

In its negotiations with African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries, *EU* refers to the Education for All objectives of the Framework for Action and has education as a priority in its poverty reduction programmes. It stresses the need for co-ordination among the funding and technical assistance agencies, and emphasizes the need for regular education expert meetings. *Portugal* indicated that it is prepared to work in partnership in the co-ordination of national plans for Portuguese-speaking countries. *ActionAid Alliance* underlined that it is in the school that partnerships between government and civil society must be forged and that civil society should be endorsed in national education plans. To others, for example *France*, this might be difficult because civil society and governments may not be in agreement.

ActionAid Alliance also underlined the necessity for financial sustainability of the education systems, as parents might otherwise not send their children to school, and for the use of positive innovative experiences and non-formal education. *WHO* stressed three ways in which scarce resources could be used more successfully: better understanding of deficiencies or barriers to goal achievement, mobilization of support for relevant major initiatives, and identification and application of best practices. *Anil Bordia* proposed that basic education should become an element of all development funding and that in countries with no negotiation capacity, organizations, such as UNESCO, UNICEF and UNDP have a particular role to play in ensuring 'mutually acceptable' conditions in aid negotiations. *UNESCO IBE* reflected on the need to think even more broadly in terms of capacity-building and the power of ideas when discussing resource constraints. Countries need to develop their own ideas and capacities so that they can stand up to the funding and technical assistance agencies, it was argued. Agencies also need to work together in order to move in the same direction.

According to *Anil Bordia*, the World Bank and IMF should give priority to debt relief and ensure greater transparency in all matters related to their loans, supervision and appraisal missions. He further recommended that UNESCO be invited to undertake objective evaluations of World Bank loans whose costs should be lowered and differentiated across countries according to their economic capacities and whose grant element should be increased. The issue of conditionality and country flexibility was also mentioned by *DFID* and *India*. *DFID* argued that the use of words like 'entry' and 'criteria' by the World Bank came close to setting conditionalities and that, instead, there is a need to think inclusively. *India* stressed that countries need large degrees of flexibility and freedom in the use of funding based on the understanding that it will be properly accounted for. According to *DFID*, the World Bank and the Global Campaign demonstrated contrasting views on commitment to EFA as a set of criteria for external support as distinct from internal and national accountability, respectively.

The intervention from *ActionAid Alliance* included a set of specific recommendations, including: to ensure that the global initiative belongs to all actors and not only to funding and technical assistance agencies and that specific Working Groups be set up regionally and locally to focus on five specific areas: (1) integration of NGO alternative experiences into educational plans; (2) gender equality; (3) monitoring mechanisms; (4) the global initiative, its mechanisms and financial attributions; and (5) HIV/AIDS and education. In addition, *DFID* pointed to the necessity to engage the political leadership at the highest levels in developing countries, perhaps through some global initiative.

Thematic group: issues and recommendations

The conclusions and recommendations of the thematic group discussion were based on the recognition that EFA concerns rights and values, access to meaningful learning opportunities and people. Its achievement will require recognition of complex power relationships. A precondition to success is open debate on underlying issues of leadership, economic growth, honesty in government, cross-sectoral linkages, and the importance of information, communication and transparency. The centrality of the EFA goals as stipulated in Dakar was recognized, as was the commitment to civil society, the need to act with urgency in consideration of the diversity of national contexts and recognizing that the process is both a political and a technical one.

The key conclusion of the group was that the focus of the international effort must be enabling to a collective national effort. This requires new ways of interacting and communicating across development agencies and NGOs, harmonization of procedures, and necessary mechanisms and processes which form part of wider international activities, for example in the context of the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC).

The specific recommendations of the group related to three general areas:

1. Underlying principles

It was recommended that EFA plans and strategies be an integral part of national development and poverty reduction planning. EFA plans should not duplicate or supplant existing educational planning but build on current plans and processes. EFA concerns the realization of the right to education, and all goals and objectives of the Dakar Framework for Action should be addressed in national education plans and strategies. EFA plans should be inclusive, recognize diversity and reflect a national consensus. They should enable the voices of children, parents and communities to be heard, address questions of relevance, and be culturally- and context-specific. EFA requires sustained high-level political leadership.

2. National planning processes

EFA plans should be developed within the framework and process of wider education sector planning. The plans and policies must be based on accurate data, available to all, and include measurable, time-bound targets. Mechanisms must be established to ensure that civil society is engaged in the planning and implementation of EFA strategies. This requires political and social mobilization of all levels of society, including an ongoing dialogue between disadvantaged groups and NGOs that work with them concerning practical and appropriate ways of enabling them to benefit from education.

3. International responsibilities and opportunities

There is a need to arrive at a basic understanding of the practical, operational meaning and content of the Dakar commitment that *no countries seriously committed to EFA will be thwarted in their achievement of this goal by lack of resources*. Furthermore, new or better codes of conduct must be developed to ensure greater coherence in international partnerships at the country level, in particular related to integrating EFA within wider development frameworks. This work should be carried forward by an e-mail sub-group and be possibly considered by the high-level policy group. All organizations and institutions should examine how their poverty reduction and sector programmes (including debt relief) are being used to improve education and meet the Dakar goals.

There should be regional and subregional opportunities for the exchange of national experiences to add value to national EFA-related planning. These activities should involve finance ministries as well as educators and should be facilitated by UNESCO. Development agencies should work together at the country level to determine jointly where individual comparative advantage lies, for example in support of civil society to engage in educational planning, in the provision of technical assistance, in building institutional capacity and in policy dialogue with governments. Agency funding should enable governments to scale up innovative programmes and experiments which have demonstrated their effectiveness.

Mobilizing resources and designing strategies for the global initiative

The UNESCO paper, which represented work in progress and would be finalized, in part through feed-back from the meeting, should be seen in the context of two other papers produced by UNESCO which were practical in nature, namely the action plan and the *Guidelines for the Preparation of National Action Plans for Education for All*. In her presentation, *Lene Buchert* initially returned to the issue of definition of the global initiative. She argued that §11 of the Dakar Framework for Action was open to interpretation and highlighted this through two specific examples which contrasted the approach being developed by UNESCO with that of the World Bank, responding at the same time to what *DFID* had called the need to 'use inclusive language': (1) in contrast to World Bank emphasis on establishing 'criteria by which countries can join the initiative', UNESCO would emphasize the necessity to provide necessary assistance in

order to create the preconditions for countries to join the initiative; (2) in contrast to World Bank emphasis on 'how to quickly mobilize extra financial resources and support once countries have a viable plan', UNESCO would emphasize the necessity to provide assistance in order for countries to develop plans which would permit them to gain access to funding through the global initiative.

She expanded this perspective by discussing the content of §11 and its six indicated dimensions or options, which is the term of the Dakar Framework for Action (see p. 17, footnote 2). While the word option might indicate a choice between the different dimensions — which, perhaps, justifies the World Bank's approach which focuses particularly on two of the options, namely increased funding and debt relief — UNESCO's interpretation is that the six elements constitute parts of a global strategy which has to be specifically designed as a function of individual country contexts. This interpretation also questions whether other elements need to form part of the overall strategy, such as the one underscored by *USAID* related to new information technologies and the one discussed in the UNESCO paper on targeting. With respect to content, *Buchert* argued that the global strategy concerns not only funding and money, but also the nature of international development co-operation. As noted by *USAID*, there are new rules for building strategies and for co-ordination. These rules are currently based on two generally acknowledged principles, namely national ownership and government leadership. These principles, according to *Buchert*, ought to be the starting point for the global initiative — reflecting also the remark by the *World Bank* that the global initiative must complement what goes on at the national level and that of *Anil Bordia* that international financing could have a positive effect if it is supportive of home-grown development processes.

The complementarity of the global initiative to national efforts, *Buchert* indicated, appeared from the indication by the World Bank that the contribution by the international community to educational development in developing countries is a small part of the whole, constituting only 3 per cent of total funding. Even though there are differences among countries in terms of aid dependency and even though international funding can play a critical, catalytic and supportive role, it is necessary, she underlined, to think the contribution by the international community into this larger picture. This underlines the necessity to focus on issues of national resource mobilization, including cost-saving and cost-efficiency measures, improving financial systems, budgetary re-allocations, debt relief and ensuring that international financial flows support sustainable national development processes, when discussing and designing the overall strategy for the global initiative.

Buchert emphasized that this was particularly important also in light of the trends in official development assistance flows during the 1990s seen in relation to the perceived funding gap

for Education for All (Oxfam's \$8 billion annually to achieve universal primary education in addition to what is currently spent, or \$1 billion or \$2-3 billion as indicated by the Global Campaign). These trends led her to draw three core conclusions: (1) that the overall picture in aid flows is far from positive and that support for education remains small (\$3.5 billion in 1998) and even smaller for basic education (\$700 million in 1998); (2) of total financial flows, private investment financing now constitutes two-thirds of the total and ODA one-third, whereas the reverse was the case in the early 1990s; and (3) that non-concessional funding represents the higher proportion of the multinational assistance.

The implication of these trends, she argued, is that it has become more expensive for countries to receive international assistance and that much work still has to be done in terms of advocacy and awareness-raising of the importance of education in national development. While it is important to convince OECD/DAC countries to increase their Official Development Assistance and assistance for education, it is equally important to identify alternative financial sources, including non-OECD/DAC countries, former aid recipient countries, the private sector, innovative fund-raising, for example by the NGO community, debt relief and to utilize the prospects of supporting national development processes through improved trade relations and re-allocations from military expenditure, in addition to the necessary strengthening of national resource mobilization. This ties with UNESCO's interpretation of the cross-cutting issues of the six elements of the global initiative, namely expanding sources of financing, applying soft and flexible terms, translating political will into longer-term commitments, adopting cost-efficient procedures deriving from country needs and circumstances, and creating preconditions for use of new and alternative financial mechanisms.

With respect to preconditions, *Buchert* emphasized the need to support Education for All as part of wider education sector support and of other elements of a government budget, and for Education for All action plans to be linked with other plans, strategies and objectives in order to see education through, what *USAID* called, a poverty-society lens. However, because international support should be provided as a function of institutional and structural constraints in individual countries, she warned against using as sole criteria the existence of the full set of plans (EFA, education sector, wider development strategy, CCA/UNDAF, CDF, PRSP and HIPC) which would apply to very few countries. Instead, targeting should be based on inclusive rather than exclusive criteria and underline the right to education. It would be necessary to establish transitional criteria for countries that do not have Education for All plans. Support should be given to the wider Education for All concept and the traditional division of funding responsibilities among national governments, communities and international agencies should be revisited.

Reactions

In the panel discussion and general reactions, participants endorsed the general approach being developed by UNESCO. A number of issues were raised that were considered to be particularly pertinent if the global initiative was to move forward in a consolidated manner. These concerned not only resource mobilization, but also the choice of countries for allocations and the practice of international development co-operation.

The need to adopt a broad approach to issues of resource mobilization and allocation was welcomed by several participants, for example the *African Development Bank (AfDB)* and *DFID*. *AfDB* indicated that many of the presented concerns were also concerns of the *AfDB*, for example how to mobilize resources and how to facilitate co-ordination at the country level, an issue which was also underlined by *Bahrain*. The sector-wide approach was identified by *UNFPA* as a welcome mechanism for channelling of resources, whereas *Save the Children Alliance* stressed the need to link international financing with the issue of decentralization in order to ensure that international assistance is provided at the level of the administrative structure where it will have most impact, i.e. the district level. *UNDP Mauritania* supported the need for action programmes to be linked with programmes on decentralization and for increased resource allocations at the community level. *India* pointed to the need for closer analysis of lending expenditure which, significantly, is not free to the countries, and of financial sustainability, in particular the extent to which international financial support is being matched by increased national support. *India* also warned against unacceptable conditionalities, such as setting conditions for fiscal reform before support for education can be granted, whereas *Bahrain* warned against the risk that international funding and the global initiative could become a tool for government rationalization of their own expenditure.

DFID, *AfDB* and *Sida* also reverted to the need to link education with poverty reduction and, in that context, to give priority to basic education. This change was beginning to happen in their own agency contexts and more widely, it was suggested by both *DFID* and *Sida*. However, according to *DFID*, the difficulty is to reconcile the reaching of specific targets with dialogue on an overall poverty strategy and with governments' own agendas and poverty goals. This partly concerns the extent to which agencies are prepared to take risks and support countries which do not have adequately developed plans. According to *UNDP Mauritania*, funding agencies do not like to take risks, whereas *USAID* argued that funding and technical assistance agencies can no longer afford to work only in risk-safe environments, that there is a need for effective policy and planning processes for countries in crisis, and that new mechanisms for international, collaborative technical assistance that concern risk should be established. *India* argued that the risk-taking by international

agencies is small since, seen in economic terms, global international funding for education is low, but also seen in comparison with the personal risks many teachers, for example, have to take in situations of school and other violence. With respect to the strategic frameworks, *UNDP Mauritania* saw a need to develop modalities for their use, particularly in order to prevent them from being taken over by the Bretton Woods institutions. *ADEA*, similarly, pointed to the need for ownership of the new instruments and questioned whether the three dominant World Bank instruments could be appropriated by others.

AfDB underlined the need for appropriation through participation and that financial actions must be taken in response to national needs. *India* underlined the difficulties this might involve since this presumes homogeneity and flexibility whereas education is, in fact, a negotiated political process. To achieve the ideal, *India* argued, there is a need for advocacy in both developing and developed countries, a need to link educational issues with human rights development, to seek changes in procedures and to ensure proper monitoring and evaluation to build institutional strength. Underlying this are necessary national capacity-building processes which should form part of strategic planning and the need to ensure that existing capacities are maintained in the right place, as also pointed out by *UNDP Mauritania*. *Save the Children Alliance* emphasized the need to see capacity-building in the context of effective delivery of education at the district level, to analyse examples of effective change and integrate local experiences in the formulation of national plans, and to link financial issues with this.

To move forward with the global initiative, *ADEA* underlined the need to develop a detailed strategy for communication in order that all parties involved have a better understanding of how to operationalize the underlying terms of the global initiative. *USAID* appreciated the effect of advocacy efforts, for example by the Global Campaign, which has raised the interest in educational issues. Advocacy efforts have led to increased support for education in the United States as exemplified by the innovative Global Food Initiative and through expected increased funding for education through *USAID*. *USAID* also underlined the need to link public and private funding, welcomed the World Bank intention to increase low-interest loans and underlined the importance of HIPC schemes. At the same time, *USAID* saw a need to bring all new mechanisms together and to do so in full transparency so that all partners have the same knowledge. This could be done through the creation of websites.

USAID made two specific proposals for how to consolidate further work: first, to create an international council for EFA in order to achieve its overall goals; and, second, to create a sub-committee of the Working Group to discuss policy, planning and funding issues in depth and to identify measures for their orchestration. *Bahrain* proposed that this

sub-committee could assist in assuring that all partners speak with the same voice. *UNICEF*, similarly, presented a number of challenges that derived from the presentation and discussion, namely: how to link macro- and micro-level support in order to ensure that international support is most efficiently targeted at the country level; how to ensure flexibility in co-ordination in different country contexts and in situations of pressure to meet commitments; how to safeguard flexibility in accountability, i.e. who is accountable to whom for the resources through the global initiative; how to target countries in accordance with Dakar priorities, taking into consideration the excluded, girls and issues of quality, and realizing that it is more expensive and time-consuming to reach the hard-to-reach; and how to set goals and targets, and to design approaches for resource mobilization and use.

Thematic group: issues and recommendations

The thematic group made proposals which related to moving the global initiative forward both in more general and in more specific terms. In general terms, the group recommended that a Task Force be set up to do further work on the initiative and support the work of the high-level policy group. Furthermore, UNESCO was encouraged to target the private sector, particularly that part of the sector which is involved in information technologies, in both the North and the South concerning funding for EFA and harnessing the information technology momentum at the country level. In specific terms, the group addressed two areas:

1. Funding needs and targeting

National governments and international funding and technical assistance agencies were encouraged to co-ordinate the development of national action plans in consideration of poverty reduction strategic plans. Co-ordination should be led by governments using sector-wide approaches. Funding by international agencies should be co-ordinated in order to avoid duplication and resources should be targeted for countries where co-ordination is particularly effective.

International agencies should be willing to support the development of national EFA action plans whose formulation process should be inclusive of all stakeholders, including civil society. This support should be related not only to funding needs, but should also include support for building the capacities needed in order for countries to manage the resources and implement the plans in accordance with EFA goals. Of these EFA goals, particular attention should be paid to support for the Dakar priorities related to bridging gender gaps and catering to special needs. Consideration should be given to long-term financial sustainability which should be ensured through financial co-operation among all stakeholders but without placing undue burdens on the communities. Special consideration should be given to crisis or post-crisis countries.

All agency activities at the country level should be undertaken within the framework of the EFA action plans. All programme and project activities should include a proportion for national capacity-building in order to facilitate impact assessment of programmes and manage information systems efficiently. Technical assistance should be provided to strengthening national decision-making bodies, such as the national EFA forums. The focal point for EFA progress should be determined on a country-by-country basis based on the comparative advantage of the individual actors.

2. Learning from and sharing of experiences

It was recommended to examine good practices in order for individual countries to complement standard approaches with innovations. Network organizations such as ADEA and UNDP should be utilized to disseminate information and share experiences and lessons learned in education at the national and regional levels. It was considered to be particularly important to integrate experiences from NGO platforms into national plans. Existing mechanisms should be strengthened in order to facilitate exchange with civil society and to face new challenges, such as those related to HIV/AIDS.

Monitoring Education for All goals and targets

USAID, in its introductory remarks to the presentation by the *UNESCO Institute for Statistics*, underlined the importance that the Institute become a successful observatory for the EFA movement. Work of evaluation, monitoring, statistical interpretation, indicators and targets is critical to the achievement of success for EFA, it was stressed. According to *USAID*, the Observatory function has two aspects: planning and programme development, on the one hand, and indicators and statistics, on the other. With respect to the former, it is critical to establish free and open transmission of information about education at national, regional and international levels, and to map the EFA planning processes at both national and international levels. With respect to the latter, few indicators are needed at the international level whereas indicators and targets must be set at the national level in accordance with the needs of national EFA action plans. *USAID* went on to indicate the significant challenges ahead, highlighting the need for collaboration between agencies and for clarity regarding the support to the Institute in order for it to perform its critical functions.

Denise Lievesley started by indicating that this was the right moment to receive feed-back on the Institute's provisional thinking on its Observatory functions. She pointed to the

universal recognition of the importance of regular monitoring and the need to learn from the lessons of the Dakar assessment, in particular that monitoring of progress towards the EFA goals begins at the beginning. The role of the Observatory is to collect, analyse and disseminate up-to-date information on the state of education required by countries, regions and the international community in monitoring progress towards the EFA goals. In this context, *Lievesley* stressed the need to evaluate existing indicators from a statistical and policy relevance point of view. Regular data collections should be continued and alternative data sources should be investigated as well. Furthermore, new indicators should be developed in response to the EFA goals for quality of education (related, for example to outcomes, achievement, assessment and literacy), marginalized groups and out-of-school children, and in response to specific areas, such as financing of education, effective use of education, the finance gap and financing strategies, education in emergency situations and others.

This amount of work alone indicates the need to set priorities. In setting those priorities, *Lievesley* stressed several critical issues that need to be taken into consideration: the importance of developing data by different actors at different levels and of integrating national and international data collections with the Institute maintaining the co-ordination role, the need to define the response burden and identify the resources needed for data collection, the importance of having sound indicators that are policy driven, and the need to realize that developing new indicators is a slow and costly process. At the same time, *Lievesley* underlined the balance to be struck between maintaining national statistical agendas and collecting cross-national data. The latter are needed for comparative purposes in light of the internationally set EFA goals and can assist in identifying gaps which could lead, for example, to targeted placement of resources and additional resource mobilization. Thus, in the ideal case, monitoring of progress towards the EFA goals would be based both on an extensive national data-base plus a set of national core data and on comparable data for countries in identical situations.

An important question to consider is the likely implications of establishing national data-bases that are responsive to or supportive of national education plans which may lay out different goals in different countries, and how such work could be linked with the generation of poverty reduction strategy papers. Another set of critical issues relates to the use of statistical information, in particular ensuring that users can judge independently the quality of the data and their significance for educational structures and policy formation. Related to this is the particular importance of preserving the integrity and independence for critical judgement by the Observatory. This would involve designing pro-active strategies for data use in policy formation and establishing warning systems and feedback loops in order to undertake necessary corrective measures throughout the monitoring

process. *Lievesley* concluded by stressing the necessity of committing finances and expert resources.

Reactions

In the panel reactions and discussions, several agencies, for example the *World Bank*, *UNICEF* and *Sida*, stressed their willingness to work with and continue to support the Institute and its Observatory function in terms of both human and financial resources. We simply cannot afford to have another post-Jomtien lack of activity in this area, said the *World Bank*. The core issues during the debate concerned in particular the purpose and creation of reliable statistics and their use by different constituencies.

There was widespread agreement about the importance of having solid data and relevant indicators at the country, regional and international level. While *UNICEF* pointed to the necessity to disaggregate data, *EU* has made a major effort to simplify the number of indicators and concentrate on a set of core indicators in a resource-oriented manner. These include indicators for access (including equity), effectiveness (including quality), relevance and equity, efficiency, and financial and institutional sustainability. *OEI* focused on the newly created observatory for Spanish-American education and its work in nineteen Spanish-American countries which, inter alia, focuses on strengthening institutional capacities in statistical data collection. *UNESCO Santiago* made reference to the Latin American project on statistics and indicators at the sub-national, national and regional levels, whereas *UNESCO Beirut* stressed the importance of the Arab regional initiative for capacity-building in information and utilization of education information in policy and management. *Japan* reinforced the need for capacity-building in monitoring and for establishing basic indicators which many countries lack. *UNESCO IIEP Buenos Aires* similarly stressed the need for independent mechanisms at the country level and for quality indicators. *Brazil* saw statistics and evaluation as important for the management of education systems and schools, whereas *ABONG* considered reliable information to be an efficient instrument to involve society in the educational debate. Solid statistics can both assist governments and be used to evaluate the impact of different organizations at the country level, said *AfDB*.

While the *World Bank* pointed to the need to have a baseline of reliable, ongoing statistics and a set of core indicators, especially for financing, *AfDB* and *UNESCO IBE* mentioned the importance of contextualizing universal indicators, i.e. of their association with the particular country context. This was exemplified by *UNESCO IBE* with reference to studies in achievement in mathematics that show higher achievement in the Netherlands than in Mexico. While it is easy, *UNESCO IBE* said, to associate lower achievement with inferior quality, the real explanation is related to the difference in instruction time

in the two contexts since the school timetables in the Netherlands are eight hours compared to four hours in Mexico, leading to effectively three more years of basic education in the Netherlands compared to Mexico. *AfDB* exemplified the need for contextualized data with the differences in school entry age or even the age of school children in different countries. It is, therefore, critically important that UNESCO works with countries when developing new, or putting permanent indicators into place, *AfDB* argued.

According to *ABONG*, there is an issue of the comparative costs and benefits regarding the use of information gathered during the monitoring process. Producing the data is very costly compared to their actual dissemination and use. To what extent are national governments and international agencies dedicated to disseminating the information gathered and using it for multiple interpretations rather than legitimizing particular policy stances? To what extent are they willing to create real debate in civil society? In a similar vein, *France* stressed that funding and technical assistance agencies do not have the same objectives as researchers of development issues. Who defines the indicators? Who uses the statistics? Who are the recipients of the statistical information, *France* and *Japan* asked. While *ABONG* considered that NGOs have a particular responsibility to play to foster debates and diverse interpretations of results, *ADEA* underlined the relationship between statistical capacity, indicators and advocacy. How can indicators be taken out of the close circle of experts to intermediary information (journalists)? How can statistics be made user-friendly? How can user-friendly information be designed, *ADEA* asked.

Thematic group: issues and recommendations

The thematic group made proposals related both to the function of the UNESCO Institute for Statistics and with respect to the core themes of *Lievesley's* presentation and the plenary debate. The Institute was encouraged to become a portal in disseminating information, act as a bridge between decision-makers and statisticians, and continue consultations through small working groups. The substance issues and recommendations related to the following three general areas:

1. Data collection, use and reliability

It was emphasized that priority should be given to data collection in the least developed countries and that the sources of data should be diversified and include, for example, data collections by NGOs in non-formal education. Furthermore, while comparability was considered to be important, its difficulties underline the need for context-specificity. Since regional indicators hide large discrepancies among countries, country-level assessments were considered to be most useful, while global assessments should take country-specific and regional differences into consideration.

Targets should be set at the subregional level. At the country level, there is a need for disaggregated data at the district/local level and at the rural/urban level which may be complicated by resource needs and may have unknown effects on reliability because of the risk of manipulation. It was proposed that decentralization processes should inform local contexts. The relevance of local issues should be highlighted, and teachers and communities should have the opportunity to analyse data for local purposes. Teachers should be used as evaluators, and not only as data gatherers, and field workers should be fully involved in data gathering and analysis.

Collected data should be user-friendly, gender-specific and of a good quality. To achieve this, national capacity-building might be needed. Problems related to non-existing or obsolete data, for example population censuses, must also be overcome. The data should assist in decision-making at the country level and in school improvement programmes. Efforts should be made to make use of rich district- and school-level data. At the school level, enrolment by grade and by gender needs to be carefully monitored. Transparency and the right to information should be promoted at all levels of the administrative system, for example, the use of school level display boards showing pupil progress, budgets etc. Considerations should be given as to how to collect data in countries in crisis.

It was noted that data of relevance for national policy-makers are not necessarily the same as those of relevance to the international EFA goals. It was proposed to ensure monitoring of the six EFA goals while assisting, through capacity-building, the monitoring of regional and national goals. Attention should also be paid to the choice of variables to be measured since this could have an impact on use by policy-makers. It was considered that monitoring of non-formal education be particularly important for EFA, that capacity-building as regards the quality of statistics is needed in order to improve the monitoring processes, and that community-based monitoring should be enhanced through communication processes and the incorporation of triangulation principles.

2. Indicators

It was proposed to revisit the eighteen EFA indicators in the light of the Dakar Framework for Action and the specific EFA goals and to develop focused indicators in line with the six EFA goals. New indicators might have to be developed for some areas, such as early childhood and non-formal education while, for other areas, existing indicators developed by other organizations could be used, for example WHO indicators on adolescent behaviour. Considerations should also be given to the development of indicators on the impact of education on societal development and the school environment, for example democratic participation, health and nutrition. For other pertinent issues, for example values, other types of evaluation studies might be more appropriate.

Identified indicators should be user-driven and include, for example, indicators to monitor progress in quality, such as

teaching hours per school year and availability of books. School participation should be examined more comprehensively combining, for example, data on enrolment, attendance, repetition rates, monitoring of progress of pupils and completion rates. Indicators also need to take into consideration the relevance and linkage to the overall development context at the macro level.

It was proposed to create a forum for discussion composed of researchers and academics that could assist in identifying the most relevant indicators. Statisticians from different fields of expertise and demographers should be involved in the design of improved indicators in order to reach increased understanding of EFA goals.

3. Communication

It was underlined that there is a need to develop capacities for effective communication of statistics and to enhance communication between statisticians and policy-makers. Communication strategies could be developed, based on advice from the media. There is also a need for clarity on who are the end-users of specific statistics. Networks should be established between users and producers of data in order to enhance their relevance and effectiveness. Good statistics should facilitate, among others, interventions of NGOs and civil society on educational matters.

Efforts should be made to prepare focused presentations in the form of thematic and regional reports with simplified graphic presentations which could also be understood by illiterates. Stand-alone statistical presentations should be avoided. While comparability should be ensured, league tables should be avoided. Diagnostic and formative evaluations should be encouraged and summative ones discouraged. In order to demystify statistics, it is important to work with communities using effective communication strategies.

Summary of major recommendations

The debate following the thematic group reports refocused attention on five major areas and specified seven recommendations.

1. Preparation of national EFA plans

It was stressed that national action plans are already being prepared in a number of countries at a time when no clear procedures and guidelines have been established concerning their content, the process to be followed and the guidance that can be provided in their preparation, the mechanisms for their assessment and validation, and their coherence with wider plans and strategies. Another concern related to the need for accurate, context-sensitive data in order to develop realistic plans. Regional co-operation and networking might

be particularly conducive to positive results. The need to include countries currently covered by only UNICEF and UNDP was also emphasized.

Recommendation: it was proposed that a small, virtual team be established to make the Guidelines developed by UNESCO more operational, providing more detail and examples on what constitutes a 'good' plan.

Recommendation: it was proposed to establish a virtual sub-group to examine how best to integrate EFA with wider development frameworks and ensure greater coherence in international partnerships, including new or better codes of conduct.

Recommendation: it was proposed to establish a small group to examine whether or not criteria should be defined to determine target or eligible countries.

2. UNESCO's role in EFA follow-up

It was stressed that UNESCO has a particularly important role to play as a broker of knowledge on the progress being made in Education for All on a country-by-country basis around the globe, and as a facilitator or co-ordinator of an inclusive process to prepare national action plans. It was mentioned that it is important to establish criteria for review of national plans, that UNESCO should report on how UNESCO and other development partners are responding to country needs and that, if need be, a code of conduct should be developed which could be based on the EU experiences.

Recommendation: it was suggested that UNESCO establish a website/listserv on country plans and planning processes. UNESCO could play a leadership role in identifying where help is needed in terms of both technical assistance and financial support and could channel requests for support to funding and technical assistance agencies.

Recommendation: UNESCO should play a core role as a facilitator of truly participatory and inclusive preparations of national plans.

3. Role of NGOs

It was pointed out that in light of the important role of NGOs at the national level, there is a need for more 'structured'

knowledge on their actual activities and on how national actions can be strengthened. Co-ordination at the regional level was considered to be particularly important. NGOs emphasized the need to be considered as a heterogeneous group and as partners, rather than a counter voice, and to be included in policy dialogue at all levels and in the implementation process.

Recommendation: UNESCO should involve NGOs in the Dakar process and set up mechanisms, for instance for capacity-building and monitoring, to facilitate NGO participation and effective contribution at the regional and international levels. International funding and technical assistance agencies, in general, should provide moral and financial support for this to occur.

4. Financing of EFA

The urgency to enhance resource mobilization was re-emphasized in view of, for example, the HIV/AIDS pandemic and its impact on education. It was, therefore, considered to be critical to involve other, in particular private, partners in the EFA initiative and to ensure that all funding programmes, in particular the debt relief schemes, actually support EFA priorities. It was, finally, underlined that issues of commitment and conditionality concern both countries and the international community.

Recommendation: it was suggested to set up a task force, inclusive of all important constituencies, to work on the issue of financing. Terms of Reference should be developed within two to three weeks.

5. ICTs

The need to examine the potential of ICTs to meet the urgent challenges of EFA in terms of both quality and access and to use information technologies to facilitate networking and information-sharing in wider civil society was re-emphasized. UNESCO's potential role as a broker of information on EFA progress and good practices was underlined, as was the possibility to combine the use of information technologies as a means to meet both the EFA goals and the need for increased private funding. □

IV. Mapping the future

In his concluding remarks, the *UNESCO Assistant Director-General for Education a.i.* underlined that all proposals which had been made in the context of the presentations and debate on the issues of mobilizing international support for Education for All and on the Observatory would be carefully studied by UNESCO and appropriate actions taken. UNESCO would ensure that all participants receive UNESCO's electronic news bulletin board while participants were requested to ensure its wider dissemination. The meeting report would be developed in an interactive process with the participants and would serve as a basis for discussion in the meeting of the high-level policy group. UNESCO would consider for particular attention the following recommendations of the meeting:

1. Establishing a *task force* to contribute to the work on financing strategies for Education for All based on the UNESCO paper prepared by Buchert. Such a task force should consider, amongst others: funding needs, instruments, identification of priority countries and transparency in utilization of funding. Participants from all constituencies were encouraged to submit comments on the paper.
2. Providing a *platform for discussion among funding agencies*. This forum could be established by UNESCO in co-operation with, for example, EU, OECD/DAC and other partners. It should focus, for example, on: evaluation of risk-taking, establishment of evaluation systems and development of a code of conduct.
3. Organizing *collaboration among agencies*: Such collaboration must be established among all agencies at the international, regional and national levels along the lines of agreements between UNESCO and UNICEF for West and Central Africa, and for Latin America and the Caribbean. In terms of technical assistance, UNESCO is planning to concentrate on more than twenty-five least developed countries that do not have EFA co-ordination mechanisms or which are in the process of formulating strategies and programmes in the fight against poverty, and on fifteen to twenty other countries that have requested UNESCO assistance. Support was requested from UNESCO's cooperation partners.
4. Studying *best practices in development of plans*: This relates to issues both of linkages among different plans, and of ensuring ownership among all involved parties and transparency of the process. Participants were invited to identify positive examples.
5. Strengthening *operational aspects of the UNESCO Guidelines* for the preparation of national EFA plans: UNESCO Institutes would be mobilized to improve the operational aspects of the *Guidelines*, for example in terms of including the non-formal sector and considering decentralization aspects. It would be considered to establish a virtual group to discuss, amend and improve the document.
6. Associate the *private sector* with Dakar Follow-up: Participants were invited to make concrete proposals concerning individuals who could be nominated for the high-level policy group and who could be approached for collaboration in areas such as: launching of a media campaign or establishing a web-site for EFA donations. Regular participation in the World Economic Forum should be ensured in order to enhance contacts.
7. Create a *portal* on Dakar Follow-up: This will be examined by UNESCO in co-operation with its regional offices.
8. Design a *time-bound action plan* for Dakar Follow-up: The plan would stipulate actions for the EFA movement, in general, and UNESCO specifically. □

Appendices

I. Welcome Address by Mr Koïchiro Matsuura

Director-General of UNESCO

Ladies and Gentlemen,
Colleagues,

Good morning.

It is a great pleasure for me, as convener of the Working Group on Education for All, to welcome you all to UNESCO and to this first meeting of the Group. I wish to assure you both of the great importance which UNESCO attaches to the Dakar Follow-up process and of UNESCO's commitment to fulfil its own mandate as defined in Dakar. This mandate is at the same time a vote of confidence and an immense challenge. We interpret the mandate as 'leadership in partnership'. This means that we have to create synergy within the array of different opinions and perspectives among all partners involved in the follow-up process while respecting, as an intergovernmental organization, that governments are the principal authority of the movement and while respecting also the important message from Dakar that the process must be led by the countries through their governments, national NGOs and civil society.

UNESCO's commitment to Education for All has, in fact, been expressed through concrete actions taken ever since I joined this Organization in November 1999, that is, even **before** the World Education Forum in Dakar. I am sure you are all aware of the ongoing reform process within UNESCO which is affecting its structure, programmes and management. As the other United Nations organizations, we have to slim down, or downsize, and concentrate our activities in order to become more effective and relevant. While this is obviously painful in many ways, I believe that the reform process has provided us with the opportunity to **rethink** how the Organization as a whole, and the education sector in particular, can enhance UNESCO's vitality and credibility in the field of education, and how the Organization can best support Education for All in light of its capacities and resources.

The overall structure for the Organization that we are now putting in place is both simpler and more focused than the one we had previously. Each individual part of this new structure, be it a regional office, a field office, a UNESCO institute, the different substantive sectors of the Organization — which are Communication and Information, Social and

Human Sciences, Natural Sciences, Culture, and, of course, Education — all have to develop work programmes that respond to the need for Education for All.

With respect to the Education Sector, specifically, we have consolidated all work into five Divisions: Educational Policies and Strategies; Basic Education; Secondary, Technical and Vocational Education; Higher Education; and Promotion of Quality of Education. The particular importance attached to Education for All is reflected in the proposition for an increased budget for basic education and in the creation of the two new, transversal divisions: Promotion of Quality of Education and Educational Policies and Strategies. Furthermore, the Divisions of Secondary, Technical and Vocational Education and of Higher Education have also been requested to design work programmes in support of Education for All. The new structure for the Education Sector and its new emphases will permit us to focus on Education for All across all divisions and, therefore, to understand and approach specific issues of basic education holistically as **a part of** the education system in any country and not **isolated from** the rest of the system.

It is also no coincidence that the newly appointed Deputy Assistant Director-General for Education is the Director of the Division of Basic Education, Mrs Aïcha Bah-Diallo, whom I have by my side here today.

Permit me to take this opportunity to dwell also for a moment on someone who has been particularly critical for me in this transition period. This is Jacques Hallak, our current acting Assistant-Director General for Education, whom I have on my other side, and who has assisted me since the beginning of May of this year. I will shortly appoint a new Assistant Director-General for Education who will have the challenge of taking over the leadership of the Education Sector from someone who is renowned for his work capacity, his task orientation, and for his decision-making and action-oriented leadership style. Many of you know Jacques and have also worked with him in his previous positions within the UNESCO system. You also know, therefore, that Jacques is much more than what I just said. The miracles that happen where ever Jacques treads his ground, they happen **not only** because he works hard and

is a shaker and a mover. They happen **not only** because of his long experience in the field, or his intimate knowledge and understanding of the issues at stake, or his profound knowledge of UNESCO as an organization and of all the other players. These miracles happen, **in particular** I believe, because of his vision and wisdom combined with his personal charisma, enthusiasm and strong perception of human capacities. Jacques can bring out the best in all of us.

Jacques — I am deeply grateful for the support you have provided me and UNESCO at this crucial juncture for the Organization. I hope you will look back on this experience as having been a worthwhile investment of your precious time, now that you have other pressing priorities in your life. I thank you.

I thank you also for agreeing to preside over this first meeting of the Working Group on Education for All. I wish to underline the critical importance I attach to this Group as a core **informal** mechanism to bring the Dakar Follow-up process forward on the basis of consultation and sharing of experiences among professionals. You will recall that it was decided in Dakar **not** to establish new permanent structures for EFA coordination. This Working Group has **not** been mandated to monitor or take decisions on the follow-up to Dakar. Rather, I interpret UNESCO's 'leadership in partnership' to mean that we must have regular **technical** consultation among partners in order for me to understand the different approaches, perspectives and sensitivities among the different partners. This is the purpose of this first meeting. Its outcomes will assist me not only in the preparation of the meeting of the high-level policy group, which I shall come back to a little later, but also in proposing informed strategic actions for the process ahead of us.

The Dakar follow-up process is a collective undertaking at all levels and through all existing mechanisms. However, I consider it to be of particular importance that this Working Group provide a forum for active discussion of the concrete experiences at the **country** level as they are understood by **governments** and **national** groups. In any aspect of the development process, it is important that we learn and understand the issues as they are experienced by the key actors concerned. **National ownership** depends on endogenous development. We must define our strategies and determine our pace in response to home-grown, nationally motivated and nationally determined action. It is the actors on the ground — who have grown out of and are living inside the process — who are likely to bring the best sense of realism into the work. We must all listen to them carefully.

I have decided to compose the Working Group of professionals from all the major partners in the regions and countries, from the international funding and technical assistance agencies, including the United Nations system, and from non-governmental organizations. In this composition, I have aimed at ensuring a fairly balanced North-South representation in response to the clear

understanding that the key responsibility for the Dakar Follow-up process lies at the national level, and that the international community is to play a supportive, catalytic role.

You have been selected as participants based on your professional competence and involvement in the EFA process, and **not** as elected representatives of your organizations. As I said before, this is a meeting of technical experts. We must benefit from the diversity within this group and build on the strengths of each and every one in order that we can build up a truly participatory process aimed at reaching common goals and targets. Despite the somewhat formal surroundings in this room, the intended **spirit** of this meeting is *informality* — or *structured informality* as some people now say. I urge you all, also my own colleagues, to leave your organizational agendas behind and to speak your mind freely and constructively.

This first meeting will be followed by others which I will convene. Because of the need to involve all partner groups, we have had to reconcile the imperatives of size and manageability in the actual composition of this meeting. We have had to adopt a principle of rotation which will allow different professionals to contribute to the deliberations in different meetings and at the same time make for manageable meetings able to reach concrete outcomes. In addition, we have permitted wide participation of observers some of whom are located in the room next door with coverage of the discussions in this room by video. It is critical, however, that those present in each individual meeting fulfil their responsibility to share its inputs and results broadly with their constituencies, in order that we can ensure continuity, institutional memory and optimal progress on the ground.

You have all received a copy of the programme. As you can imagine, with a *multi-faceted* concept like Education for All, with a *global* initiative like Education for All, and with a *diversified* interest group like this Working Group, much consideration has gone into the design of a programme that could encompass the wide-ranging content aspects, the widespread activities in the area, and the multiple national, regional and international partners. It has also been necessary to strike a balance between, on one hand, building a common framework of knowledge and understanding of what is happening in the regions, countries and various organizations in terms of concrete activities after Dakar and, on the other, of identifying core areas of key concern that deserve special attention in order to shape the Education for All process in the immediate future.

This explains why, today, you will hear from a wide range of participants on what is happening on the ground and on how certain initiatives may have been strengthened or modified or otherwise affected by the results of the World Education Forum in Dakar. During these presentations and the subsequent discussions, you are likely to begin to touch upon, amongst others, the three core issues that have been selected for in-depth discussion tomorrow:

- ▷ The first one relates to the need for countries to produce Education for All action plans. UNESCO has developed Guidelines for this purpose as part of the commitment and duty of the international community and the United Nations system to assist the EFA process. You will also be discussing how nationally developed action plans can be linked with other plans, strategies and policy frameworks.
- ▷ The second issue relates to what is called the global initiative, or how the international community can best support national Education for All efforts in terms of resource mobilization. UNESCO will present its work in progress on this matter and will play a role as mobilizer of international funding.
- ▷ The third question is how the Education for All process can best be monitored nationally, regionally and internationally. You will discuss UNESCO's observatory function and the need for close cooperation at all levels in this respect.

There are, of course, many other issues that also deserve ample time for discussion. This first meeting may well serve to identify such issues which could then be taken up later on. We have selected those mentioned because of their implications for the whole process and because of the necessity to reach agreement about appropriate plans, strategies and systems as early in the process as possible. You should, therefore, attach high importance to the reflective work required of you in the thematic break-away groups tomorrow afternoon which can lead to more specific proposals in these areas.

The outcomes from the meeting and the recommendations from the thematic groups will be used in different ways to further the Education for All process. One is, of course, in your own work within your own organizations. Another is to help shape the agenda of the informal, flexible, high-level policy group I am setting up under my direct authority. The purpose of this high-level group, which as its name indicates will be composed of individuals from the highest levels nationally, regionally and internationally, is to ensure fulfilment of the stated commitment for the Education for All process in countries, regions and in international organizations. I hope that we will succeed in establishing a highly fruitful relationship between the work of this Group here and the high-level policy group whose first meeting is expected to take place in March of next year.

We all wish to see positive developments towards the goals and targets for Education for All and towards the other targets to reduce poverty by the year 2015. I believe that we *can* make true headway towards these targets even though the challenges we have ahead of us are huge. I believe so for several reasons:

- ▷ There is a high level of *agreement* in the international community concerning what needs to be done.

▷ We have extensive *knowledge* of how to do it.

- ▷ And we have the *means* to do it if we decide to use those means.

But we have to sustain the momentum of the political will expressed in Dakar in April and at other high-level political meetings, for example in the context of the G8 countries. We must keep the targets on the top of our various agendas internationally, regionally and nationally. And we must make a consolidated effort to translate political will and commitment into actions that can help transform the lives of those who need it the most: children, women, the poor, the marginalized and the excluded.

This must be the essence of Education for All.

This is why you are here. You are here to ensure that Education for All remains a key focus in national, regional and international development efforts. You are here to help move the process forward in a consolidated manner.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

We have been discussing the right of the child to free education for more than half a century. We have been discussing global inequalities, North-South divides, and the rift between the rich and the poor for decades. Let us not continue to just talk. This forum is fortunate in that it brings together such qualified representatives of both reflection and action, and of policy and practice. I shall make it a particular priority to ensure the same balance when setting up my high-level policy group. Let us forge the link between reflection and action. Let us together build the bridge between policy and practice. I strongly believe that we cannot justify letting another decade go by, only to realize at the end of it that nothing much has changed for those who need change the most. We must find the best way forward together. We must reach across differences. **YOU** must make this happen. Not only today, tomorrow and the day after tomorrow. But as full partners in a process that will be monitored and measured against goals and targets for 2015. And, perhaps even more important than that, measured against the need to prove to the future that the world *does* have a conscience, that we *are* capable of setting self-serving interests aside, and that we *are* able to use our wisdom and knowledge for the benefit of development for those who need it the most.

Colleagues,

I wish you a very productive time together during the next three days. I look forward keenly to the outcomes of this meeting. And I shall do my very best to ensure that these outcomes are acted upon in our own institutional context within UNESCO and in the context of the high-level policy group.

I thank you for your attention.

2. List of participants and observers

1. Countries

Bahrain

Dr Ali Fakhro
President, Bahrain Center of Studies and Research
P.O. Box 496, Manama, Bahrain
Tel: (973) 75 47 57
Fax: (973) 75 46 78
Email: afakhro@bcsr.gov.bh

Brazil

Mr Éfrem de Aguiar Maranhão
President, National Council of State Secretaries of Education
Secretary of Education in Pernambuco
Av Bernardo Vieira de Melo 1122 / 401 Piedade-Jaboatao-Pernambuco, Brazil
Tel: (55 81) 3 224 33 33
Fax: (55 81) 3 224 62 63
Email: eam@ndp.ufpe.br

Georgia

Mr Tamaz Tatishvili
Deputy Minister of Education
National Board Program Deputy Minister
52 Uznadze Str., Tbilisi 380002, Georgia
Tel: (995 32) 95 25 14
Fax: (995 32) 95 31 55

India

Ms Achala Moulik
Secretary, Elementary Education and Literacy, Department of Education
Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India
Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi-110001, India
Tel: (91-11) 338 2587 / 338 1104
Fax: (91-11) 338 7859 / 338 1355 / 338 2947
Email: achalamoulik@sb.nic.in

Kenya

Ms Salome W. Gichura
Assistant Director of Education
Ministry of Education, Science and Technology
P.O. Box 74882, Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: (254-2) 33 44 11 x 30655 / 33 62 82
Fax: (254-2) 21 30 25 / 21 42 87
Email: salomegichura@hotmail.com

Senegal

M. Pape Momar Sow
Directeur, Planification de l'éducation
Ministère de l'éducation nationale
BP 4025, Rue Calmette
Dakar, Sénégal
Tel: (221) 821 07 62
Fax: (221) 821 13 76
Email: mendpre@sentoosn

2. Regional organizations

ADEA

Mr Richard Sack
Executive Secretary, Association for the Development of Education in Africa
IIEP 7 rue Eugène-Delacroix
75116 Paris, France
tel: (33) 01 45 03 38 64
fax: (33) 01 45 03 39 65
Email: r.sack@iiep.unesco.org

CARICOM

Dr Carole Maison-Bishop
Programme Manager, Human Resources Development
Caribbean Community Secretariat
Bank of Guyana Building
Georgetown, Guyana
Tel: (592 2) 519 60
Fax: (592 2) 580 39
Email: cbishop@caricom.org

European Commission

Mr José-Javier Paniagua
Principal Administrator
European Commission
Rue de Genève, 12
1040 Brussels, Belgium
Tel: (32 2) 295 39 76
Fax: (32 2) 296 71 41
Email: Jose.PANIAGUA@cec.eu.int

OEI

Ms Rosario Fernandez Santamaria
Secrétaire général-adjointe
Organización de Estados Iberoamericanos para la Educación, la Ciencia y la Cultura
Bravo Murillo, 38
28015 Madrid, Spain
Tel: (34 91) 594 44 42
Fax: (34 91) 594 32 86
Email: rfs@oei.es; oeimad@oei.es

3. Bilateral donor agencies

France

M. Jean-Michel Severino
Inspecteur général des Finances
Ministère des Finances, de l'économie et de l'industrie
139 rue de Bercy (Teledoc 335)
75012 Paris, France
Tel: (33) 01 53 18 14 80 / 01 53 18 38 00
Fax: (33) 01 53 18 95 62
Email: jean-michel.severino@igf.finances.gouv.fr

M. Jean-Bernard Thiant
Directeur adjoint de la Coopération technique
Direction de la Coopération Internationale et du Développement
Ministère des affaires étrangères
20 rue Monsieur, 75007 Paris, France
Tel: (33) 01 53 69 37 93
Fax: (33) 01 53 69 43 87
Email: jean-bernard.thiant@diplomatie.gouv.fr

M. Renaud Rhim (Observer)
Adjoint au Délégué aux Relations Internationales et de la Coopération
Ministère de l'éducation nationale
4 rue Danton, 75006 Paris, France

Mme Claudine Bourrel (Observer)
Chargé de mission pour la Coopération multilatérale
Ministère des affaires étrangères
20 rue Monsieur, 75007 Paris, France
Tel: (33) 01 53 69 41 90
Fax: (33) 01 53 69 41 95
Email: claudine.bourrel@diplomatie.gouv.fr

M. Lucien Cousin (Observer)
Chef de la division de la Coopération éducative
Ministère des affaires étrangères
20 rue Monsieur, 75007 Paris, France
Tel: (33) 01 53 69 41 74
Fax: (33) 01 53 69 43 89
Email: lucien.cousin@diplomatie.gouv.fr

M. Paul Coustère (Observer)
Chargé de mission, Bureau des enseignements scolaires et de l'alphabétisation
Ministère des affaires étrangères
20 rue Monsieur, 75007 Paris, France
Tel: (33) 01 53 69 34 96
Fax: (33) 01 53 69 37 83
Email: paul.coustere@diplomatie.gouv.fr

M. Jean-Claude Mantes (Observer)
Chargé de mission, Bureau des enseignements scolaires et de l'alphabétisation
Ministère des affaires étrangères
20 rue Monsieur, 75007 Paris, France
Tel: (33) 01 53 69 31 26
Fax: (33) 01 53 69 37 83
Email: jean-claude.mantes@diplomatie.gouv.fr

Mme Marie-Paule Truel Belmas (Observer)
Conseillère technique
Commission française pour l'UNESCO
57 Boulevard des Invalides, 75700 Paris 07 SP, France
Tel: (33) 01 53 69 30 05
Fax: (33) 01 53 69 32 23
Email: marie-paule.belmas@diplomatie.fr

M. André Guyétant (Observer)
Chargé de mission, Délégation aux
Relations internationales et à la
Coopération
Ministère de l'éducation nationale
4 rue Danton, 75006 Paris, France
Tel: (33) 01 55 55 65 88
Fax: (33) 01 55 55 70 67

M. Olivier Charnoz (Observer)
Assistant de recherche
Ministère des affaires étrangères
17 rue Jean-Baptiste Baudin,
94800 Villejuif, France
Tel: (33) 01 53 69 40 78
Fax: (33) 01 53 69 40 79
Email: olivier.charnoz@diplomatie.fr

Japan as well as the G8

Mr Nobuhito Hobo
Director, Aid Policy Division, Economic
Cooperation Bureau
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
2-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku
Tokyo 100-8919, Japan
Tel: (81 3 35) 81 38 71 / 80 33 11 ext 2554
Fax: (81 3 55) 11 86 38

Mr Hiroshi Kamiyo (Observer)
Director, Office of Foreigners' Education
International Affairs Planning Division,
Science and International Affairs Bureau
Ministry of Education, Science, Sport and
Culture
3-2-2 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku
Tokyo 100-0013, Japan
Tel: (81 3 35) 81 21 73
Fax: (81 3 35) 81 91 49
Email: hkamiyo@monbu.go.jp

Mr Yasutaka Miyazawa (Observer)
Deputy Director, Research and
Programming Division
Economic Cooperation Bureau, Ministry
of Foreign Affairs
2-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku
Tokyo 100-8919, Japan
Tel: (81 3 35) 81 29 65
Fax: (81 3 35) 93 80 21
Email: yasutaka.miyazawa@mofa.go.jp

Portugal

Ms Ana Benavente
Secrétaire d'Etat de l'éducation
Ministère de l'éducation
Av. 5 Outubro 107 - 9°, Lisboa, Portugal
Tel: (351) 21 793 7674
Fax: (351) 21 797 8994
Email: SEE@me.gov.pt

Ms Maria Eduarda Boal (Observer)
Directeur général, Bureau des Affaires
Européennes et Relations Internationales
Ministère de l'éducation
Av. 5 Outubro 107 - 7°, Lisboa, Portugal
Tel: (351) 21 793 4254
Fax: (351) 21 797 8994
Email: meboal@min-edu.pt

Mr João Inacio Cidade Alpiarça (Observer)
Assistant Technique, Bureau des Affaires
Européennes et Relations Internationales,
Ministère de l'éducation
Av. 5 Outubro 107 - 7°, Lisboa, Portugal
Tel: (351) 21 781 1849
Fax: (351) 21 797 8994
Email: cidadealpiarca@hotmail.com

Sweden

Mr Johan Norqvist
Senior Programme Officer
Swedish International Development
Cooperation Agency (Sida)
Svean 20 Stockholm, Sweden
Tel: (46 8) 698 52 55
Fax: (46 8) 698 52 47
Email: johan.norqvist@sida.se

United Kingdom

Mr Steve Packer
Deputy Head of Education Department
Policy and Programme Development
Department for International Development
94 Victoria Street SW1E 5JL
London, United Kingdom
Tel: (44) 20 7 917 0657
Fax: (44) 20 7 917 0287
Email: s-packer@dfid.gov.uk

USAID

Ms Emily Vargas-Baron
Deputy Assistant Administrator
Director of the Center for Human
Capacity Development, USAID
1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20523, U.S.A.
Tel: (1 202) 712 0236
Fax: (1 202) 216 3229
Email: evargas-baron@usaid.gov;
vargasbaron@hotmail.com

Mr Donald R. Mackenzie (Observer)
Associate Assistant Administrator
Center for Human Capacity Development,
USAID
1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20523, U.S.A.
Tel: (1 202) 712 1552
Fax: (1 202) 216 3229
Email: bmackenzie@usaid.gov

4. Multilateral and regional agencies

African Development Bank

Mr Gabriel Bayemi
Senior Education Analyst
African Development Bank
01 BP V 316, Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire
Tel: (225) 20 20 53 05
Fax: (225) 20 20 57 10
Email: G.BAYEMI@AFDB.ORG

AGFUND

Mr Jebrin A. Al-Jebrin
Director of Projects Department
Arab Gulf Programme for United Nations
Development Organizations
P.O. Box 18371, Riyadh 11415
Saudi Arabia
Tel: (966 1) 441 43 82
Fax: (966 1) 441 29 63 / 62
Email: projects@agfund.org

UNFPA

Mr Ali Ugur Tuncer
Deputy Director, Technical Support
Division, United Nations Population Fund
220 East 42nd Street
New York, N.Y. 10017-5880, U.S.A.
Tel: (1 212) 297 5237
Fax: (1 212) 297 4915
Email: tuncer@unfpa.org

UNICEF

Mr Omar Abdi
Deputy Director, Programme Division,
United Nations Children's Fund
3 United Nations Plaza
New York, N.Y. 10017, U.S.A.
Tel: (1 212) 824 6502
Fax: (1 212) 824 6470
Email: oabdi@unicef.org

Mr Sheldon Shaeffer (Presenter)
Chief, Education Section, Programme
Division, UNICEF
3 United Nations Plaza
New York, N.Y. 10017, U.S.A.
Tel: (1 212) 824 6619
Fax: (1 212) 824 7129
Email: sshaeffer@unicef.org

Ms Mary Joy Pigozzi (Presenter)
UN Girls Education Task Force Leader,
UNICEF
3 United Nations Plaza
New York, N.Y. 10017, U.S.A.
Tel: (1 212) 824 6618
Fax: (1 212) 824 6481
Email: mjpigozzi@unicef.org

WHO

Mr Jack T. Jones
School Health Specialist
Department of Health Promotion
NMH/HPS
World Health Organization
20 Appia Way, 1211 Geneva,
Switzerland
Tel: (41 22) 791 25 82
Fax: (41 22) 791 4186
Email: jonesj@who.ch

World Bank

Mr Eduardo A. Doryan
Vice President, Human Development
The World Bank
1818 H Street N.W., Washington, D.C.
20433, U.S.A.
Tel: (1 202) 473 7575
Fax: (1 202) 522 3235
Email: edoryan@worldbank.org;
mlockheed@worldbank.org

Ms Maris O'Rourke (Presenter)
Senior Adviser on Education for All
The World Bank
1818 H Street N.W., Washington, D.C.
20433, U.S.A.
Tel: (1 202) 473 7096
Email: morourke@worldbank.org

Mr Birger Fredriksen (Observer)
Sector Director, Human Development
Africa Region, The World Bank
1818 H Street N.W., Washington, D.C.
20433, U.S.A.
Tel: (1 202) 473 5033
Email: bfredriksen@worldbank.org

5. Civil society: non-governmental organizations, foundations and others

International NGOs

Action Aid Alliance/Bureau Collective Consultation of NGOs on Literacy and Education for All

Mme Claire Calosci
Comité de directeurs d'Aide et action
Action Aid Alliance/Bureau de la
Consultation
Collective des ONG sur l'alphabétisation
et l'éducation pour tous
53 Boulevard de Charonne
75545 Paris Cedex 11, France
Tel: (33) 01 55 25 70 25
Fax: (33) 01 55 25 70 29
Email: partenariats@aide-et-action.org

M. Joel Bedos (Observer)
Responsable des partenariats/External
Relations Adviser
Aide et Action
53 Boulevard de Charonne
75545 Paris Cedex 11, France
Tel: (33) 01 55 25 70 00
Fax: (33) 01 55 25 70 29
Email: partenariats@aide-et-action.org

Save the Children Alliance

Ms Marion Molteno
Education Adviser, Save the Children
Alliance
c/o Save the Children Fund UK
17 Grove Lane
London SE5 8RD, United Kingdom
Tel: (44) 20 77 03 54 00
Fax: (44) 20 77 93 76 26 / 20 77 03 22 78
Email: m.molteno@scfuk.org.uk

UNESCO NGO Liaison Committee/Education International

Mme Monique Fouilhoux
Coordinatrice Education/Coordinator
Education
Comité de liaison ONG-UNESCO/
Internationale de l'éducation
1 rue Miollis
75732 Paris Cedex 15, France
Tel: (33) 01 45 68 32 67 and (32 2) 224 0643
Fax: (33) 01 45 66 03 37 and (32 2) 224 06 06
Email: monique.fouilhoux@ei-ie.org

National NGOs

Ação Educativa/Asociación Brasileria de ONGs (Latin America)

Ms Vera Masagão Ribeiro
Deputy Executive Secretary of Ação
Educativa/Asociación Brasileria de ONGs
Rua General Jardim, 660
01223-010 Sao Paulo SP, Brazil
Tel: (55 11) 3151 2333
Fax: (55 11) 3151 2333
Email: vera@acaoeducativa.org

Arab Resource Collective (Arab Region)

Mr Ghanem Bibi
General Coordinator, Arab Resource
Collective
P.O. Box 13-5916, Beirut, Lebanon
Tel: (96 11) 74 20 75
Fax: (96 11) 74 20 77
Email: arccyp@spidernet.com.cy;
arcleb@mawared.org

Dhaka Ahsania Mission (Asia)

Mr Kazi Rafiqul Alam
Executive Director, Dhaka Ahsania
Mission
House No. 19, Road No. 12 (NEW)
Dhanmondi, Dhaka-1209, Bangladesh
Tel: (880 2) 811 5909 / 811 9521 - 22
Fax: (880 2) 811 3010 / 811 8522
Email: dambgd@bdonline.com

People's Action Forum (Africa)

Ms Jennifer M. Chiwela
Executive Director, People's Action Forum
Post Office Box N° 33709
Lusaka 10101, Zambia
Tel: (260 1) 23 12 01 / 097 78 49 48
Fax: (260 1) 23 69 43
Email: paf@zamnet.zm

Foundations

Aga Khan Foundation

Ms Kathy Bartlett
Co-Director, Secretariat of the
CGECCD/Education Programme Officer
Consultative Group on Early Childhood
Care and Development
Aga Khan Foundation
1-3 Avenue de la Paix, P.O. Box 2369
1211 Geneva 2, Switzerland
Tel: (41 22) 909 7200
Fax: (41 22) 909 7291
Email: kathy.bartlett@akdn.ch

6. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)

OECD

Ms Stephanie Baile
Principal Administrator, Strategic
Management of Development
Co-operation
Division, Development Co-operation
Directorate
Organisation for Economic Co-operation
and Development
2, rue André Pascal
75775 Paris Cedex 16, France
Tel: (33) 01 45 24 90 30
Fax: (33) 01 45 24 85 00
Email: Stephanie.BAILE@oecd.org

Mr Henny Helmich (Observer)
Administrator, Development Centre
Organisation for Economic Co-operation
and Development
94 Rue Chardon-Lagâche, Paris, France
Tel: (33) 01 45 24 82 85
Email: henny.helmich@oecd.org

7. G8

*See Bilateral donors agencies,
p. 34, listed under Japan*

8. Other invitees

Invited in personal capacity

Mr Anil Bordia
Foundation for Education and
Development)
Former Education Secretary
27 Devi Path, Kanota Bagh, Jaipur –
302004, India
Tel: (91 14) 157 3141
Fax: (91 14) 162 4741
Email: bordia@datainfosys.net;
anilbordia@hotmail.com

UNDP Mauritania

Mr Michel de la Taille
UN Resident Coordinator/Resident
Representative of UNDP
P.O. Box 620
Nouakchott, Mauritania
Tel: (222 2) 524 09 / 524 11
Fax: (222 2) 526 16
Email: michel.delataille@undp.org

UNESCO

Mr Koichiro Matsuura
Director-General

Mr Jacques Hallak
Assistant Director-General for Education a.i.

Ms Aïcha Bah Diallo
Deputy Assistant Director-General for
Education

UNESCO technical secretariat

Ms Karine Brun
Mr Firmin E. Matoko
Ms Anne Muller
Ms Chantal Pacteau
Ms Ulrika Peppler Barry
Ms Muriel Poisson
Ms Ranwa Safadi
Ms Susanne Schnuttgen
Mr Luis Tiburcio
Ms Jeanette Vogelaar
Mr Wolfgang Vollmann

UNESCO presenters

Mr Kacem Bensalah, ED
Ms Lene Buchert, ED
Ms Françoise Caillods, IIEP
Ms Anna-Maria Hoffmann-Barthès, ED
Ms Denise Lievesley, Director UIS

UNESCO Institutes and Regional and field offices

Mr V. Billeh, Director, UNESCO Beirut
Ms A. L. Machado Pinheiro,
Director, UNESCO Santiago
Mr A. Parsuramen,
Director, UNESCO Dakar
Mr Zhou Nanzhao,
Director, UNESCO PROAP
Mr Moegiadi,
Director UNESCO, New Delhi
Ms C. Braslavsky, Director IBE
Mr G. Hernes, Director IIEP
Mr A. Ouane, Director UIE

**Secretarial assistance/
support staff**

Ms Dominique Dumas
 Mr Martin Jacobsen
 Ms Mercada Hassine
 Ms Mary Konin
 Ms Mairéad Maguire
 Ms Judith Roca
 Ms Cecil V. Sayag
 Ms Frédérique Zamani-Payam

9. Other observers**Permanent Delegations to UNESCO**

Belgium
 (M. Marc Thunus, Ms Rita Stubbe)

Brazil
 (Ms Izabel Carreiro,
 Ms Carmelito De Melo)

Canada
 (H.E. Mr Louis Hamel,
 Mrs Dominique Levasseur)

China (Mr Jianjun Zhai)

Colombia (Mr Santiago Montoya)

Costa Rica (Mrs Iris Leiva de Billault)

Denmark (Mr Steen Larsen)

France (Mrs Sylvianne Legrand)

Germany (Mr Michael Worbs)

Greece (Mr Vassiliki-Maria Grivitsopoulou)

Grenada (Ms Chafica Haddad)

India (Mr Amarjeet Sinha)

Indonesia (Mr Jose Tavares)

Iran, Islamic Republic of
 (Mr Mohamad Kashani)

Iraq (Mr I. Aflak)

Italy
 (Ms Alessandra Molina,
 Ms Marina Misitano)

Japan (Mr Akira Yoshikawa)

Lao People's Democratic Republic
 (M. Khamliene Nhouyuanisvona)

Mexico (M. Diego Simancas)

Morocco (Mr Rachid Seghrouchni)

Namibia (Mr Justin Ellis)

Netherlands (Mr Marjan Roman)

Nicaragua (Mr Ximena Flores)

Nigeria (H.E. Mr Michael Omolewa)

Portugal (Ms Ana Paula Zacarias)

Republic of Korea
 (Mr Jooseok Kim, Mr Gulwoo Lee)

Saint Lucia (Ms Vera Lacoeuilhe)

Senegal (Mr Ousman Blondin-Diop)

Spain (Mr Francisco Lopez Ruperez)

Sweden
 (Mr Jan Nyberg, Ms Margaretha
 Johnsson, Ms Anna Stellingner)

United Arab Emirates
 (M. Feddonh Kammah)

National Commissions

Georgia National Commission
 (Mr Dimitri Guindadze)

United Kingdom National Commission
 (Ms Sally Gear)

Permanent delegations to OECD

Delegation to OECD Australia
 (Ms Kerri Elgar)

Delegation to OECD Japan
 (Mr Takuji Hanatani)

European Commission

(Mr Gilles Fontaine)

Civil Society

Centre International d'études
 Pédagogiques
 (Ms Sadika Benslimane)

CNFA (M. Tikhobrazoff)

Comité des femmes africaines pour
 la paix et le développement
 (Ms Marie Thérèse Avemeka)

FICEMEA (M. Claude Vercoutère)

Global Campaign for Education
 (Ms Maggie Burns)

Global Campaign for Education, India
 (Mr Kailash Satyarthi)

GRETAF International
 (Mr Cheik Dem, Mr Michel Debeauvais)

IWGDD (Mr Hannu Savolainen)

Inclusion International
 (Ms Nancy Breitenbach)

OIEC
 (Mr Fulgence Koné, Ms Brigitte Huissier)

Journalists

Ms Ruth Nabakwe (AGENCE PANA)

Ms Hapolean Saboia (Brazil)

3. Agenda

8:30 am Registration

DAY 1: Information sharing: show and tell

Regional presentations and flagship programme presentations

9:30-11 am Chair: Mr Jacques Hallak, ADG/ED a.i.

- 9:30-10 am Opening by the Director-General of UNESCO
 10-10:20 am Regional presentations (Asia) by: India, Dhaka Ahsania Mission (Bangladesh), Roshni, A Civil Society Initiative (India)
 10:20-10:40 am Regional presentations (Africa) by: Senegal, Kenya, People for Action Forum (Zambia)
 10:40-11 am Regional presentations (Arab States) by: Bahrain, Arab Resource Collective, ALECSO

11-11:30 am Coffee Break

11:30 am-1 pm Chair: Ms Achala Moulik, India

- 11:30 am-12 noon Discussion
 12-12:10 pm Flagship presentation: United Nations Girls Education Initiative (UNGEI), by UNICEF (paper prepared jointly with UNESCO)
 12:10-12:20 pm Flagship presentation: Early Childhood Care and Education, by the Aga Khan Foundation (paper prepared jointly with UNESCO, UNICEF, Bernard Van Leer Foundation, Save the Children Alliance)
 12:20-12:40 pm Flagship presentation: HIV/AIDS, by UNICEF/IIEP (paper prepared jointly with WHO, the World Bank, USAID)
 12:40-1 pm Discussion

1-2 pm Lunch

2-3 pm Chair: Mr Efrem de Aguiar Maranhão, Brazil

- 2-2:10 pm Flagship presentation: Focusing Resources on Effective School Health (FRESH), by WHO/UNESCO (paper prepared jointly with UNICEF and the World Bank)
 2:10-2:20 pm Flagship presentation: Education in Situations of Emergency and Crisis, by UNESCO (paper prepared jointly with UNICEF and UNHCR)
 2:20-2:40 pm Flagship presentation: Teachers and Quality Education, by Education International (paper prepared jointly with UNESCO and UNICEF)
 2-3 pm Discussion

3-4:15 pm Chair: Mr Ali Ugur Tuncer, UNFPA

- 3-3:30 pm Regional presentations (Latin America and the Caribbean) by: OEI, CARICOM
 3:30-3:40 pm Presentation by Georgia
 3:40-4:15 pm Discussion

4:15-4:40 pm Coffee Break

4:40-6 pm Chair: Mr Steve Packer, Department for International Development (DFID)

- 4:40-6 pm Special interest group on the Dakar Framework 'global initiative'
 6:30 pm Director-General of UNESCO's reception

DAY 2: Analysis and discussion on key issues

9-10:45 am *Chair: Ms Salome Gichura, Kenya*

- 9-9:10 am Introduction by ADG/ED a.i.
 9:15-9:30 am *Linking of EFA plans with sector strategies and development objectives*
 Paper and presentation: Maris O'Rourke, the World Bank
 9:30-10 am Panel reaction: India, Action Aid Alliance, UNDP Resident Representative Mauritania
 10-10:45 am Discussion

10:45-11:15 am Coffee Break

11:15 am-1 pm *Chair: Mr Jean-Michel Severino, France*

- 11:15-11:30 am Mobilizing international support for Education for All
 Paper and presentation: Lene Buchert, UNESCO
 11:30 am-12:10 pm Panel reaction: G8, African Regional Development Bank, DFID, UNFPA
 12:10-1 pm Discussion

1-2 pm Lunch

2-3:30 pm *Chair: Ms Emily Vargas-Baron, USAID*

- 2-2:15 pm *Monitoring of Education for All Goals and Targets*
 Paper and presentation: Denise Lievesley, UNESCO Institute for Statistics
 2:30-3:30 pm Panel reaction: OECD, the World Bank, Brazil

3:30-4 pm Coffee Break

- 4-6 pm Three thematic groups to prepare recommendations on the themes: Linking of Education for All plans with sector strategies and development objectives, Mobilizing international support for Education for All, Monitoring of Education for All goals and targets.

DAY 3: Moving ahead

9-10:45 am *Chair: Ms Marian Moltano, Save the Children Alliance*

- 9-10 am Groups report back (20 minutes each)
 10-10:45 am Fine-tuning of recommendations

10:45-11:15 am Coffee Break

11:15 am-12:30 pm *Chair: Mr Jacques Hallak, ADG/ED a.i.*

- 11:15 am-12:15 pm How do we keep the momentum? Key advocacy and communication issues
 12:15-12:30 pm Conclusions by ADG/ED a.i.

4. List of documents

Organigrammes: Streamlining the Education Sector (November 1999)
UNESCO Secretariat HQ (15 November 2000)

Address by Mr Koïchiro Matsuura Director-General UNESCO at the meeting of the Development Assistance Committee, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, *“Education’s Role in Poverty Reduction: UNESCO Objectives and Concerns”*

Principal documents

Document number	Title	Author/Presenter
1	Post Dakar Activities Undertaken by the Dhaka Ahsania Mission	Presented by Kazi Rafiqul Alam, Dhaka Ahsania Mission
2	Monitoring systems of education programmes: The case of the ten-year education plan in Senegal	Presented by Pape Momar Sow, Senegal
3	Contributions to the Information Sharing on Progress and Constraints in the Dakar Follow-up from Members of the NGO Network in the Field of Education in Zambia	Presented by Jennifer Chiwela, People’s Action Forum
4	EFA in the Arab Region	Presented by Dr. Ali Fakhro, Bahrain
5	United Nations Girls’ Education Initiative. Summary of Status	Submitted by Mary Joy Pigozzi, UNICEF
6	Early Childhood Care and Education	Presented by Kathy Bartlett, Aga Khan Foundation for the Consultative Group on ECCD
7	UNESCO Strategy on HIV/AIDS and Education	Presented by Françoise Caillods, IIEP
8	Inter-Agency Working Group on AIDS, Schools and Education	Presented by Sheldon Shaeffer, UNICEF
9	Dakar Follow-up Activities prepared by the Organization of Ibero American States (original: spanish)	Presented by Dr Rosario Fernandez Santamaria, OIE
10	Education for All in the Caribbean	Prepared by Caribbean Community Secretariat
11	Teachers and the Quality of Education	Prepared by Education International
12	Achieving Education for All (EFA) through partnerships and linkages	Presented by The World Bank
13	Development Partner Co-operation in the Support of Education for All: Rationale and Strategies (short version)	Discussion paper presented by Lene Buchert
13b	Development Partner Co-operation in the Support of Education for All: Rationale and Strategies. A discussion paper (full-length version)	
13b Annex	Development Partner Co-operation in the Support of Education for All: Rationale and Strategies. Annex	
14	EFA Observatory based in the UNESCO Institute for Statistics	Presented by Denise Lievesley UNESCO Institute for Statistics
15	Focusing Resources on Effective School Health (FRESH)	Presented by J. Jones, WHO and A. M. Hoffmann-Barthès, UNESCO
16	The Initiative on Education in Situations of Emergency and Crisis	Presented by Kacem Bensalah, UNESCO
17	Education for All. Aspects of the Implementation of the Programme in Georgia	Prepared by Tamaz Tatishvili, Georgia
18	ROSHNI – a civil society initiative for relevant basic education for adolescents and young adults	Presented by Anil Bordia
19	How to translate EFA into reality	Notes by Ghanem Bibi Arab Resource Collective

Other documents distributed during the meeting

Welcome Address by Mr Koichiro Matsuura.

Achieving Education for All Through Partnerships and Linkages. A Presentation by the World Bank and UNDP at the first EFA Working Group (slides with notes)

Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan – A programme for Universal Elementary Education in India

Follow-up of Dakar – Brazil Statement. What Has Happened with the Education For All Program Since Dakar (Efrem de Aguiar Maranhão)

Brazilian Association of NGOs (ABONG) – Ação Educativa (Ms Vera Masagão Ribeiro)

Contribution from France

Report to the Education for All Working Group. Contribution, United States Agency for International Development

Preparation of National Plans of Action. Country Guidelines

Dakar Framework for Action

First Meeting of the Working Group on EFA – Japan's Contribution Paper.

What is an EFA plan (by Sheldon Shaeffer) Categories of Criteria

TOR (Terms of reference) for Thematic Group 1/A (Linking EFA Plans)

TOR (Terms of reference) for Thematic Group 2/B (Mobilizing International Support)

TOR (Terms of reference) for Thematic Group 3/C (Monitoring EFA goals and targets)

How do we keep up the momentum?

Notes on educational quality and Teachers (Sheldon Shaeffer, UNICEF)

Report Group 1 Thematic Group: Planning for the Achievement of Education for All (M. Parker)

Report Group 2 Thematic Group: Mobilizing International Support for Education for All

Report Group 3 Thematic Group: Monitoring of EFA Goals and Targets

Global Campaign for Education, Strategic Options for taking forward Dakar's "Global Initiative"

Transparencies – Mary Pigozzi

FRESH – Examples of Actions Undertaken since the Dakar World Education Forum

Organigramme: Division for the Promotion of Quality Education

IWGDD International Working Group on Disability and Development

Mobilization Plan for the National EFA Plan Preparation. Regional Proposal. Draft prepared by UNESCO/UNICEF Latin America and Caribbean Region

Closing Statement of Mr Hallak - Quelques Elements de Conclusion (FRENCH ONLY)

Statement by Mr Michel de la Taille, UNDP Mauritania (FRENCH ONLY)