



United Nations  
Educational, Scientific and  
Cultural Organization

Organisation  
des Nations Unies  
pour l'éducation,  
la science et la culture

Organización  
de las Naciones Unidas  
para la Educación,  
la Ciencia y la Cultura

Организация  
Объединенных Наций по  
вопросам образования,  
науки и культуры

منظمة الأمم المتحدة  
للتربية والعلم والثقافة

联合国教育、  
科学及文化组织

## Internal Oversight Service Evaluation Section

IOS/EVS/PI/26  
Original: English

# Evaluation of the “Mobile Teams of Experts for EFA” Project

Robert Langley Smith, LINS  
Anders Breidlid, LINS  
Ellen Carm, LINS  
Tove Kvil, LINS  
Titus Tenga, LINS  
and Janne Lexow, LINS/DECO  
April 2004

The designations employed and the presentation of material throughout this document do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of UNESCO concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area of its authorities, or concerning its frontiers or boundaries.

**REPORT OF AN EVALUATION OF THE 'MOBILE TEAMS OF  
EXPERTS FOR EFA' PROJECT**

**LINS, OSLO UNIVERSITY COLLEGE**

**AUGUST 2003**

REVISED NOVEMBER 2003

REVISED FEBRUARY 2004

# EVALUATION OF THE UNESCO MOBILE TEAM OF EXPERTS PROJECT

## CONTENTS

List of abbreviations used	4
Acknowledgements	5
Executive Summary	6
<b>1. INTRODUCTION: BACKGROUND TO THE MOBILE TEAMS OF EXPERTS CONCEPT</b>	<b>10</b>
1.1. Background to EFA	10
1.2. The Norwegian Funded ‘Mobile Teams of Experts’ Project	11
1.3. Operationalisation of the MTE concept	13
1.4. The country selection procedure	14
1.5. UNESCO’S Decentralisation policy	16
1.6 Evaluating progress towards EFA through the MTE concept	19
<b>2. COUNTRY CASE STUDIES</b>	<b>21</b>
2.1. Introduction	21
2.2. Field report from Cambodia	22
2.3. Field report from Haiti	28
2.4. Field report from Indonesia	34
2.5. Field report from the Sudan	42
<b>3. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS: RESPONSE TO THE TORs</b>	<b>49</b>
3.1. Introduction	49
3.2. Contextual issues	49

3.3. Inputs	50
3.4. Processes	51
3.5. Products	52
3.6. Decentralisation in theory and practice	53
3.7. Summing up	56
<b>4. ANNEXURES</b>	<b>59</b>
4.1. Terms of Reference for the evaluation	59
4.2 Sample Itineraries	66
4.3. People met and interviewed	69
4.4. List of documents consulted	71

## List of abbreviations used

CIPP	Context, inputs, processes, products (Stufflebeam's model of evaluation)
DECO/NCG	Development Consulting/Nordic Consulting Group
DFU	Dakar Follow-up Unit
ECCD	Early Childhood Care and Development
EFA	Education for All
EMIS	Education Management Information System
ESR	Education Sector Review
FO	Field Office
GTZ	German Agency for Development Cooperation
ICT	Information and Communication Technology
IIEP	International Institute for Educational Planning
INGO	International Non-Governmental Organisation
LDC	Least Developed Countries
LINS	International Education Centre, Oslo University College
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MENJS	Haitian Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports
MOE	Ministry of Education
MOEYC	Ministry of Education Youth and Culture
MOEYS	Ministry of Education Youth and Sports
MTE	Mobile Teams of Experts
NEP	NGOs Education Partnership (Cambodia)
NFE	Non-formal education
NFIT	Norwegian Funds in Trust
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NPA	National Plan of Action
PTA	Parent-teacher Association
SMC	School Management Committee
TORs	Terms of Reference
WB	World Bank
WG	Working Group
WGECCD	Working Group on Early Childhood Care and Development

## **Acknowledgements**

The LINS team of Ellen Carm, Tove Kvil, Anders Breidlid, Titus Tenga, Janne Lexow and Robert Smith would like to thank UNESCO Paris for the opportunity to share in this important evaluation of the Mobile Teams of Experts concept. The exercise was doubly interesting and valuable to LINS as an international education centre which focuses on basic education and teacher education as its main areas of activity. First, to be able to follow progress within the EFA movement by assessing a particular activity in four selected countries provided valuable insight into issues and challenges on the ground. Our involvement in the recent review of progress towards EFA presented in Oslo by Professor Colclough had given LINS staff a broad overview of a largely quantitative type. Our opportunities to observe first hand in Cambodia, Haiti, Indonesia and Sudan complemented this perspective in a unique way. Secondly, the main *raison d'être* for LINS, as revealed in our mission statement, is to support and extend the push for Education for All in as many forms as possible. Formal schooling, non-formal education, community schools and adult literacy programmes are all aspects of the educational portfolio of LINS and we have found it stimulating and professionally rewarding to carry out this particular study

We should therefore like to record our thanks to the UNESCO and Ministry staff who welcomed our review team in the four countries. It was also very valuable to meet representatives of NGOs and other development organisations engaged in EFA in the broadest sense. We owe all these people our sincere thanks.

Finally we should like to thank UNESCO Headquarters staff in Paris for all their assistance. The evaluation team received extensive comments from a number of Headquarters staff both in writing and at a face-to-face de-briefing. As far as possible we have incorporated these comments into the revised report.

A particular word of thanks is due to Min Jeong Kim who provided information, briefing opportunities and guidance in numerous ways. Thank you very much for your kind cooperation.

*The views and opinions expressed in this report are entirely those of LINS, the International Education Centre of Oslo University College. They do not necessarily represent the views of the UN Organisations contacted, nor the Ministries of Education and Non-Governmental Organisations in the countries reviewed.*

## **Executive Summary**

- This evaluation was undertaken within a context of UNESCO's responsibility for mobilising and supporting Member States in their pursuit of strategies for achieving Education for All (EFA)
- UNESCO's focus at the individual country level was conceived of as including support for national EFA planning, capacity building, mobilisation of partners and the monitoring of progress
- The Norwegian-funded Mobile Teams of Experts (MTE) concept was designed specifically to provide technical assistance for countries in developing or improving national plans for EFA
- An agreement on the operationalisation of this concept was reached in November 2001, laying out procedures such as country selection, based on assessment of current progress towards EFA goals and their needs for strengthening planning capacity
- UNESCO's decentralisation policy formed an important strategic background to the MTE concept, especially in terms of country selection and other processes
- From the outset, it was agreed that the Norwegian Government would be kept informed of progress, hence the current evaluation focusing on efficiency, relevance, effectiveness and sustainability of the MTE interventions
- The evaluation team settled on a conceptual framework for the assessment based on Stufflebeam's Context, Inputs, Processes and Products (CIPP) model
- In consultation with UNESCO Headquarters in Paris, four countries were selected for the case studies - Cambodia, Haiti, Indonesia and Sudan
- The evaluation in Cambodia revealed that EFA Working Groups were in place and that the relevance and quality of MTE inputs were gauged as high. The Ministry felt that they could have been more deeply involved in certain aspects of the work (e.g. preparation of TORs). NGOs now occupied a more prominent position in planning and preparation and were included in the donor meetings. Overall the MTE concept was not known or understood in Cambodia. A considerable debate had arisen over the use of consultants for capacity building anyway. Experience from the MTE programme had shown that short-term consultants did not contribute much to local capacity building. Funding for MTE had not been used efficiently and the demands placed on consultants were complex. However, three out of four assignments had been completed and the outcomes were generally

satisfactory despite some criticisms from Working Group members. The WGs were in fact strengthened, adding to the sustainability of EFA work in Cambodia. Cambodia had been proactive in getting EFA planning off the ground and had developed strong ownership through the partnerships developed with UNESCO and NGOs. Bangkok office of UNESCO had certainly 'added value' to the process.

- Haiti's educational context has been described as 'catastrophic' yet MTE support enabled the Ministry to complete its National EFA in March 2003 within a more general strategic plan for education.. A strategic focus had been developed and there was good cooperation among donors, Government and NGOs. MTE was used to consolidate the present arrangements for planning and UNESCO took a key role in the preparation of special studies. UNESCO itself has become a stabilising influence in a difficult environment and local networks are also strong. Long-term needs remain to be filled and sustainability in a context of systemic deterioration is a matter for concern.
- Indonesia's planning for EFA is developing within a context of education sector reform. EFA will be integrated into the current five-year plan (1999 to 2004). Working Groups for EFA have been set up as elsewhere and a plan of action is being prepared. Coordination between the EFA work and that for the ESR is an issue which is being addressed. Because of the size and complexity of Indonesia's education system there has only been a general contribution to planning capacity. A national impact is hard to identify and there are considerable variations in capacity from province to province. The MTE modality has not proved fully effective in Indonesia. Sustainability demands a longer time-span for MTE inputs. Lessons learned from Indonesia include the need for more open and participatory procedures as 'donorship' seems to remain strong.
- For Sudan, Paris, Beirut, Cairo and Khartoum were all involved in the MTE programme. However, the input from UNESCO has not been extensive and the linkage between Beirut, Cairo and Khartoum has not worked well. Decentralisation has not been effective in this case due to the differing degrees of commitment of staff at the various levels. There has been poor communication between Cairo and Khartoum in particular and the original proposal from Khartoum was changed before it reached Headquarters.. Funds remain underspent although the national EFA plan has been completed. Local planning competence is high but implementation will be the crucial area for continued UNESCO support. In this preparation phase inputs from Cairo have been too few and goals have not been clearly identified. UNESCO's role could have been much more effective and



sustained. It is important that UNESCO continues to support capacity building more effectively in order to sustain the EFA momentum.

- UNESCO's decentralised structure played an important role in operationalising the MTE concept but in some cases it did not work as well as might have been expected. EFA plans have been advanced or strengthened in all the cases studied but contextual issues determined to a large extent the relevance and effectiveness of MTE assistance, especially the capacity of existing structures. UNESCO's own criteria for decentralisation need to be used more effectively to ensure that the twin concepts of relative autonomy and accountability are balanced. The effectiveness of the implementation modalities was not especially evident except in the case of the Bangkok office although some issues connected with their management of decentralisation remained problematic. In short, it can be stated that most of the criteria for decentralisation were observed to some extent but the modality still needs time to get established fully and will need continuing support.
- In each of the four countries selected as case studies EFA planning is well advanced although progress varies from place to place. Overall, it can be said that UNESCO's assistance was relevant both to the needs of the Member States and to the mandate of UNESCO itself. In some cases support was highly relevant; in others, such as Sudan, it was less prominent.
- In terms of effectiveness, the quality of planning has also been enhanced. Factors in this process have included the capacity of the relevant Ministry of Education and the quality of consultancy inputs. The MTE modality has proved itself a sound concept but it was not sufficiently known and understood by recipients. UNESCO needs to consider the importance of this issue for any continuation of the concept and for other innovations it promotes. Coordination within the UN system has generally been satisfactory with the exception of the Beirut-Cairo-Khartoum relationship. Monitoring has not been a strong feature of the MTE programme. Progress has varied but is generally satisfactory.
- Work has been carried out in a reasonably efficient manner although it is too soon to form a judgement in the case of Haiti. Local capacity has been the dominant factor. Cambodia was able to use 85% of the budget available, Haiti has spent the available budget according to plans and Indonesia has utilised 33%. There were few records available for Haiti or Sudan. The Haitian Ministry regarded the MTE inputs as 'central' to their requirements. Overall, it is not clear that decentralisation of UNESCO activities always worked efficiently.

- Key processes deriving from the MTE concept include capacity building and competence building. These were not always achieved. As a general observation these processes need to be given greater prominence. More needs to be done in terms of transparency, ownership and the greater use of local competence.
- Products from the MTE process were clearly identified in terms of finalised plans, enhanced quality, enhanced capacity and, in some cases, materials made available. Engagement with MTE as an international strategy increased Ministry awareness and confidence in many cases. Help from UNESCO assisted the national EFA co-ordinator in Sudan significantly. In some cases, assessment of products or outcomes was made more difficult by the lack of record keeping.
- Sustainability is highly problematic, especially in the poorer countries. Beneficiaries have been engaged in some countries, especially NGOs, and capacity has been built. Assistance has not always been compatible with national requirements and much more needs to be done in terms of ensuring real ownership. Coordination with donors has been well managed in some countries. There is no doubt that the MTE model could and should be replicated, especially where implementation of EFA plans poses a major challenge to governments.
- Risks associated with the MTE concept include ensuring ownership by the recipients, more careful selection of consultants, deeper engagement by existing structures (such as the EFA WGs), ensuring a proper balance between products (plans) and processes (capacity building). In addition, it is essential that the potential and capacity of UNESCO at its various levels is fully understood by Member States, within the UN system, within Government and particularly within the Ministry of Education.
- In summary it can be said that the MTE strategy was well conceived but might have been 'marketed' and operationalised more effectively. Relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, quality and sustainability were features of the strategy but, as would be expected, varied from context to context. Given the lessons from experience incorporated into this report, the MTE concept should be supported, especially in terms of how it can function well within a decentralised system to take on board those lessons and to assist countries in the operationalisation and implementation of their EFA plans.

# 1. INTRODUCTION: BACKGROUND TO THE MOBILE TEAMS OF EXPERTS CONCEPT

## 1.1. Background to EFA

At the World Education Forum in Dakar, Senegal, in 2000 delegates agreed on the following six EFA goals that were considered to be essential, attainable and affordable:

- Expand and improve comprehensive early childhood care and education;
- Ensure free, compulsory and quality primary education for all children by 2015;
- Ensure access to learning and life skills programmes for young people and adults;
- Achieve a 50% improvement in adult literacy, especially among women, by 2015;
- Eliminate gender disparities in primary and secondary education by 2005 and achieve gender equality by 2015;
- Improve all aspects of the quality of education and skills acquisition.

Worth recalling here is the fact that in the same year the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) were announced, two of which related to education – universal primary school (UPE) and elimination of gender disparities - and were agreed and indeed defined as crucial to the elimination of extreme poverty. It goes without saying that the MDGs complement the Dakar Framework in that they provide an opportunity to argue the case for EFA within the collective effort to eradicate poverty.

Following the commitments made at Dakar, the Dakar Framework for Action requests all countries

*“To build on existing national sector strategies, and to develop or strengthen existing national plans of action by 2002 at the latest. These plans should be integrated into a wider poverty reduction and development framework, and should be developed through more transparent and democratic processes, involving stakeholders, especially people’s representatives, community leaders, parents, learners, non-governmental organisation (NGOs) and civil society. The plan will address problems associated with the chronic under-financing of basic education by establishing budget priorities that reflect a commitment to achieving EFA goals and targets at the earliest possible date, and no late than 2015. They will also set out clear strategies for overcoming the special problems facing those currently excluded from education opportunities, with a clear commitment to girls’ education and gender equity.”*

(The Dakar Framework for Action, par. 9)

Explicit within the above statement, the Dakar Framework recognises and indeed clearly states that **‘the heart of EFA activity lies at the country level’** and therefore, Governments have an obligation to ensure that the agreed EFA goals and targets are reached and sustained. Within the Dakar Framework, UNESCO has the mandate to mobilise and co-ordinate EFA partners in maintaining their collaborative momentum. Thus, according to UNESCO’s *Policy Statement on Co-operation with Donors for the Dakar Follow-up Actions*, the Organisation’s role is twofold. On one hand, the Organisation is responsible for providing country-level **technical assistance**, in the form of policy advice on key areas of its own competence. On the other hand, it is charged with **mobilising** resources and **co-ordinating** EFA partners at global, regional and national levels in their respective EFA processes. Accordingly, UNESCO sees and defines its functions and actions for the Dakar follow-up in four areas.

**Supporting National EFA Action Plans**, with the focus on assisting the countries to develop (according to their needs) and implement their national EFA plan.

**Capacity building**, first for national stakeholders who are responsible for preparing and implementing the National EFA plans and secondly, in building and sustaining capacity among educators, including policy and decision makers, heads of institutions, curriculum developers, trainers and teachers.

**Mobilising partners** at the global and regional level to mobilise resources and promote inter-agency co-operation and collaboration in the various EFA processes. The establishment and meetings of the High-level Group and Working Group of EFA, will be the key mechanisms for reviewing the above respectively.

**Monitoring progress** by issuing an independent annual EFA Monitoring Report, the preparation for which will be co-ordinated by the Dakar Follow-up Unit.

It is in pursuit of its first two functions above that UNESCO commissioned the ‘Mobile Teams of Experts’ project.

## **1.2. The Norwegian funded ‘Mobile Teams of Experts’ Project**

The Norwegian funded ‘Mobile Teams of Experts for EFA’ project was established through an agreement between the Government of Norway and UNESCO. The project has been funded through Norwegian Funds-in-Trust (NFIT) to UNESCO. The aim of NFIT was to support UNESCO’s technical assistance in EFA planning at the country level. According to

the Terms of Reference for this evaluation (see Annexure), the NFIT ‘Mobile Teams of Experts’ project reflects UNESCO’s Regular Programme and Budget 31 C/5 (2002-2003) paragraph 01110, which states that:

*“The General Conference authorises the Director-General to implement a corresponding plan of action in order to lay the foundations to ensure the right to education for all through the realisation of the six goals of the Dakar Framework for Action by coordinating EFA partners and maintaining their collective momentum in designing strategies and mobilising resources in support of national efforts; and strengthen institutional capacities and promote national policy dialogue to enable Member States to draw up their EFA national action plans and begin to implement them”.*

(Terms of Reference page 1).

The concept of Mobile Teams of Experts evolved over time. Originating from the office of the Director General of UNESCO, early thinking was for the setting up of mobile teams at Headquarters and possibly at Field Offices. Lack of resources, both financial and human prevented this idea from becoming operational. However, Norway supported the concept and what emerged was a revised notion of providing technical consultancy services to fulfil the goals the DG had in mind. Traditional forms of technical assistance were considered by UNESCO officials as too expensive and insufficiently demand-driven therefore TA was more broadly conceived of by UNESCO as incorporating national expertise, institution building, capacity building and a variety of other forms of support. The initial notion of ‘Mobile Teams of Experts’ suggested the idea of some sort of permanent structure or team that moves from one country to another providing technical assistance as and when needed. As indicated, this shifted to more of a concern with more flexible forms of support. The term ‘Mobile Teams of Experts’ embodied the technical services needed for guiding the activities at the country level, and does not refer to a structure as such. It is seen more as a concept that will be implemented flexibly with different groups of experts and different types of inputs, as needed and requested by particular countries. Depending on the needs/requests submitted to UNESCO, the five Divisions at the Education sector at UNESCO’s Headquarters (ED/EPS), in collaboration with Cluster and Field Offices were to co-ordinate the task of forming and participating in the ‘Mobile Teams of Experts’. Thus, the notion of MTE only refers to the process UNESCO supports by assisting in identifying the needs at the national level in consultation with the recipient countries. This in turn leads to the selection and engagement of different experts

and/or institutions to assist Member States in the elaboration and revision of their National Action Plans for EFA. The main objective of the MTE project was thus laid out to be:

*“To assist Member States in developing and/or strengthening National Plans for EFA through targeted interventions of technical services”.*

From this main objective, three more concrete expectations of the MTE were envisaged as follows:

- At least 10 targeted countries to be fully engaged in EFA planning processes, such as policy development and plan readjustment in accordance with the Dakar Framework for Action.
- Increased and improved participation of national EFA stakeholders in the planning and consultations for EFA.
- Capacities of governments increased in policy formulation and co-ordination for EFA implementation.

It can be seen therefore, that MTE embodies the notion of UNESCO supporting countries technically in preparing EFA plans in specific areas identified by the countries themselves and in the ways preferred by the individual countries. In fact, over time the term ‘MTE’ was largely replaced by expressions such as ‘technical support’ and ‘technical services’ in official documents sent to field offices

### **1.3. Operationalisation of the MTE concept**

The agreement between the Government of Norway and UNESCO which established this project, was signed in November 2001. As stated in the agreement, the aim of the programme was ‘to assist UNESCO in implementing the following activities: Forming and operationalising *Mobile Teams of Experts* for technical assistance and sending the *Mobile Teams of Experts* to no less than 10 identified target countries’. In order to prepare the implementation framework of the project, ED/EPS sent a letter to Field Offices (FOs), together with the application form for Funds-in-Trust Norway, on 28<sup>th</sup> January 2002 inviting them to present countries for selection under this project. The letter was explicit in mentioning that all FOs were eligible for applying and therefore, national and cluster offices were invited to submit a complete support proposal form, in consultation with Regional Bureaux. The letter also clarified the distribution of responsibilities between FOs and ED/EPS in order to ensure efficient implementation of the project. While ED/EPS was entrusted with the overall responsibility for technical support and monitoring, the FOs were to be fully responsible for

the implementation of their activities. Furthermore, the letter stated that the selection of countries for participation in the NFIT/MTE project would be done by the ED/EPS and that once the participating countries were selected, corresponding funds would be decentralised to the field offices concerned for execution. The deadline for submission of applications at Headquarters was initially 8 February, but this was later extended to 15 February 2002.

At this point, it is important to emphasise that the application form entitled ‘Country Support Strategy for EFA Planning’ was designed with a view to evaluating the situation in countries wishing to participate in the project. The form included five broad questions: (i) Appraisal of the current status of the preparation of EFA plans at country level with particular emphasis on the national strategies adopted for preparing EFA plans; (ii) FOs’ efforts for support in the preparation of EFA plans, especially assessment of country needs and identification of specific areas for technical assistance from UNESCO, etc.; (iii) The catalytic role played by FOs contributing to donor co-ordination mechanisms, especially for joint and concerted support to the preparation of the EFA plans in line with broader development frameworks; (iv) The specific activities proposed under the Norwegian Trust Funds with a view to providing relevant technical expertise; (v) Assessment of difficulties faced by Field Offices in providing required technical support.

By the deadline date, 17 Field Offices (FOs) had submitted applications (project proposals) for support to 32 countries in the preparation/reinforcement of national EFA plans under the Norwegian Trust Funds<sup>1</sup>. Applications submitted after the deadline were to be considered for examination and funding under other sources.

#### **1.4. The country selection procedure**

As intimated earlier, UNESCO Headquarters carried out the selection of countries to participate in the MTE/NFIT project. At the Headquarters, ED/EPS which was designated the task of designing the implementation framework for NFIT, as well as co-ordinating the budget and ensuring quality control of the proposed activities, set-up a technical team for examination of project proposals. The technical team which comprised representatives from ED/BAS, ED/EPS and ED/EO, proceeded with the evaluation of the applications in the light of the specifications outlined in the application form and also on the basis of the agreed

---

<sup>1</sup> It is here worth mentioning that PROAP Bangkok proposed a consolidated proposal for six countries – Cambodia, Lao PDR, Indonesia, Thailand, Korea DPR, Mongolia in cooperation with UNESCO Cambodia, UNESCO Beijing, UNESCO Jakarta. Thailand later dropped out as not requiring TA

framework between the Government of Norway and UNESCO. Consequently, four criteria were developed to guide the selection process for countries to participate in the NFIT:

- The development level of the countries, on the assumption that LDCs have the lowest school enrolments and the most pressing needs for technical assistance in the preparation of the EFA plans.
- The efforts so far made by FOs for assessing the country needs for technical assistance, including the design of project documents for comprehensive support in the preparation of EFA plans in co-operation with the other agencies.
- The proposed modalities of support to countries, implying that this NFIT is primarily for the provision of technical expertise as stipulated by the donor country
- In proposing support, priority to be given to EFA planning, due to its urgency, over other implementation activities.

On 7 March 2002, the Technical Team concluded its work and proposed 16 countries (as against the initial target of 10 countries) to be supported under the NFIT project. The expansion was due to two factors, according to the Technical Team. Based on estimations that the Norwegian FIT of US\$ 600,000 (including 13% agency fees) was to cover 10 countries, giving an average of US\$50,000 per country, the Technical Team noted that, first, PROAP Bangkok submitted a consolidated proposal for 6 countries with a total amount of US\$166,000. Secondly, other offices e.g. UNESCO Port-au-Prince, presented proposals for lesser amounts. Hence, this enabled more countries to benefit from the same budget of the Norwegian FIT. Consequently, the following FOs (representing the 16 countries) were proposed for participation in this NFIT project:

- UNESCO Dar es Salaam: Comoros
- UNESCO Dakar: Sierra Leone
- UNESCO Bangkok: Cambodia, Lao PDR, Indonesia, Thailand, Korea DPR, Mongolia
- UNESCO Kathmandu: Nepal
- UNESCO Almaty: Tajikistan
- UNESCO Port-au-Prince: Haiti
- UNESCO Guatemala: Guatemala
- UNESCO Santo Domingo: Dominican Republic
- UNESCO Cairo: Sudan



- UNESCO Beirut: Yemen
- UNESCO Sarajevo: Bosnia and Herzegovina.

By region, the distribution is 2 in sub-Saharan Africa; 3 in Asia; 2 in the Middle East region; 3 in Latin America and 1 in Europe. This proposal was endorsed on March 8, 2002 and in the letter to the selected FOs, ED/EPS reiterated and emphasised the distribution of responsibilities between the FOs and Headquarters in order to ensure efficient technical and administrative co-ordination between them. The FOs were designated as fully responsible for the implementation of their activities and to keep ED/EPS regularly informed, while ED/EPS was entrusted with overall responsibility for technical support and monitoring and ensuring appropriate modalities for this purpose, as mentioned earlier. Indeed, 60% of available funds were immediately allotted to the FOs concerned for expediting technical support in the preparation of national EFA plans, the remainder upon approval of progress reports.

In order to place the activities of the ‘Mobile Teams of Experts’ in their right perspective, and indeed, as requested in the ‘Terms of Reference’, it is important to trace and locate its operations within the wider context of UNESCO’s decentralisation process for the Dakar follow-up actions.

### **1.5. UNESCO’s decentralisation policy**

In the aftermath of the World Education Forum in 2000, UNESCO decided to pursue a decentralisation strategy in pursuit of its obligations for the Dakar Framework. At the country level, the EFA Forum was to be the ultimate authority to oversee the execution of the National EFA Action Plan. It would serve as a counterpart to UNESCO in confirming the country’s involvement in the Action Plan, working with the ‘Mobile Teams of Experts’, organising in-country capacity building workshops, as well as implementing concrete programmes to tackle priority EFA issues in the country.

UNESCO’s Regional, Cluster and Country Offices, that is UNESCO Field Offices (FOs), were to get together with the Headquarters in working out how to support the Action Plan. The Field Offices’ main task would be to assist the national EFA Forum to implement and monitor the Action Plan, a task which included, among other things, identifying donors to help fund the implementation of the National EFA Plans, the priority EFA issues and operational measures that UNESCO had helped to develop. UNESCO’s co-ordination and facilitation roles at the country, sub-regional and regional level were to be carried out by the

Field Offices, whose collective activities would be co-ordinated at the global level by the Dakar Follow-up Unit (DFU) at UNESCO Headquarters.

At UNESCO Headquarters, the five Divisions of the Education Sector and the DFU were to be the two focal points for the implementation of the EFA goals. The Divisions' main responsibility was to develop the criteria for National EFA plans and compile feasible policy options for key EFA issues. The DFU was to be responsible for the undertaking of activities planned at the global or international level, mainly the High-Level Group and the Working Group on EFA meetings and their related activities. Field Offices in liaison with DFU would carry out mapping of these activities at the country, sub-regional and regional levels, as well as overseeing the inter-regional co-ordination.

In principle, therefore, activities were to be decentralised to the countries and to the UNESCO Field Offices. The Headquarters' responsibility was to provide an overall framework in which the individual activities in the regions would be held together coherently and offer technical assistance as and when requested. In this way, UNESCO hoped its decentralisation strategy would increase its effectiveness in its Member States and Associate Member States. Moreover, UNESCO also wished its decentralisation process to 'be seen as a means to ensure that UNESCO designs and implements programmes that, although global in scope, are adapted to the needs and specific circumstances of Member States, with particular attention to developing countries and their local socio-economic, geographical, cultural and political context' (see the *UNESCO Worldwide Decentralization Strategy* document).

UNESCO's '*Capacity building for EFA. Extra-budgetary Programme for Technical Services to Member States*' serves to illustrate the decentralisation policy of the Organisation even more concretely. As articulated in the Programme Implementation Structure of this policy document, approximately 75% of the funds raised will be decentralised in line with UNESCO's decentralisation policy. Under the decentralised structure, a screening committee, headed by an Assistant Director-General of Education, carries out selection of the projects within the framework of this programme. However, a committee made up of representatives of Divisions at Headquarters, Field Offices and Institutes on a rotating basis decides on the way donor funds should be allocated following the in-house bidding process. The Executive Office in the Education Sector ensures that the implementation of activities presented within the EFA programme will be undertaken in a coherent manner so that stated results are achieved in respective countries. In addition, it will also facilitate the overall monitoring and

evaluation of the projects implemented within the programme, as well as the programme itself.

Regional Bureaux have a key role to play in building up a consensus on regional priorities and strategies and therefore would co-ordinate the activities performed by Cluster/National Offices. More specifically, Regional Bureaux were to provide expertise as needed by Cluster/National Offices and help in forming networks and linkages that would facilitate sharing of expertise and experience within the region. Funds would be allocated/given to the Regional Bureaux to allow them to fulfil this function. Cluster and National Offices, as the grass roots of the Organisation, had the most important role to play. The major part of funds from the donors would be allocated to the Cluster/National Offices, as they are responsible for actual implementation on the ground. In addition to funds, they would also be given considerable autonomy to decide on their priorities, strategies and implementation programmes at field level.

UNESCO institutes too had a central role to play. As a number of them have regional focus and have also developed specific capacities, Regional Bureaux and Cluster/National Offices could call upon them for specific capacity building assistance.

In designing the concrete implementation framework for the project, the Division of Education and Strategy of the Education Sector of UNESCO, in consultation with the field officers and other ED Divisions concerned, put emphasis on the following three aspects:

- Areas of support to countries should be demand-driven (and not supply driven)
- The assistance should conform to the on-going decentralisation policy of the Organisation.
- Technical assistance will be both results-oriented and supportive of the EFA process in the context of sector-wide planning at country level.

Some comment is necessary at this stage on the relationship between the expressed goals and intentions of the decentralisation policy and how it has worked out in practice. The MTE evaluation required the evaluators to look specifically at the 'explicit decentralisation structure and the effectiveness of the strategy'. This is dealt with in section 3.6. below but as an advance organiser it is worth recording at this point that the basic criteria for decentralisation of UNESCO's activities were approved by the Executive Board and subsequently the General Council to include responsibility for strategic planning, for integration of activities with the regular UN system, for establishing and maintaining relationships with stakeholders and beneficiaries, for establishing and maintaining networks, for managing financial and human resources and for programme results. These criteria will be

looked at in 3.6. the light of findings from the field and other sources. It should also be noted at this stage of the evaluation report that many initiatives have been taken by UNESCO over the years to help establish an effective decentralisation process and periodic reviews of the effectiveness of the strategy are required by the Executive Board through regular evaluation exercises. It is hoped that this report will contribute to the Board's knowledge.

## **1.6. Evaluating progress towards EFA through the MTE concept**

This evaluation was foreseen from the outset of the project and therefore, is stipulated in the donor agreement which states the following (paragraph 11):

*UNESCO shall provide the Government of Norway with a final evaluation report no later than three months after the termination of the Agreement, containing such elements as are essential for an assessment of the programme and the results of the relevant activities, as well as UNESCO's own conclusions thereon....*

(Terms of Reference page 2).

Here, it is important to note that the agreement to undertake an evaluation was an outcome of a long discussion on optimal utilisation of extra-budgetary resources, and the necessity for development of strategic thinking in the approach to contributing to EFA between the donor and UNESCO. The donor and UNESCO agreed that the contribution for this particular project would be the initial stepping-stone for Norway-UNESCO's larger scale co-operation under the EFA Programme, and as a secondary objective, a thorough evaluation of the activities undertaken. In accordance with the TORs, the evaluation was designed to focus on:

- The **efficiency of the implementation modalities** in place for execution of the Project (with special emphasis on the explicit decentralisation structure) and the effectiveness of this strategy according to the overall goals of the UNESCO programme for support to EFA and this particular project.
- The **relevance of the initial project idea** in relation to the proposal from the field offices (i.e. the needed of the beneficiary countries) as well as **the effectiveness of the project** (objectives, expected results and proposed activities) against the output and results actually achieved).
- The **sustainability of the capacity of beneficiaries** for policy development and national EFA planning.

The main stakeholders of the evaluation were intended to be the countries that benefited from this project, Governments and civil society; UNESCO's ED Sector and participating field

offices. The donor Norway and partner agencies within the EFA movement were also perceived as beneficiaries.

Any evaluation must proceed from a sound technical and theoretical basis. Research has been defined as 'systematic enquiry within an appropriate theoretical framework' and this evaluation has been approached in the same way. Although there are many models for evaluation (see Pawson and Tilley, 2000 for an extensive treatment of the field), a fairly straightforward and practical theoretical position has been adopted, that of Stufflebeam (see Stufflebeam and Kellagher, 1993). Stufflebeam suggests that evaluation of projects or programs should be based on analysis of **the context, the inputs, the processes involved and the products or outcomes** of the intervention. This 'CIPP' model has informed the process of evaluation which is described below. Out of the country case studies, each based on CIPP, sound recommendations should flow. It should also be noted that the evaluation team, having decided to adopt Stufflebeam's approach as a general framework proceeded to develop jointly an approach to the methods of enquiry. Janne Lexow of DECO/NCG had done some preliminary work on drafting issues and questions arising from the ToRs but the field team spent time together refining and expanding the set of questions to an agreed broad format. It was always understood that these questions would function as guidelines to ensure that field reports were structured similarly, thus assisting in the construction of a coherent report. In this last connection, the format for the country reports was also agreed.

The report which follows was prepared by a team of five LINS staff. Country reports were prepared by Tove Kvil (Haiti), Anders Breidlid (Sudan) and Ellen Carm (Cambodia and Indonesia). Hence there are variations in style and substance although the approach to in-country enquiries and the format for reporting were based on an agreed structure as noted above. In addition to the country reports, additional background material, summarising and editing were contributed by Titus Tenga and Robert Smith.

## 2. THE COUNTRY CASE STUDIES

### 2.1. Introduction

The country case studies were based upon documentary background information on the concept of MTE, its objectives and the process of country-wise and regional applications to UNESCO for assistance. These applications were themselves based upon national needs in pursuing the EFA processes. The actual fieldwork was organized through the following procedures:

- In depth interviews with UNESCO's educational officers at a variety of levels. *(These and all other interviews were based on a semi-structured format developed in advance by the LINS team)*
- Interviews with regional/national directors at UNESCO offices.
- Interviews with individuals/or group discussions with governmental bodies, those responsible for the development of the EFA planning and implementation strategies.
- Interviews with relevant stakeholders, such as INGOs, local NGOs, UN-agencies and donor representatives, either individually, or within group discussions.
- Field visits to some institutions/districts that had benefited from MTE support.
- Documentary analyses, related to EFA planning procedures, EFA plans and relevant work of UNESCO directed towards the MTE strategy.
- E-mail correspondence with selected UNESCO offices

As noted above, the broad format for interview guides and questioning had been determined in advance although field-related flexibility was encouraged. The approach to documentary analysis had also been agreed in terms of searching the documents for indications of agreed approaches to pushing the EFA process forward and assessing what role the Mobile Teams of Experts might play in this objective and whether the MTEs actually helped achieve such goals. The basic conceptual framework was one of internal and external consistency – did the documents say the same things and were the positions reflected in the documents consistent with UNESCO's broad policy statements. Interestingly, throughout the field visits the concept of MTE, or even the existence of such a mechanism, was not fully understood among MOE and other governmental representatives in the countries visited, among other UN

organizations, among the donors or among local and international NGOs. Not even those employed through this funding arrangement as short-term consultants, were fully aware of their status as an “MTE consultant”. The fact that the concept was not known among relevant stakeholders and dialogue partners, including those directly benefiting from the expert inputs, tended to push field discussion towards the role of short and long term experts in general, recruitment procedures, development of TORs, roles and responsibilities of the various involved actors, modes of work, efficiency etc. Through these procedures the evaluation team was able to identify the MTEs and their work throughout the field visits, and managed to assess their inputs/added value to the EFA process.

In the sense that the concept of MTE is more a kind of funding mechanism, the fact that people outside UNESCO, and even inside the organisations various offices, did not know about it is not necessarily a serious issue. However, the principle of UNESCO having resources available for support to the EFA process should be fully transparent, especially in terms of the recipient countries’ own EFA planners and those in the various EFA Working Groups. Through that kind of openness, UNESCO and their partner government representatives could develop shared responsibility for maximizing the use of the money within the framework of the EFA planning processes and the needs identified within the various Ministries of Education.

## **2.2. Field report from Cambodia.**

### **2.2.1. Relevance of the project in terms of national needs and the objectives of EFA**

The EFA process in Cambodia was organized through the establishment of 6 Working Groups, all of them coming out of the main EFA goals defined in the Dakar Framework for Action, i.e. ECCD, Gender disparities, NFE, Life-skills education, Primary education, Quality education. These working groups comprised people from a range of stakeholders, NGOs, communities, district and provincial representatives, as well as representatives from relevant MOE departments/positions. The Coordinator was also the Director for Teacher Education in Cambodia. In addition, throughout the EFA process, draft EFA planning documents had been disseminated to relevant bodies for review, comments and inputs.<sup>2</sup> The MTE inputs provided were highly relevant to the needs of the government and the donor group although education officials felt that they should have been more intimately involved in the preparation of TORs. They also felt that their expectations had not been fully met in terms of capacity building

coming out of MTE interventions. Quality in EFA planning had been improved through the use of MTE so relevance was clearly achieved.

MTE consultancy inputs were by definition required to fit into the context of educational development planning in Cambodia. Significant actors in this regard are both the donors and the NGOs. Each month, the Donor Coordination Committee meets one day before a joint meeting with donors and Government partners.<sup>3</sup> This group comprises bilateral donors, UN organizations and NGOs. A senior official from the UNESCO Phnom Penh field office is the coordinator. UNESCO and UNICEF developed an ever closer collaboration and throughout the EFA process shared their areas of work towards the government according to their respective responsibilities. UNESCO was therefore supporting the MOE/EFA planning process specifically targeting Non Formal Education, while UNICEF focused on Early Childhood and gender issues. Cross cutting issues such as HIV/AIDS were in this specific case shared by UNESCO and UNICEF through joint assignment of a full time HIV/AIDS focal point person, with a 50% working load within each of the organizations. Part of this contract was funded within the MTE pilot project. There were regular and frequent meetings within the UN agencies, but to a certain extent the focus did not directly address the educational sector as such, including the EFA processes. It was argued<sup>4</sup> that one might look into various possible ways of improving the collaboration within the educational sector, as quite a number of activities were of a cross cutting nature.

The NGO Educational Partnership (NEP) is an organization comprising 47 NGOs. The chair person comes from Save the Children Norway. He was also invited to take part in the donor coordination committee.<sup>5</sup> This group is now also considered by the government as stakeholders in the consultative process as a kind of reference groups to comment on and review the EFA plans as they developed<sup>6</sup>. Through this kind of process even the small locally-based NGOs through their community- based and grass roots experience had a direct input to the EFA planning process, thus contributing both to relevance and participation requirements.

### **2.2.2. Effectiveness and outputs of the project**

#### **a) MTE: Concept, understanding and awareness among stakeholders.**

---

<sup>2</sup> Ref. NEP chair person, Save the Children, Norway, who had 5-6 versions of EFA to assess and comment on, on behalf of NEP.

<sup>3</sup> The donor coordination committee was chaired by the Director of UNESCO's country office.

<sup>4</sup> UN meeting, Thursday 030603

<sup>5</sup> In a Draft Final Report, EFA, Bangkok Oct 2002, underscores the importance of NEP and their contribution to EFA, also strongly emphasized by UNESCO Phnom Penh

<sup>6</sup> They had been contacted 5-6 times, and each time the NEP had submitted a consolidated paper with inputs and comments to the drafted EFA document.



The MTE as a concept was not widely familiar outside the UNESCO office itself. The various UN organizations and beneficiaries<sup>7</sup> were not aware of the concept, as was the case with the EFAWG members. Even the consultants assigned within the MTE pilot project were not aware of the funding procedures, or their direct affiliation with the MTE. It was not until late in the evaluator's period in Cambodia that they actually knew they had been partly funded within this project. Taking this into consideration, the discussions regarding the MTE turned into a more general discussion about the role and work of short term consultants.

**b) MTE/short term consultancies, TORs and selection.**

The TORs were mainly developed by the funding agency, here the UNESCO office in Phnom Penh, and were based upon the needs as viewed by the UNESCO Field Office in regard to the stage reached in the EFA process at a given time. The need for external support was also endorsed, approved and agreed with the coordinator of the EFA process, also in discussion with the respective Working Group itself. Regarding the four consultancies organized and conducted within the MTE concept, they were related to HIV/AIDS, ICT and education, editing of the EFA plan and development of a NFE action plan<sup>8</sup>. In two cases, the TORs were discussed and approved by the National Coordinator, namely regarding ICT and the editing of the EFA plan. The EFA coordinator and members of the 6 EFA working groups all underscored the need for closer collaboration and clarification about the expectations from the work of the consultant, and the development of TORs. Far too often the short term consultants came, interviewed a number of selected stakeholders, and members of the Working Group, in order to get an overview of the situation, and thereafter reports were written. Those consulted said:

*"We were just used as informants",*

*"We did not know what exactly was the overall aim",*

*"They did not meet our expectations",*

*"No capacity building took place".*

Generally speaking there are still ways of improving how the various agencies deal with hiring short-term consultants. This applies to the donor agencies as well as to the ministerial bodies. It was raised by UN staff, including UNICEF and UNESCO senior staff members, that they would all have to improve their work in this regard in order to gradually give the responsibility of determining the needs for short-term consultancy as well as the development

---

<sup>7</sup> For example, Mr. Sanny Sarome, deputy director of the Kandal Regional Teachers Training Centre.

<sup>8</sup> Ongoing consultancy, June 2003.

of TORs into the hands of Ministry representatives. One senior donor representative stated, “We need to go from donorship and partnership to ownership”. But there is also the need for a lot of capacity building in that process, even related to the writing up of TORs<sup>9</sup>. The selection and utilization of short term consultants is also an issue in this respect. It is preferable to select local consultants jointly by the donor agency and the Ministry. Closer INGO/NGO collaboration is needed in sharing information on qualified consultants with contextual, country-based knowledge and appropriate language skills. Better prepared TORs, procedures and experience requirements could improve the quality of consultants, and also build up and sustain capacity within the country.

### **2.2.3. Efficiency of the project**

**a) Finances.** Since the inception of the MTE scheme, the UNESCO Office Cambodia had so far<sup>10</sup> utilized US\$ 18700 of the total of US\$ 20400 available. The last consultant conducted a consultancy on NFE, and was supposed to deliver the output by June 30<sup>th</sup>. The rest of the funds had not yet been utilized and there were no actual plans or initiatives taken to decide upon the use of the remaining budget. Cambodia has finished its EFA plan to be launched on June 10<sup>th</sup> and would move into the next phase of EFA. This involves developing action plans for the implementation phase. In support of this, a visit to Sri Lanka by some Ministry of Education EFA planners and implementers was under consideration by the UNESCO educational advisor. The countries are comparable culturally and geographically, but Sri Lanka has succeeded far better in reaching EFA goals, and would therefore be a worthwhile country to visit in order to learn from best practices. Whether such an approach would be approved within the MTE concept was not clear.

#### **b) Objectives as reflected in TOR.**

The TORs evidently give the consultant a broad and complex mandate, within a rather short time frame. They included contextual knowledge of the Cambodian situation, documentary analyses of the drafted programs, strategies, policies and plans, negotiation and close dialogue with governmental officials including the Working Group on EFA, stakeholders from other relevant organizations, NGOs, (capacity building is specifically mentioned in TOR II), and editing of the final draft of the EFA strategy plan. It is doubtful how all these requirements could be adequately met within the time-frame of a single consultancy, taking into account that all the relevant stakeholders one is supposed to collaborate with have their own agendas

---

<sup>9</sup> Wrap up meeting, Friday June the 6<sup>th</sup>.

<sup>10</sup> March 31<sup>st</sup>, 2003.

and daily duties and activities to deliver. By definition, they will not be available when needed by the consultant with his/her own agenda, scope and time frame.

#### **2.2.4.Outcomes**

Of the consultancies referred to above, three had been successfully conducted and completed according to the UNESCO field office. The outcomes and activities were adequately fulfilled according to the TORs, and reports and plans were submitted<sup>11</sup>. In the “*Report on the Activities of the UNESCO Office in Phnom Penh in 2002 and 2003*”, both the activities related to HIV/AIDS and ICT as a means for raising the quality of education are highlighted.<sup>12</sup> The EFA planning process was finalized by the launch of the final EFA plan on June 10<sup>th</sup>, in Phnom Penh. The process of developing the plan was characterized as a participatory process, with the relevant stakeholders represented. The short term consultants seemed to have had an important role specifically in supporting the EFA working groups on NFE and Life Skills, even though there were some criticisms from EFA working group members relating to selection of consultants, their process of work, and finally, lack of transparency versus the concept of MTE and the direct contribution by the EFA coordinator in taking part in the discussions on the utilization of MTE.

The HIV/AIDS consultant started out being financed through the MTE pilot project. However, after a limited consultancy-period, his contract was prolonged and he was still working to improve and enhance HIV/AIDS education and awareness through various initiatives. The consultant was working closely with relevant MOE, UNAIDS and UNICEF representatives. A *Toolkit for HIV/AIDS and Education* was jointly developed, both in printed form and as a CD-ROM and distributed all over the country, as was a Newsletter on HIV/AIDS and Education. Posters were developed and distributed, and wall-painting competitions were being arranged in Phnom Penh. In a number of ways all these initiatives were an important contributing factor to the fight against HIV/AIDS in Cambodia.

The work of the ICT consultant had a similar character. She was on contract as a MTE member when she started her ICT activities and the contract was prolonged through other funding mechanisms later on. Through work-shops with participants from various institutions and at the governmental level it was confirmed<sup>13</sup> that the training would be followed up through college based work-shops in the near future, in order to apply the

---

<sup>11</sup> Also provided to the evaluation. team member

<sup>12</sup> p25-p27, UNESCO Phnom Penh, 2003

<sup>13</sup> Information from Teacher Training Institution

knowledge at college level, and from that stage further develop an ICT strategy at specific colleges.

#### **2.2.5. Sustainability**

The process of involving and engaging EFA working groups in developmental activities was seen as “maybe the most important part” of the assignment, and within the framework of the MTE concept, work-shops and stakeholder involvement were to be ensured. From the experiences derived from the work of the HIV/AIDS and ICT specialists, it was obvious that their work had impacted at different levels, and would have a long term impact on the future development of ICT and also awareness raising and integration of HIV/AIDS into Cambodian society and schools. The extent to which local competence was built up is the real key to sustainability and the points made elsewhere regarding the limited use of local expertise (‘No capacity building took place’) and the selection of appropriate consultants need to be re-emphasised. It does not appear that sustainability was a strong consideration or outcome from the MTE work in Cambodia.

#### **2.2.6. Risks and their mitigation**

Regarding short-term consultancy there might be a danger of overloading MOE staff with consultancy services that mainly function as a fire brigade in order to finish an assignment within a tight time schedule, and be result and product oriented, (i.e. concentrating on producing a report). MTE was designed to be more process oriented, ensuring capacity building is being done through a careful and flexible strategy, where the TORs are being developed in a collaborative way, ensuring a common understanding between the funding agency and those benefiting from it, here MOE representatives. Flexibility in time is also important in order to ensure that the work is being dealt with appropriately not only from the perspective of the consultant, but requiring full attention from MOE representatives during the assignment, not taking into consideration all the daily activities the MOE representatives will have to deal with throughout their working schedule. Close collaboration between the donors, UN agencies and NGOs is of great importance in order not to duplicate, to share information about activities and create synergies and apply best practices between themselves in full openness with MOE representative. Such an approach will have to be developed at all levels, of the EFA planning processes.

#### **2.2.8. Cross cutting issues**

UNESCO Cambodia interpreted the cross cutting issues as emphasizing HIV/AIDS awareness raising, and developing innovative strategies to implement ICT. This was now included in the EFA strategy, as emphasized in regional strategic goals from UNESCO Bureau, Bangkok, and as reflected in the Cambodian national strategy.

More broad cross-cutting issues arising from the Cambodia field work concern the necessity to ensure greater ownership of the MTE concept among recipients, ensuring that strategies like MTE fit in well to existing management and development structures and ensuring that interventions like MTE do not add to the burdens of over-worked MoE officials rather than lightening their loads. However, it must be said that the engagement of the Phnom Penh office in developing TORs in close collaboration with the Working Groups is a good indicator of decentralisation in operation. It is also worth repeating the concept put forward by one informant – ‘From donorship to partnership to ownership’, surely a useful objective in any decentralisation effort.

## **2.3. Field report from Haiti**

### **2.3.1. Relevance of the project in terms of national needs and the objectives of EFA**

*“La situation globale de l’éducation en Haïti est très connue aujourd’hui et elle est catastrophique. Au palmarès de l’éducation pour l’hémisphère, Haïti est de loin le plus retardé, quelque soit le critère de performance considéré.”*

(Le Plan National d’Education et de Formation 1997)

These are introductory lines in the National Plan for Education and Training (PNEF) from 1997, and their main message is that, regardless of the performance indicators in use, the education system is a catastrophe. It is also underlined that the situation is even more alarming when comparisons are made with the other countries in the Caribbean region. According to the *Ministère de l’Education Nationale de la Jeunesse et des Sports* (MENJS), the education system needs a sector wide transformation to meet the needs of a socio-economically sustainable society and the expectations of its people, all social layers included.

Haiti participated in the World Conference on Education for All in Dakar in 1990, and has also together with the Caribbean and Latin-American Education Ministers, signed several international conventions and declarations. Consequently, Haiti has developed and adopted a National Plan for Education and Training as of 1996. The national plan is based on three pillars, namely a technical diagnosis, a participatory diagnosis and strategic reflections. This led to a consensus on the main objectives of the Plan. The National Plan was a big step forward in ensuring an education of quality for all as well as respecting universal human rights.

As a consequence of Dakar 2000 and the six objectives of EFA, the Haitian authorities decided to review the PNEF and to develop a national strategy for implementing both the Dakar EFA goals and accordingly consolidating the present status of the PNEF. This *Stratégie Nationale d'Action* (SNA), the National Action Strategy, finalised in March 2003, is elaborated around four central axes: increased access to education, improvement of the quality of education, improvement of the external efficiency of the educational system, and strengthening of governance in the education sector. In fact the Haitian authorities feel that the PNEF and SNA took care of all EFA goals and their implementation very well.

The starting point of the EFA process in Haiti was to consolidate the present state of affairs to identify the most important factors that contribute to or hamper the development of the education sector. During the fall of 2001 an appeal was made by MENJS, strongly supported by UNESCO, to all NGOs, consultants, international organisations and private enterprises to undertake commitments regarding the national EFA strategy. In the first meeting, July 2001, international organisations were invited. The outcome was very positive and, in addition to promises to assist MENJS in its huge tasks regarding the EFA goals, funds were raised for certain defined EFA related activities. On this occasion UNESCO offered to assist in all the studies, but was only granted three of them, namely *Youth and alternative training (Jeunes et Formation Alternatives)*, *Literacy (Etude thématique sur l'alphabétisation)* and *Life conditions (Les Conditions de Vie des Populations en Haïti)*. UNESCO financed the first two studies, but the third one was co-funded by Japan. It should be noted that UNESCO took charge of all three studies, but private consultants actually conducted the studies.

In October 2001 two meetings were held with representatives from NGOs of relevance to the education sector, consultants, private schools, social partners, universities, and private enterprises, to undertake commitments regarding the national EFA strategy. The

participants responded very well to the EFA project. Furthermore certain NGOs as well as the universities engaged positively in both financing and conducting studies. All the participants in the above mentioned meetings were invited to submit offers to contribute to the overall EFA process and to the thematic studies. The offers were assessed and compared by a committee before the final selection was made. The following table gives an overview of the contributors, the financial contributions as well as the present status of the studies.

<b>Thematic study</b>	<b>Financial sources</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Presentation</b>
The youth and alternative training	UNESCO	Finished	July 15, 2002
Literacy	UNESCO	Finished	September 23, 2002
Life conditions	UNESCO / Japan	Finished	October 18, 2002
Human resources and quality of education	Université Quisqueya		
Life in schools	World Vision Haiti	Finished	February 24, 2003
Basic education	UNICEF		
Early childhood	UNICEF		
Statistics of different school districts	MENJS		

The Resources allocated for the MTE in Haiti amounted to a total of US\$ 15 480, and the money was spent on the following activities:

- a) National consultant (for co-ordinating the EFA Forum and being a driving force for the EFA process) in MENJS/Cellule de Pilotage EFA (US\$ 10 980) finalising the intermediate EFA/MTE reports, organising validation seminars on the finalised thematic studies, editing the National Strategy. In actual fact the ‘consultant’ was temporary UNESCO staff member on a 2 year appointment operating as a CTA.
- b) Three thematic studies (US\$ 4 500)

The relevance of the MTE in terms of national needs and the objectives of EFA were a central theme during conversations with various informants. There seemed to be consensus about the relevance of MTE and UNESCO’s overall contribution to the national EFA process in Haiti. It was often underlined that UNESCO was the only

guarantee of continuity in the struggle for EFA considering the political instability in the country. During the last ten years more than ten ministers of education had been in office, the shortest period being two months and the longest one around two years. The present Minister of Education took office in December 2002, and rumours say that she is on her way out.

UNESCO is also used as a basket for national and international funds in several other educational and cultural projects. The political and financial situation in the country is the main reason for this. The central administrative and political levels have little confidence and stability, and donors will not risk putting their money in their hands. This is also the reason why districts are more frequently chosen and not the central national level. Districts with people with capacity, good governance and a more sustainable structure tend to be selected for support.

However, it was also said that Haiti does not need more studies, but more action. This is in fact also the position of UNESCO Haiti, but since this process was decided at the central level in the MENJS, there were many good arguments for participating along the lines already decided. It is easier to exercise influence when on board than when left outside. UNESCO also realised the importance of their role as network co-ordinator nationally and internationally.

### **2.3.2. Effectiveness and outputs of the project**

It is evident that the national EFA action plans have been strengthened within the period of MTE not least due to the way UNESCO has been, and still is, involved at national regional and local level. The quality of the thematic studies where UNESCO was in charge is approved, though one may say that they have to be finalised before final conclusions regarding quality can be drawn. However, the fact that only four out of 7+1 studies have been finalised is a setback to the process. Nevertheless, UNESCO is continuously pursuing the EFA goals through its education expert in MENJS, the EFA Forum and its networking at national, regional, local and international levels. It was often said that the UNESCO presence in strategic positions and the capacity of its people is of vital importance to the EFA process in Haiti. Without them, the EFA goals would probably have remained in a drawer. UNESCO is in the driver's seat in many ways, and holds a high legitimacy among NGOs, national and international partner organisations, as well as in MENJS.



UNESCO Haiti has reported as planned to UNESCO Headquarters Paris. The EFA project has progressed as scheduled. The project has also been delivered within the budget.

### **2.3.3. Efficiency of the project**

Questions related to efficiency and the optimal transformation of inputs to outputs and the results, may be answered both positively and conditionally in the sense that the whole national process is on hold due to the unfinished thematic studies conducted outside the MTE project. However, it is unfair to MTE to let this affect the assessment of MTE. On the contrary, circumstances taken into consideration, several informants very much emphasised the central role UNESCO plays in the EFA process, the EFA Forum and the SNA. UNESCO also plays a fund raiser's role in the sense that national and international organisations use it as a mediator and a "bank" for project funds of relevance to education and culture.

### **2.3.4. Outcomes**

History shows that uncertainties about facts and figures have always been a stumbling block in the central decision making procedures in Haiti. It would therefore be fruitful to agree on a framework covering the present state of affairs, and then to try to build consensus around a framework for the EFA actions in Haiti. Even though the need for thematic studies is debated, there seems to be little doubt about the need for and the outcome of the education expert placed in the UNESCO/MENJS/Cellule de Pilotage/EFA. Dr Gaston Georges Merisier, education expert and former Minister of Education, held this position from May 2002 until February 2003 (funded by MTE). At present another education expert (funded by Japan) holds the same position and has taken on the same responsibilities for the EFA process, the EFA Forum and the National Strategy as his predecessor. It is worth noting that UNESCO is the only "person" with continuity regarding EFA in MENJS. This is the most important aspect of the UNESCO engagement in the EFA process. The other important factor is the unique position of UNESCO in MENJS through the education expert in the Cellule de Pilotage/EFA. The cooperative relationship between UNESCO and UNICEF is also an important factor in Haiti's educational development and the EFA network of international, multi-national, national and NGO bodies have all contributed in a network of support.

Several informants emphasised the need for continuous support of the EFA process as part of the MTE project. They see MTE as only the beginning of an ongoing process that will take years to fulfil.

The constant focus put on education through the EFA process, the EFA Forum, UNESCO and other organisations involved in the field of education has till now ensured that education is the winner in the national budget, if these are terms that can be used on so small a scale.

### **2.3.5. Sustainability**

Considering the present unstable and critical situation in Haiti, it is obvious that sustainability is at risk. In trying to compensate for this unsatisfactory political, economical and social situation, UNESCO and other organisations have chosen what some have called the local “guerrilla approach” already mentioned. Through building capacity and structures locally, they envision covering the country bit by bit, but over a long-term perspective. The importance of the presence of bodies like the UN organisations and other bilateral and multilateral international organisations should not be underestimated. They constitute some sort of a safety net by always being present.

### **2.3.6. Risks and their mitigation**

In March 2003, UN presented the *Programme Intégré de Réponse aux Besoins Urgents des Communautés et des Populations (PIR)* describing the present socio-economic and humanitarian situation in Haiti. Even though the country for years has been by far the poorest country in the American region, regardless of the indicators used, Haiti has during the last couple of years experienced a dramatic deterioration. At present the situation is described as precarious and urgent. With a monetary devaluation and increased prices on basic products, medicine and petrol, the condition of life for the poor has worsened drastically.

The present situation has not resulted from a natural catastrophe or armed conflicts. On the contrary it is a conjunction of several factors that has an escalating deteriorating effect on the political, economic, social and environmental conditions. Most external and international funds have been withdrawn since last fall due to the instability of the country. But apparently international organisations like the UN are providing food supply programmes and other financial support programmes.

### **2.3.7. Cross-cutting issues**

In the education sector, according to the UN, the vocational sector and apprenticeship are downgraded and parents are not financially capable of sending their children to school. Sector by sector is presented in the PIR, and actions to be taken follow the presentations. Most of the general descriptions of the situation in the education sector found in the evaluation document of EFA 2000 made by MENJS are still valid. Although some progress was made during the 1990s, the unstable situation during the last two to three years has been a setback to the EFA process. The huge problems concerning poverty, poor infrastructure, shortages of equipment, lack of qualified teachers, low quality of education, insufficient supplies for the needs, over-aged pupils, repetition of classes, inappropriate curriculum and outdated methodology, to mention the most influential ones, make the road towards *Education for All* extremely long and difficult.

It is, however, remarkable that despite these factors parents, teachers and others involved in the education sector seem to be both motivated and determined to contribute to developing the Haitian education sector to meet the needs of both the people and a socio-economically sustainable society. They also realise that no progress will be made unless the public and private sectors, the NGOs and international bilateral and multilateral organisations make substantial contributions. They also realise that if the critical instability of the country does not end, no progress will be made regardless of external funds.

## **2.4. Field report from Indonesia.**

### **2.4.1. Relevance of the project in terms of national needs and the objectives of EFA**

EFA does not really have an integrated common understanding among stakeholders in the various educational activities currently being emphasised in Indonesia.<sup>14</sup> The World Bank and the Dutch joint support to the Ministry of Education, Youth and Culture (MOEYC) is related to the Educational Sector Review (ESR), the first phase of a potential sector-wide approach targeting mainly basic education, including quality of education, and teacher training. The following issues are prominent<sup>15</sup>: identifying basic education needs, management and monitoring of education, teacher development, recruitment and deployment, quality performance, financing and budgetary issues. The ongoing planning

---

<sup>14</sup> UNESCO, UNICEF and Dutch representatives stated this in our discussions.

document, the Five Year Plan for Education, runs from 1999 until 2004. Thereafter, the challenge will be to ensure a common framework, based upon EFA planning, ESR and the previous experiences from all educational activities taking place<sup>16</sup>. A major policy issue complicating the picture, is the fact that the status of the Muslim private schools is not fully taken into account in the planning of EFA or in statistical information and planning estimates. The Muslim schools also seem to have a strong say in the development of basic education, so there are major tensions and ongoing discussions throughout the system down to grass root level. The debate is related to whether the religious aspects of education should be guaranteed and prioritised or not, in the sense that wherever there are Muslim students, a precondition is to have a Muslim teacher. The opposite situation would not occur; the implication would be the deployment of a number of Muslim teachers in the public schools, not the recruitment of Christian teachers for Muslim schools.

The EFA process in Indonesia, as in other countries, has been organised through the establishment of six Working Groups, all of them derived from the main EFA goals defined in the Dakar Framework for Action, i.e. ECCD, Gender disparities, NFE, Life-skills education, Primary education and Quality education. These working groups were comprised of stakeholders from a range of areas including the Ministry of Education, Youth and Culture, (MOEYC), NGOs and other relevant members. According to the government's statement on the development of EFA Action Plans in Indonesia, the status is as follows:

To improve the quality of and access to education through a constitutional amendment mandating a 20% budgetary allocation for education, *a new Education Law that is being finalized through a democratic process*, the reforming of the curriculum to be based on students' competence, *and decentralization of funding and of providing compulsory education to the more than 360 districts.*<sup>17</sup>

Under the coordination of the Ministry of National Education (MONE), the Government is developing a comprehensive **EFA Plan of Action** at the national, provincial and district levels, that will be integrated with the overall development plans, to strategize further steps needed to be taken to achieve the targeted EFA goals.

---

<sup>15</sup> EFA group meeting., Tuesday the 10<sup>th</sup>.

<sup>16</sup> As stated by UNICEF, UNESCO, Dutch and MOE-EFA planner

Two districts (supported by UNESCO Jakarta), and two provinces (supported by UNICEF Jakarta) developed their Plans in 2002, to be followed by another twelve provinces in 2003, and gradually by all of the other provinces and districts.<sup>18</sup>

#### **2.4.2. Effectiveness and outputs of the project**

At the time of the actual field trip, just one consultant had been employed within the umbrella of MTE. This assignment was related to the development of NFE, and the consultant was assigned for a period of 4 weeks in February 2003. The EFA working group representatives disregarded the input, the process and the outcome of the consultancy which was viewed from their perspective, “As if the consultant, instead of what was expected, i.e. to help us improve the quality of the drafted EFA plan on non formal education, rather imposed her own views and prejudices”,<sup>19</sup> and tried to make major changes instead of commenting on and improving what was there already. It was stated that the consultant’s lack of cultural and contextual knowledge was the main hindrance to efficient support. They also felt that for most of the period, the consultant was busy trying to get as much information as possible regarding NFE in Indonesia, as well as the work of the EFA Working Group through questioning and getting information from the EFA-group members. During the work-shop, she introduced issues which were not really understood by the group and which did not address expectations of what should have been the focus. The EFA Working Group members were quite frustrated and did not get much out of the consultancy. The main criticisms of the consultancy work indicated that the expert conducted the assignment based upon her own preconceptions of how to deal with NFE, without having any clear knowledge of the context, culture and challenges within NFE in Indonesia, without knowing the EFA process in Indonesia and without listening to the needs of the representatives from the NFE Working Group but rather followed her own agenda. In other words the Indonesian Working Group felt they needed

*“A consultant who had an inner knowledge of the needs of the Indonesians and could easily respond to their needs. The external consultant, who mainly spent the time interviewing, reading documents and so forth, did not have any shared agenda with those benefiting from the consultancy.”<sup>20</sup>*

---

<sup>18</sup> Progress report, UNESCO, April 2003.

<sup>19</sup> Quotation, Thursday meeting with EFA NFE group

Informants stated that in most of the processes related to the identification of support from consultancies, the consultant did not meet their expectations, did not relate to the TORs (as they had understood them) and did not understand their process of work. The support seemed to focus on situational analyses and contextual updating through questioning, not listening to the expressed needs. The consultancy ended up with a report which was left behind. As this consultancy was a major part of the technical support afforded by the MTE program a number of questions need to be addressed. There was an obvious mismatch between the Bangkok office and its recruitment of the consultant and the expectations of the beneficiaries (an important decentralisation criterion). The UNESCO Cluster Office in Indonesia did not know anybody with the skills needed, and the regional UNESCO Bureau in Bangkok provided them with the name of someone they thought to be a relevant person, with experience from similar work in Laos, Vietnam and Cambodia.

### **2.4.3. Efficiency of the project**

The MTE approach was not known outside the UNESCO environment, nor even among UNESCO employees within the office<sup>21</sup>. The governmental representatives were not informed about the application nor about the needs identified in the application. Informants met included the co-ordinator of the Core Group of EFA planners<sup>22</sup>. The TOR developed for the one consultant so far utilised under the umbrella of MTE were however shared and approved by MOE<sup>23</sup>.

The management and utilisation, the strategies and planning of the use of the resources within the umbrella of MTE have not been developed in a transparent way. None of the EFA core group of planners was aware of the facility until it was discussed during the evaluator's stay in Indonesia, as was the case for the UNESCO employees. The MOEYC representatives obviously stated that they would like to be in the driving seat; if they had known they would have contributed to the identification of needs, and would have ensured that the budget was utilised within the deadline for the finalisation of the pilot. They all argued for and underscored the need for the MOE to be in control regarding the identification of scope for the MTE/consultant, as well as for the process of identification of the actual consultant. Methodologically, the work of the consultant should not just be to investigate through questioning and documentary reviews, but should reflect an active

---

<sup>20</sup> Meeting with the EFA group on NFE.

<sup>21</sup> according to a staff member dealing with educational/developmental issues

<sup>22</sup> meeting with the co-ordinators and NFE WG

and participatory learning exercise in order to develop and sustain competence within the MOE/in the group being led or supervised by the consultant<sup>24</sup>

At the time of the field visit, the NFE consultancy was the only activity that had taken place within the umbrella of the MTE pilot. The information related to the work of MTEs therefore reflected the way the work of this consultancy was conducted, but in discussions with relevant ministerial and EFA representatives, as well as other donor and (I)NGOs we also discussed the pros and cons related to short and long term consultancies in general. Enough has been said above about the way in which the consultancy operated and the way in which the objectives were addressed. Key lessons learned were also clearly identified.

#### **2.4.4. Objectives of the project**

The TORs were approved by the UNESCO Office related to Non Formal Education and accepted by the consultant. They basically required the consultant to work closely with the relevant authorities and experts in Indonesia to draft the NFE aspects of the EFA National Plan through to 2015. That this did not work comes down to two issues. First, the personality of the consultant and an apparent gap between Bangkok and the beneficiaries, especially the MOE. On the one hand it seems that local capacity was insufficient or non-existent and on the other that Bangkok did the best job it could in selecting a qualified person. The failure of the consultancy can therefore be clearly associated with the decentralised structure. A specific requirement should be that TORs are prepared by the beneficiaries and are fully understood and embraced all the way up the decentralisation chain rather than prepared and agreed at the furthest point from implementation.

#### **2.4.5. Outcomes**

During the evaluation period, a meeting with the EFA National Coordinator together with UNICEF, agreed on a few steps necessary to finalize the National Plan of Action, i.e. three working meetings (probably of one or two days duration) were organized in July to discuss three 'areas' which need substantial strengthening in the current plan (e.g. ECCD) or which have not been addressed at all in the current draft (e.g. Inclusive Education) or only partially (e.g. Life Skills with special focus on HIV/AIDS, FRESH, etc.). UNESCO contracted experts from University of Bandung who have already been involved because of their expertise, and to a certain extent have been engaged in the EFA process. These

---

<sup>23</sup> according to UNESCO ed. Advisor,

<sup>24</sup> Tuesday meeting EFA group

resource persons and facilitators for the mentioned workshops(sponsored by the MoE), were to assist with the integration of the workshop recommendations into the existing plan, to assist with the finalization of the plan and its translation into English. They were contracted for a period of months to ensure full support to the finalization of the process. Later, an official communication from Paris indicated that the transfer of remaining NFIT funds to the proper budget line to be used for organizing workshops and training had been approved, extending the programme until December 2003. Therefore support is available for the EFA planning process in two of the ten provinces targeted for this year 2003. The Ministry's contribution (as well as UNICEF's for 6 provinces) will be in the form of matching funds and therefore it is expected that the central and provincial government will supplement them. The Ministry is committed to continuing their strategy of promoting EFA planning at provincial level (first) as well as district level, therefore there will not be any 'by passing' of the provinces, as was also discussed during the evaluation mission. Two quotations from recent UNESCO Progress Reports provide more insight into EFA plans in Indonesia and the continuing role of MTE:

The pilot EFA Plans of Action for the District of Bojonegoro (East Java) and the Regency of Yogyakarta (central Java), supported by UNESCO in 2002, are currently being implemented and monitored by the EFA Core Team, but no progress report is available yet. The Province of Central Java, where the pilot EFA planning was supported by UNICEF in 2002, has plans to support the EFA planning exercise in all its 35 districts/cities benefiting from the pilot planning experience at the provincial and district level. In 2003 an additional twelve provinces (out of 32) shall prepare their EFA Plan of Action, six supported by the Ministry of Education and six supported by UNICEF. The provinces supported by UNICEF have already been identified, while the other six supported by the Government are still to be determined

(Progress Report, April 2003, UNESCO).

Effective EFA dissemination has not reached the Regency (Yogyakarta), where no systematic planning and evaluation mechanisms for the education sector are in place. Given the importance of NFE within the larger EFA planning process, UNESCO considers that priority should be given to EFA dissemination at the regency level, thereby strengthening the capacities of the local government and overall understanding of the importance and potential of NFE if integrated effectively into the larger educational structure. Assist local authorities in enhancing their capacities and skills in educational planning and management will have a



greater impact in determining the achievement of EFA goals within the new decentralised context.

(Progress report, April 2003, UNESCO).

Turning to another set of outcomes co-ordination between the various donors has developed quite recently within the last two years<sup>25</sup>. Co-ordination between the Banks, bilaterals and UN organisations is organised through meetings approximately every third month, while UNICEF and UNESCO have more frequent and regular but informal collaboration in the EFA process, as well as in daily ongoing activities within education. Increased and more coordinated support from relevant donors to the EFA National Plan of Action (EFA NPA) is an important development in Indonesia. It has been agreed that the on-going multi-donor supported Education Sector Review will integrate and enrich to the greatest possible extent the EFA sector analysis and, consequently, the EFA NPA as far as common components are concerned. The ESR and EFA working teams on basic education and quality in education respectively should merge, given the overlapping of their mandates, to the benefit of the consistency of the final documents. In light of this increased coordinated support among donors, a draft costing of the EFA NPA was prepared in November 2002 by the EFA Team and presented in a video conference on the ‘Financing of Basic Education’ organized by UNESCO Bangkok for Vietnam and Indonesia. This costing is currently in the process of being reviewed with the assistance of a WB consultant who, in addition to undertaking the analysis of education financing and public spending for the ESR, will also assist the EFA team in finalizing the costing of the EFA National Plan of Action.<sup>26</sup>

#### **2.4.6. Sustainability**

In order to make planning and implementation of EFA sustainable, the project should be flexible in time and scope, and last for a maximum of 6 years. Within that time-frame the project/program should be taken over by MOE representatives at province or district level, or be run through other private sources. Flexibility in time and focus is needed in order to ensure the money will meet the needs of MOE, the Indonesian context, and take into account that plans may change, or be delayed for various reasons. One would also have to develop an agreement or code of conduct with MOE/government to ensure that the

---

<sup>25</sup> UNESCO input

<sup>26</sup> Progress report, April 2003, UNESCO

support was a part of a long term agreed strategy between the partners. The work already being conducted within the umbrella of MTE did not seem to have had any direct and positive impact on the EFA process for NFE.

The further plans related to the development of provincial EFA plans, seemed promising. This will strengthen the work of MOEYC in addressing their decentralised strategy in achieving EFA. Based upon district planning in Yogyakarta<sup>27</sup> they seem to have succeeded in developing an EFA plan involving relevant stakeholders and have thereby taken local concerns into the discussions and their final EFA plan. At this stage nothing was actually being implemented as money had not been released.

#### **2.4.8. Cross cutting issues**

Cross-cutting concerns arising from the MTE experience included:

- The need for openness and participation throughout the process, between UNESCO and MOE at the planning phases regarding identification of the needs, country-wise. This implies more effective decentralisation, giving greater attention to the ‘relations with stakeholders and beneficiaries’ criterion noted in Section 1 above.
- Close collaboration between the various donor actors, the MOE, the development banks, the UN organisation, the INGOS and NGOs, ensuring a comprehensive TA/capacity building support with no overlapping
- Openness and a common understanding about TORs
- Sharing of the potential for using local competencies, regional and/or international when needed.
- Flexibility in time is an important issue, as one year’s duration is quite a tight time-schedule.
- There must be flexibility related to the aims, modes of work, and utilisation of funds
- There must be a common strategy, long term commitment among UNESCO Headquarters, Regional, Cluster and Field Offices and the National Commission

---

<sup>27</sup> Field visit, Yogyakarta,

- The Field Office should also develop a commonly agreed long-term strategy whereby MOE and UNESCO have an agreed framework and strategy for action that is flexible and adjustable, ensuring that the needs are met according to any contextual national changes

## **2.5. Field report from the Sudan**

### **2.5.1. Relevance of the project in terms of national needs and objectives for EFA**

In a variety of ways UNESCO Headquarters Paris, the Cluster Office in Cairo and the Regional Office in Beirut have been involved in the MTE process. The goal has been, as stated in the TORs, ‘To assist member states in developing and /or strengthening National Plans for EFA through targeted interventions of technical services’. Therefore the project has, in principle, proved very relevant to the needs of Sudan in the preparation of its EFA plan. However, the actual working out of the assistance has been quite problematic.

### **2.5.2. Efficiency of the program**

From the studies of the reports and interviews it seems clear that the interventions from UNESCO in developing and strengthening the planning, development and production of the Sudanese EFA plan have not been very extensive. According to the new UNESCO strategy, UNESCO work has been decentralised to the UNESCO offices in the various regions. In the case of Sudan the responsibility for the UNESCO interventions has been lodged with the UNESCO Regional Office in Beirut and particularly the UNESCO Cluster Office in Cairo. According to information from Beirut, coordination was good from the beginning of the EFA initiative and allotment of funds to Cairo ‘was never a problem’. Under the regular programme of Cairo, EFA training took place and it was agreed that should more funds be required then they could be transferred. No such requests were received by Beirut. Thus, things have not worked very well in relation to the MTE, primarily due to the lack of direct intervention and interest from the Cairo Office which is the implementing UNESCO office for the project. As a matter of fact this was both the impression of the evaluator (based on interviews and documentary studies) and also the experience of the top level representatives of the Sudanese Ministry of Education, despite the agreement with Cairo that funds would provide a consultant for assessment of the final draft of the EFA Plan, printing of the Plan document in Arabic, translation of the Plan document into English and printing the English version. The question arises whether

these, other than the first, were the most strategic and appropriate interventions to fund. The evaluators could get no information on how far the final proposal for UNESCO support differed from the original but such matters as funding translations seem to be low-level activities for this kind of programme. Other international partners in the EFA process voiced similar concerns. Although it would be unwise to generalise from one example, it does indicate that a policy of decentralisation is by definition, highly dependent on the commitment and professionalism of the staff at the decentralised levels.

### **2.5.3. Effectiveness and outputs of the project**

Before the actual start of the preparation of the EFA National Plan members of the Educational Planning Department in the Sudanese Ministry of Education participated in a series of regional UNESCO seminars and workshops where various issues of EFA planning mechanisms and processes were discussed. The participants included various member states in the region, and Sudan was thus not specifically targeted. The South East Asian model (DIRK) as a guideline for EFA planning was translated into Arabic by the Beirut UNESCO Office and was used in the workshops described. In July 2002, Mr Habib Hajjar (an educational planning specialist from IIEP, paid for from MTE funds) and Ms Ghada Gholam (the Head of Education in UNESCO, Cairo) undertook an advisory mission to Sudan upon the request of the Sudanese authorities. A report from the mission was prepared. In late October 2002 two representatives from the Government of Sudan visited Beirut for a review meeting at the regional level on the first draft of the Sudanese EFA plan. Ten specific comments were given. While no report from the meeting was available the Sudanese educational planners were given two months to revise the plan according to the comments from UNESCO. The Sudanese EFA plan is now finished in Arabic on the basis of these comments. Chapter 3 and the conclusions have been translated into English and the remaining parts will be translated into English shortly.

The Sudanese government has been given funding for one or two workshops (Cairo says two, Khartoum says one) in the utilisation of the Excel programme and for statistics and information technology in connection with educational planning requirements. However, according to Cairo, reports from these workshops do not exist.

The Sudanese Ministry of Education has written a proposal for EMIS (Education Management and Information System). The UNESCO Beirut Office promised \$500 for the formulation of the project but the amount had still not yet come through in July 2003.

The Sudanese Ministry of Education is also waiting for comments/approval of the EMIS proposal submitted from Beirut.

The goal of assisting with the completion of the EFA Plan has been achieved since Sudan is one of the first countries in the region to produce a comprehensive and qualitatively good EFA Plan. The competence of the EFA National Co-ordinator and his team is very high and the Plan would probably have been completed with good results without the interventions of UNESCO. This does not mean that capacity building interventions from UNESCO are not needed in several areas (particularly within information technology in relation to educational data, not only on the national level, but on the state and local levels). If the implementation of the EFA plan is to succeed (a much more critical issue than the production of the EFA plan per se) a massive human capacity building programme on various levels is needed, and UNESCO interventions in this field will be essential.

The communication between UNESCO's Cairo Office and the EFA National Coordination Office is seriously hampered by at least two issues:

*Infrastructural issues.* The Sudanese National EFA Co-ordinator does not have sufficient technical equipment to facilitate communication through fax machines, reliable telephone lines etc. The communication has thus at times had to go through a third partner, i.e. UNICEF, and this is by no means satisfactory. Even though the MTE interventions are not meant for assistance in terms of equipment it is necessary to look into the issue of improving the standards in this field. The National EFA Co-ordinator and his team have e-mail at their disposal, and this should be used more frequently. The problem is, however, the aforementioned instability of the telecommunication network (also due to the fact that the government delays paying the bills to the company operating the network).

*Lack of proper co-operation.* Not much effort seems to have been made in making regular contact with the National EFA Co-ordinator and both Cairo and Beirut Offices (the Cairo Office in particular) are very slow in responding to requests from the National EFA Co-ordinator and his team. One would expect that requests are responded to promptly, but the impression is that the Cairo Education Officer has not put EFA Sudan high on her list of priorities. The National EFA Co-ordinator expressed great dissatisfaction with the way the Cairo Education Officer handled things related to Sudan, and this was confirmed in the evaluator's interview with the Cairo Education Officer. She was very unwilling to meet the evaluator and the

UNESCO observer from Paris, and only after considerable pressure did she grant us a one hour interview (we were initially granted 10 minutes).

If the reason for this unwillingness was the lack of Cairo interventions in this field is not known. The official reason was that she was too busy to discuss with us even though she had accepted the itinerary of the evaluator and the UNESCO Paris observer in Cairo.

The National EFA Co-ordinator also expressed dissatisfaction about the fact that the Cairo Education Officer had made only one mission to Khartoum. He wanted regular meetings, e.g. quarterly, with UNESCO in Beirut, Cairo or Khartoum. It must also be said, however, that the EFA team in Khartoum must be more pro-active in their communication and ask repeatedly for response on requests if they are not forthcoming.

Perhaps even more significant was the issue of the original proposal prepared by Khartoum in collaboration with the UNICEF EFA focal point. This original proposal was a lot more detailed than the final proposal that was sent, either by Beirut or Cairo, to UNESCO Headquarters. It is possible that either of these two offices selected activities on behalf of Khartoum which they felt the budget could support. The evaluators were not able to get an answer on this issue which is obviously of great importance in terms of decentralisation, control and participation.

#### **2.5.4. Links to other development plans in the government.**

The EFA plan from the Ministry of Education is an integral part of the National Education Plans. As mentioned in the UNESCO report in July the Sudanese EFA National Coordinator has participated in "the workshops for the development of the national strategy for the eradication of poverty and is also the head of the sub-committee for developing a strategy for child development."

#### **2.5.5. Monitoring and evaluation.**

So far UNESCO has, as mentioned above, given comments to the first draft of the Sudanese EFA plan on which the National EFA Co-ordinator has acted. Beyond this no monitoring or evaluation procedures have been proposed

#### **2.5.6. Coordination mechanisms.**

The co-ordination between UNESCO Beirut and Cairo seems unclear. The Sudanese Ministry of Education was happy with the efforts from Beirut, and wanted to strengthen these links at the expense of the Cairo Office.

#### **2.5.7. Funding.**

It is unclear to what extent the Norwegian funding for the MTE has been spent by UNESCO as decided. Due to lack of interventions from the Cairo Office there seems to be an underspending of MTE funds.

#### **2.5.8. Cross-cutting issues**

- *Objectives/goals.* The major problem in the case of Sudan was the lack of interventions in the EFA planning process, not that the interventions were irrelevant. The interventions that took place, both regionally and locally, seemed to satisfy some of the needs of the Sudanese EFA National Coordinator, but they were not sufficient, perhaps because his original proposal had been diluted. The National EFA Coordinator had asked for other interventions that could have taken place within the budget, but the requests for these interventions were, as has been noted, not answered.
- *Goals not clearly identified.* Another problem was that the potential interventions of the MTE from the UNESCO Regional Office were not clearly identified and it was difficult for the evaluator to find out how much funding from the Norwegian donor had been used in the EFA planning process. Neither was it clear how close the final proposal was to the original prepared in Khartoum.
- *More funding* should have been spent on human capacity building, particularly related to computer skills for EMIS data collection and analysis and educational costing at state and local levels. Moreover multi-cultural issues should have been addressed specifically (see below).
- *Mono-culturalism in a multi-cultural society.* The Sudanese curricula for both primary and secondary schools are heavily Islamised. This is not acceptable in a multi-cultural society like Sudan, and the human rights of major population

groups which are not Muslims, like the majority of the Southern population, are being violated in these curricula. The issue was addressed in our conversations with the Sudanese government, and the problem was acknowledged by some government officials, but not by the very influential curriculum committee. In addition to technical interventions like the ones requested (and mentioned above) UNESCO has a key role in this area and its interventions ought to have addressed this serious issue in terms of workshops and seminars. Peace will not be sustainable in Sudan and the achievement of EFA will suffer if the issue of the curriculum is not taken seriously. It was promised that more reference to this issue should be included in the EFA plan.

- *Competence/capacity of EFA team.* It has already been mentioned that the competence of the Sudan EFA team was high in producing the Plan which could have been completed without too many interventions from UNESCO
- *Commitment to EFA:* Clearly the Sudanese government is, at least in terms of rhetoric, committed to the Dakar goals and the goals are firmly embraced in the EFA plan, not necessarily as a result of UNESCO interventions. The technical assistance given by UNESCO has nevertheless helped the national EFA coordination team.
- *The implementation of the EFA Plan* is, however, another matter and it is obvious that the Ministry of Education needs massive technical and financial interventions from UNESCO and other agencies in order to implement the plan. The gap between rhetoric in the EFA plan and the situation on the ground, i.e. in the schools and among the teachers and children, will prove to be massive if interventions are not systematically injected into the implementation program.
- *Gaps in capacity:* There is, as has been noted, a capacity gap that could have been reduced if UNESCO interventions had been more frequent. Some of the requests outlined in a proposal submitted jointly by UNICEF and the EFA Coordinator have been met. More regular contacts and discussions between Ministry of Education and UNESCO would have facilitated processing other needs for



technical assistance and capacity building. It is important now that UNESCO takes the implementation of EFA seriously and assists in human capacity building in the areas mentioned above.

- *Planning capacity* has improved due to UNESCO interventions, but not to the degree foreseen by the funding for the MTE. Whereas the stakeholders' involvement is to a certain extent more sustainable, the proof of the pudding will come in the implementation process.
- *Sustainability*: Since UNESCO interventions were relatively low, they have not created huge sustainability problems. A serious issue in terms of sustainability is, however, that capacity building in the Ministry may not be sustainable in the long run due to more attractive and better paid jobs elsewhere, particularly among the international organisations. This brain drain was acknowledged as a serious problem and may definitely have a negative impact on sustainability.

### **3. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS: RESPONSE TO TERMS OF REFERENCE**

#### **3.1. Introduction**

The evaluation of MTE in the four selected countries reveals certain patterns and lessons from experience which can illuminate further practice. Our starting point was Stufflebeam's CIPP model and the evaluation looked into the context, the inputs, the processes and the products from the MTE project. In addition, the Terms of Reference required the evaluators to assess the efficiency of implementation, especially in terms of the decentralisation strategy of UNESCO, the relevance of the project to national needs, the effectiveness of the project in terms of objectives, expected results etc. and finally to assess the sustainability of the EFA planning process in the light of MTE interventions and any risks associated with the concept. The discussion which follows combines the findings from both the methodological approach and the demands of the TORs.

#### **3.2. Contextual issues**

In each of the four countries visited, EFA planning was well advanced though some had progressed further than others. Working Groups had been set up within the countries and generally speaking, competence within the various Ministry departments responsible for planning was adequate. In Cambodia, an important contextual issue was the close coordination of donor inputs and involvement; UNESCO and UNICEF were also involved. In most of the countries, the MTE intervention was a very necessary supportive input to this competence, particularly so in the case of Haiti. Indonesia also enjoys a collaborative donor environment although more coordination is necessary, particularly as the planned Education Sector Reform will influence the national EFA plans considerably. The dangers of a parallel approach developing are obvious. As far as Sudan was concerned, local competence was high and it was adjudged that MTE inputs, although helpful and desirable, were not essential to the task of EFA Planning. Serious coordination problems between Cairo, Beirut and Khartoum were the most obvious contextual challenge and it is hoped that these challenges can be overcome. Khartoum has an infrastructural problem too which it was hoped MTE funding could help overcome.

In summary it can be said that all four countries exhibited an appropriate level of expertise, had EFA structures in place and appeared to be fully committed to the Dakar Framework.

The relevance of the MTE approach is therefore assessed in terms of how supportive UNESCO's expertise was to existing structures and commitments. Cambodia represents a case where the support was particularly relevant, resulting as it did in the satisfactory completion of three out of four assignments. Despite some critical comments regarding selection of consultants and more collaboration in constructing TORs, it does appear that the quality of the EFA plan was improved and that consultancy work on HIV/AIDS and ICT answered national needs very well. In the case of Haiti, the MTE consultant added value to the EFA planning process by finalising the Plan document and editing the National Strategy, all within a context described officially as a 'catastrophe'. More positively the environment in Haiti included active involvement of parents and a certain level of partnership between the Government and the private sector in education. Relevance to national needs was apparently not accomplished in Indonesia's case. Sudan had the advantage of a strong National Co-ordinator for EFA who was supported less directly through participation in workshops and more directly through inputs to planning from IIEP.

Relevance and context are obviously closely linked and it can be stated that generally, the MTE interventions managed to provide relevant services. The overall impression gained was that the objectives pursued, the services provided and the approaches used were relevant to national needs and conformed to the mandate of UNESCO.

### **3.3. Inputs**

These varied considerably. In almost all cases the label of 'Mobile Teams of Experts' was not clearly recognised or identified due to reasons already commented upon. As a lesson for the future, UNESCO at its various levels should give serious consideration to how it promotes its innovative approaches. For such a significant international organisation, it is essential that the UNESCO label is clearly recognised.

Inputs in terms of consultancy support were generally well received, with the exception of the NFE expert engaged in Indonesia. The themes developed in Haiti as central problem areas and the thematic studies were valuable inputs to the EFA process. For Sudan, the role of the Cairo Cluster Office as facilitator or barrier needs very thorough review.

Engagement by UNESCO was not very extensive. This was one case where the decentralised model did not work well, largely because of problems at the Cairo office, including underspending of funds available. At the same time Sudan pointed out that capacity building by UNESCO was felt to be essential for their EFA process. Cambodia had a high success rate with three out of four consultancies satisfactorily completed although it was noted that heavy inputs overloaded Ministry officials who were consequently less able to deliver their normal work assignments.

The concept of efficiency – the extent to which optimum use has been made of available resources – is worth examining. In a number of cases budgets had not been fully utilised (Cambodia 85% used; Indonesia 33% used; Sudan/Cairo very little record keeping). Efficiency was hard to assess in Haiti as the EFA process is basically on hold until thematic studies are completed. However, the Ministry regards MTE as ‘central’ to their requirements for successful EFA planning and implementation. Efficiency is however more than a matter of the optimum use of funds. Sudan’s experience is somewhat extreme but it should be noted that decentralisation has not worked well for Sudan. The evaluator noted that lack of support from Cairo held back progress and efficient use of what was available was not achieved.

### **3.4. Processes**

The key processes looked for in the MTE intervention were capacity and competence building. There was not a uniformly positive story to tell here. Cambodia presented a promising story and there is no doubt that capacity was built. Haiti reported that the MTE inputs were highly relevant to EFA planning and UNESCO’s continuing presence represented a safety net for the future of educational development within an unstable political environment. The process in Indonesia was somewhat slow as they were able to spend only one third of the planned budget by the time of the evaluation. However, the working group meetings for EFA have resulted in a demand that provincial levels of EFA planning be more fully involved, surely a positive process. Sudanese Ministry officials were able to engage in regional seminars and IT training was conducted, thus raising competence. In addition, the Sudanese MoE was able to cooperate with IIEP and UNESCO Cairo in development of EFA Plans. Underspending was however a feature of the Sudanese experience. UNESCO will need to continue its support for capacity building

in Sudan if implementation is to follow planning. It is also noteworthy from the Sudanese case-study that it was difficult to discover what the Norwegian money had been spent on.

### **3.5. Products**

These were clearly identified in a number of countries in terms of finalised plans, capacity building and, in some cases, materials made available. In a less concrete way it could be seen that the confidence of Ministry officials who had been involved with MTE interventions had also grown. There was evidence that in some cases professional abilities had been increased, also a sense of ownership of the EFA process had been created. This latter point is also associated with the growing sense of a number of people interviewed that their national EFA planning is part of a world-wide effort.

On a less positive note it should be remembered that 15% of the budget in Cambodia remained unspent. At the same time, three out of four consultancies were satisfactorily completed, the EFA planning process was qualitatively improved and the key objectives (HIV/AIDS, ICT, and NFE) were largely met.

Haiti reported that only four out of eight studies had been completed but national EFA plans have been finalised. The EFA process will be delayed until the studies are completed but this hold up has not been caused by the MTE initiative. In fact, Haiti has declared the MTE intervention as 'central' to its EFA processes and its support should be continued.

In the case of Indonesia EFA plans have been improved qualitatively and although progress has been slow common strategies have been developing among the MOEYC and UNESCO at Headquarters and field levels.

Sudan was able to integrate its EFA plans with other Government planning processes. Sudan's excellent National EFA Co-ordinator was able to complete the plan thanks to significant help from UNESCO. An important issue in respect of outcomes from the Sudanese case study is the paucity of records to indicate exactly what has happened, who has been involved and what the effectiveness of the interventions has been.

### **3.6. Decentralisation in theory and practice**

The evaluation team was asked in the TORs to look particularly at the issue of decentralisation and the effectiveness of this modality. Note was taken at the outset of this report of the criteria for decentralisation agreed by UNESCO at the highest level. Each of the criteria may now be examined in the light of the experience of the four countries selected for the present study to enable us to arrive at a judgement on the effectiveness of a decentralised mode of delivery. In addition, specific lessons from the experience with the Bangkok office will be drawn out.

The first criterion mentioned was *Strategic Planning*. The question must be asked whether any of the Regional, Cluster or Field Offices engaged in the MTE initiative had a role in strategic planning for the initiative. The short answer must be 'no', as MTE was born in the Directorate General of UNESCO Headquarters and gradually metamorphosed into a programme of technical assistance. The MTE experience serves to illustrate a perceived problem within UNESCO, the extent to which planning remains top-down with Field Offices only engaged at the later stages when key decisions are already made. For example, the five divisions of the Education Sector at Headquarters plus the DFU remained the focal point for overseeing the EFA strategy. Whether decentralisation can be said to function within an umbrella of this sort is doubtful.

Whether the Regional Bureaux or Cluster Offices then used the MTE strategically poses another set of questions. Certainly it can be stated that where MTE inputs were used well (as in Haiti) they contributed to strategic development of EFA Planning. Almost total breakdown between Cairo and Khartoum tells its own story.

However, if we use this first criterion to ask whether the decentralised structures had a role in the strategic planning for EFA in some countries then the answer is a qualified 'yes'. For example, the Bangkok office (which provided the consultancy team with more and better information than others) initially proposed that it would support countries in the region through TA for resource projections and EFA planning. Bangkok went so far as to mount an EFA Coordination Meeting using FIT moneys but without approval from Headquarters or the donor.<sup>28</sup> Bangkok left it to Beijing, Jakarta, Hanoi and Phnom Penh to get on with operationalising their plans but did a great deal of work in liaising with Member States over the EFA plans, technical backstopping for the individual countries, developing EFA planning guides and producing a framework for assessing National EFA

---

<sup>28</sup> Looked at benignly and in the light of Norway's recipient responsibility principle, this could be interpreted as 'real' decentralisation.

plans. All these activities (and some were not well managed, as witness the Indonesia case-study above) do represent an effort to operate strategically in supporting EFA planning and to 'add value' to the processes involved. It should also be noted that Field Offices liaised with the DFU to map activities at country, sub-regional and regional levels, illustrating UNESCO's strategy of being 'global in scope but local in nature'. It must also be recognised that 75% of funds for the MTE project were decentralised.

*Integration with the regular UN System* is presented as the second criterion for effective decentralisation. It was not clear from our enquiries how much of an issue this was although the sense that there was a hierarchy (Headquarters, Regional Bureaux, Cluster Offices, Field Offices, National Commissions) was quite strong and this is natural enough given the reputation particularly of Headquarters and Bangkok as technical and professional powerhouses. (It should be noted in passing that Bangkok's mounting of a very useful EFA Coordination meeting without Headquarters approval does not indicate a high level of integration with the regular system). Attention must also be drawn to the role of Headquarters in monitoring agreed priorities and their implementation at the Field Office level and the accountability required of Field Offices. Is there enough attention paid to these important functions? In the country-studies mention is made of relationships between UNESCO and other UN agencies engaged with educational development. In particular there was an effective division of responsibilities between UNESCO and UNICEF in Cambodia where one organisation dealt with ECCD and the other with NFE. In addition, the two bodies co-operated in funding an HIV/AIDS focal point person. Haiti is another example of where the two bodies functioned well together. However, it is not yet certain that the 'one UNESCO' concept has been fully established and it will not be unless the roles and functions of the different links in the chain from Paris to project implementation are more clearly established.

*Relationship with stakeholders/beneficiaries* is the third criterion for effective decentralisation. Something has been said about this in the country studies and should not be repeated here but the role of the Field Offices in relation to their Member States may need greater clarification. For example, some Ministries of Education felt they should have been more involved in preparation of TORs etc. On a more positive note, it was clear from most of the countries visited that interactions with NGOs and INGOs were often very good, thus cementing relationships with the ultimate beneficiaries with whom the NGOs were engaged. It was also evident that there is much goodwill towards UNESCO

and other UN organisations among their partners at governmental and NGO levels. Haiti and other countries showed a high level of local networking and support of this type.

*Decentralised network structures* represent another criterion for the decentralisation process. Again, the clustering of countries answered this criterion but in addition, the relationship among the different UNESCO actors from the Region to the Cluster to the Field Office and National Commission has to be clarified and understood if the network is to be used effectively. From the four countries studied it is not always easy to detect how the structures actually worked. At the practical level it can be seen that Cambodia for example, demonstrated a good use of local networks and the case of Haiti has already been touched upon.

*Financial and human resources* present a major challenge for UNESCO as decentralisation cannot be expected to work where resources are slender or not available. In the four countries studied finances always seemed to be a problem despite 75% of MTE funding being decentralised. Comparatively modest sums were made available for studies and other activities and we found no evidence that Field Offices were raising extra funds themselves to do a more extensive or thorough job. Decentralisation on a shoestring will not work and serious attention must be paid to policies and practices which will enable Field Offices and Cluster Offices particularly to seek funding appropriate to the tasks they have to undertake. The UNESCO literature does show good examples of successful use of modest budgets but the general story is one of ad hoc approaches rather than strategic solutions. Headquarters will need to help build local capacity in this respect. As for human resources, these seemed in some countries to be in short supply, perhaps the root of the Cairo-Khartoum breakdown. It is known that many UNESCO offices are short-staffed, that there are numerous temporary staff and that shortcomings in training exist. Decentralisation cannot work if tasks are delegated to under-resourced locations.

*Programme results* in the four cases studied are of course mixed and it would be instructive to acquire a broader picture of MTE in many more countries before coming to a conclusion on the overall effectiveness of decentralised modalities. Programme results are all important and although vague outcomes such as ‘increased capacity’ may be quoted, the central focus of the MTE programme was to see that appropriate TA was made available to help Member States get their EFA National Plans designed. It is by this outcome that decentralisation should be measured, although the supporting outcomes of greater capacity, improved networking and knowledge development through special studies should not be ignored. By the criterion of programme results it can be seen that



Cambodia felt that quality of MTE inputs was high, three out of four assignments had been completed and outcomes were generally satisfactory. Haiti is another relatively successful story with UNESCO playing an invaluable role in sustaining the education system anyway. The MTE approach has not been so successful in Indonesia but this may not be entirely attributable to decentralisation as a modality. The same problems could have occurred under a different approach if transparent and participatory procedures had also been ignored. Could the Sudan story have been an improved one if the decentralised 'chain' of involvement had worked better? The answer undoubtedly is 'yes', particularly if the changes to the original proposal had been discussed fully with Khartoum before onward submission to Headquarters. It must also be admitted that there was already a competent EFA planner in Khartoum who got the EFA plan out anyway. Perhaps the key question here is how the decentralised model might have supported him and his staff better if it had actually worked.

What does come through the evaluation and the other literature examined is the importance of the clustering concept and its value in the decentralisation process. If the four countries examined had greater access to the experience of neighbouring countries in a cluster then the synergies deriving from learning together would have benefited all. It is also clear that a number of other organisational and procedural steps need to be taken if decentralisation is to work effectively; also that UNESCO is well aware of these issues. Resources, training, accountability, transparency, established monitoring and evaluation procedures are all well known solutions. What is of greater importance perhaps is the question of what alternative models present themselves? J.P. Naik, in contemplating the huge task of educating India's millions once said, 'We have no alternative to alternatives'. In other words we must try all reasonable avenues. UNESCO cannot return to a centrally-managed system, although a number of aspects of centralisation still remain in place. It has no alternative to decentralisation and the challenge now is to make it work better. From the slender evidence of the four countries presented here, there is no reason why decentralisation should not be a very satisfactory mode of operation. given time and continued support. The structure is in place, the criteria have been established but the human and financial resources remain overstretched. Decentralisation is the future if the concept of 'From donorship to partnership to ownership' is to be realised.

### **3.7. Summing up**

The key questions posed in this evaluation concern the efficiency, relevance, effectiveness (especially in terms of decentralisation), outcomes, sustainability and risks associated with the MTE strategy. Using only four countries as case studies provides only a limited sample and the four selected showed a wide variety of contexts from poverty-stricken Haiti to civil-war stricken Sudan. Both Cambodia and Indonesia have come through recent political and economic upheavals. It is probably true to say that there are no ‘typical’ countries which might have been chosen.

What can be said is that the MTE strategy was well conceived but might have been more effectively ‘marketed’ to ensure that its impact was maximised and its mission understood. It is significant that despite a shift within UNESCO to regarding MTE more as technical support and assistance, the MTE label was maintained at a documentary level. In addition, the varying contexts of the target countries proved extremely significant in the extent to which inputs could be gauged as effective. As far as relevance is concerned, the evidence from the documents and the field work is quite conclusive. MTE inputs were of great relevance to national needs, even where, as in Indonesia, the consultant selected did not fulfil the TORs as required by the national EFA team. Effectiveness was also generally high, especially in the cases of Haiti and Cambodia. Results or outcomes were achieved in all cases, or will be, given extensions as agreed. Some of these outcomes are highly significant with national EFA plans completed and Working Groups well supported. Quality of planning was enhanced and some (but not enough) capacity was built as the field reports indicate. Sustainability is another matter. The Cambodian experience suggest that short-term inputs may not be the best strategy to pursue. In Haiti it was suggested that UNESCO is ‘in the driving seat’ and that without the organisation education will grind to a halt – hardly a recipe for sustainability but a fair comment on the realities. Indonesia’s progress has been significant but slow – another sustainability issue – and as mentioned, Sudan will need continuing support. MTE was never designed to create conditions within which countries would receive short-term inputs leading to stand-alone self sufficiency. However, the MTE initiative should certainly take cognisance of the necessity for greater institutional sustainability through capacity building. This latter quality has been scarce and in reviewing the MTE strategy, UNESCO should emphasise the importance of combining effective inputs to planning and implementation processes with sharper focus on capacity building.

Implicit in the discussion above has been the dominant question – Has the MTE initiative been worthwhile? In terms of the countries visited for this evaluation the answer must be in the affirmative although a number of significant lessons have been learned for incorporation into future MTE-style inputs. Operationalisation and implementation of good quality EFA plans remains the challenge for many countries and the MTE concept, suitably redesigned, has an important role to play in assisting Member States towards fulfilment of the 2015 target for EFA.

Did UNESCO's decentralisation policy assist or hinder the MTE initiative? It has been stated by the evaluation team that they see no alternative to decentralisation. The criteria developed by Headquarters are sound. Perhaps it is too soon to see them worked out fully in the MTE story but as the basis for a continuing MTE programme aimed at assisting countries to implement their EFA National Plans, a strengthened decentralised system is essential. In reporting to the donor, UNESCO should consider emphasising the following points:

- ◆ The MTE initiative has demonstrated that it is quite possible to provide competent professional support to the development of EFA Plans through a decentralised system.
- ◆ Weaknesses in the approach were shown up where resources were limited but the critical concept of building on local needs and capacities was tested and proved to be feasible
- ◆ The ongoing challenge will be to build on the experience gained from the MTE initiative and focus its strengths on supporting the implementation of the successfully developed National plans for EFA on the target countries

## 4. ANNEXURES

### Annex 4.1. Terms of Reference for evaluation of project

#### “Mobile Teams of Experts for EFA”

Funded through the Norwegian Funds-in-Trust to UNESCO (504INT1011)

#### 1. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

*The Dakar Framework for Action* reaffirms the right to education as a fundamental human right. It requests all countries to build on existing national sector strategies and “to develop or strengthen existing national plans of action by 2002 at the latest. These plans should be integrated into a wider poverty reduction and development framework, and should be developed through more transparent and democratic processes, involving stakeholders, especially peoples’ representatives, community leaders, parents, learners, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and civil society. The plans will address problems associated with the chronic under-financing of basic education by establishing budget priorities that reflect a commitment to achieving EFA goals and targets at the earliest possible date, and no later than 2015.” (Dakar Framework for Action, par. 9).

**In accordance with its commitments made at the World Education Forum in Dakar in 2000**, UNESCO developed the “UNESCO Policy Statement on Co-operation with Donors for the Dakar Follow-up Actions” (Annex 1). Following Norway’s expressed interest in the new approach for cooperation for EFA, UNESCO submitted a request to Norway 16 October 2001 to partly fund the first chapter of the programme “Education for All: Learning to Live Together in the Knowledge Society” (Annex 2a) - later revised to “Extra-budgetary Programme for Technical Services to Countries implementing the Dakar Framework for Action” (Annex 2b) - and elaborated the “Mobile Teams of Experts for EFA” Project (Annex 3). The project was established by countersignature of donor agreement 21 November and 6 December 2001.

The work undertaken through the voluntary contribution from Norway reflects **UNESCO’s Regular Programme and Budget 31 C/5** (2002 - 2003) paragraph 01110 “*The General Conference authorizes the Director-General to implement the corresponding plan of action in order to lay the foundations to ensure the right to education for all through the realization of the six goals of the Dakar Framework for Action by coordinating EFA partners and maintaining their collective momentum in designing strategies and mobilizing resources in support of national efforts; and strengthen institutional capacities and promote national policy dialogue to enable Member States to draw up their EFA national action plans and begin to implement them*”.

**The term *Mobile Teams of Experts*** embodies the technical services needed for guiding the activities at the country level, and does not refer to a structure as such. It is a concept that ascribes to the process UNESCO is involved in identifying the needs at the national level in consultation with the recipient countries leading on to selecting and engaging different experts and/or institutions to assist Member States in the elaboration and revision of their National Action Plans for EFA.

Main objective:

- To assist Member States in developing and/or strengthening National Plans for EFA through targeted interventions of technical services.

Expected results:

- At least 10 countries fully engaged in EFA planning processes, such as policy development and plan readjustment in accordance with the Dakar Framework for Action.
- Increased and improved participation of national EFA stakeholders in the planning and consultations for EFA.
- Capacities of governments increased in policy formulation, planning and co-ordination for EFA implementation.

The Division of Educational Policy and Strategy of the Education Sector was designated to design the concrete implementation framework in consultation with the field offices and the other ED Divisions concerned. In order to set up such a framework, three aspects were taken into account:

- (i) needs for and areas of support to countries should be demand-driven (and not supply-driven);
- (ii) the assistance should conform to the on-going decentralization policy of the Organization;
- (iii) technical assistance will be both results-oriented and supportive of the EFA process in the context of sector-wide planning at country level.

## **2. PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION**

The evaluation was foreseen from the outset of the project proposal and is included in the donor agreement which states the following (paragraph 11):

*“UNESCO shall provide the Government of Norway with a final evaluation report no later than three months after the termination of the Agreement, containing such elements as are essential for an assessment of the programme and the results of the relevant activities, as well as UNESCO’s own conclusions thereon. In addition, UNESCO will forward periodic reports and other relevant information on the progress of the activities under this Agreement to the Government of Norway, as often as may reasonably be requested by the Government of Norway. The final evaluation report shall be prepared in close cooperation with and under guidelines provided by UNESCO’s Internal Oversight Services (IOS). The funds for the evaluation, at the level of 7.5% of the total budget in accordance with the enclosed programme document, shall be drawn from Norway’s contribution.”*

This agreement to undertake the evaluation was the outcome of a long history of discussion on optimal utilization of extra-budgetary resources, and the necessity for development of strategic thinking in the approach for contributing to EFA between the donor and UNESCO. The donor and UNESCO agreed that the contribution for this particular project would be the initial stepping-stone for Norway-UNESCO’s larger scale cooperation under the EFA Programme, and as a smaller initiation, a thorough evaluation of the activities undertaken.

As stated in the project agreement, UNESCO shall undertake an end-of-project evaluation. The evaluation will focus on:

- i) The **effectiveness of the implementation modalities** in place for execution of the Project with special emphasis on the explicit decentralization structure and the effectiveness of this strategy according to the overall goals of the UNESCO Programme for support to EFA and this particular project;
- ii) The **relevance of the initial project idea** in relation to the proposals from the field offices (i.e. the needs of the beneficiary countries) as well as the **effectiveness of the project** against the objectives and expected results of the project; and
- iii) The **sustainability of the capacity of beneficiaries** for policy development and national EFA planning

The main stakeholders of the evaluation are the countries that benefited from this project, Governments and civil society; UNESCO's ED Sector and participating field offices; the donor Norway; and partner agencies for EFA movement.

### 3. EVALUATION SCOPE

The scope of the end-of-project evaluation will be all the project activities in the participating countries. It covers the three points mentioned in **Point 2.i** as efficiency of project execution, reporting mechanisms and programme delivery under the decentralized structure as well as coordination between national, regional and international partners in the beneficiary country; for **Point 2.ii** as relevance of the project to the needs of the beneficiary country, and degree of achievement of the project to its objectives, results and work plans; and for **Point 2.iii** as sustainability of national capacity, built as a result of the technical assistance provided, in preparing the national EFA plans.

The evaluation's Timeline is provided under point 6 of this TOR but in brief, the evaluation team will carry out two weeks of desktop studies and research; one week of field visits to maximum of five venues of the implementation sites with interviews of in-country stakeholders such as senior Government officials, NGOs, partners in the UN agencies and Bretton Woods institutions and bilateral donors; and one week of finalising the report. The field offices and sixteen countries participating in the project are:

**Comoros** UNESCO Dar es Salaam Dir: Mr Cheikh Tidiane Sy FP: Ms Cathleen Sekwao  
**Tajikistan** UNESCO Almaty Dir: Ms Anjum Haque FP Ms Yumi Tokuda  
**Sudan** UNESCO Beirut Dir: Mr Victor Billeh FP: Ms Nour Dajani UNESCO Cairo Dir a.i.: Mr Amr Azzouz FP: Ms Ghada Gholam  
**Yemen** UNESCO Beirut Dir: Mr Victor Billeh FP: Ms Nour Dajani UNESCO Cairo Dir a.i.: Mr Amr Azzouz FP: Ms Ghada Gholam  
**Guatemala** UNESCO Guatemala Dir and FP: Mr Federico Figueroa Rivas  
**Nepal** UNESCO Kathmandu Dir: Mr Yoshiaki Kitamura FP: Mr Aarati Gurung  
**Dominican Republic** UNESCO Santo Domingo Dir and FP: Mr Luis Tiburico  
**Bosnia/Herzegovina** UNESCO Sarajevo Dir and FP: Mr Colin Kaiser  
**Sierra Leone** UNESCO Dakar Dir: Armoogum Parusuramen FP: Ms Benoît Sossou  
**Haiti** UNESCO Port-au-Prince Dir: Mr Bernard Hadjadj

**Cambodia** UNESCO Bangkok Dir: Mr Sheldon Shaeffer FP: Ms Dominique Altner Mr Riku Warjovaara UNESCO Phnom Penh Dir: Mr Etienne Clement FP: Mr Supote Prasertsri

**Lao PDR** UNESCO Bangkok Dir: Mr Sheldon Shaeffer FP: Ms Dominique Altner Mr Riku Warjovaara UNESCO Bangkok Dir: Mr Sheldon Shaeffer FP: Ms Dominique Altner Mr Riku Warjovaara

**Indonesia** UNESCO Bangkok. Dir: Mr Sheldon Shaeffer FP: Ms Dominique Altner/ Mr Riku Warjovaara UNESCO Jakarta Dir: Mr Stephen Hill. FP: Ms. Cecilia Barbieri

**Thailand** UNESCO Bangkok Dir: Mr Sheldon Shaeffer FP: Ms Dominique Altner/ Mr Riku Warjovaara UNESCO Bangkok Dir: Mr Sheldon Shaeffer FP: Ms Dominique Altner/ Mr Riku Warjovaara

**DPR Korea** UNESCO Bangkok Dir: Mr Sheldon Shaeffer FP: Ms Dominique Altner/ Mr Riku Warjovaara UNESCO Beijing Dir: Ms Yasuyuki Aoshima FP: Ms Maki Hayashikawa

**Mongolia** UNESCO Bangkok Dir: Mr Sheldon Shaeffer FP: Ms Dominique Altner/ Mr Riku Warjovaara UNESCO Beijing Dir: Ms Yasuyuki Aoshima FP: Ms Maki Hayashikawa

The evaluator will make a final decision as to the venues for field evaluation in close consultation with the project officer. However, it is suggested to focus on the implementation mechanisms/modalities of the project in relation to the other aspects of the evaluation, i.e. Points 2.ii and 2.iii of Purpose. With this in mind and while it is expected that the evaluator will further elaborate on these, some suggestions for the selection criteria could be as follows:

- Venue where UNESCO has a field office (Bosnia-Herzegovina, Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Haiti, Indonesia, Nepal, and Thailand) vs. venue where UNESCO does not have a field office (Comoros, Indonesia, Korea DPR, Lao PDR, Mongolia, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Tajikistan, and Yemen);
- Venue where the activities were executed by a single field office vs. venue where they were coordinated regionally (Cambodia, Lao PDR, Indonesia, Thailand, DPR Korea, and Mongolia);
- LDCs and non LDCs;
- Technical assistance mainly by international expertise vs. national expertise vs. a combination of both;
- Possibility of stakeholder interviews: Government officials and non-governmental organizations/civil society, other EFA partners.

Recommendations and lessons learned will be drawn from observation, collected data and analysis. The recommendations in the final report should:

- (i) focus on implementation modalities/mechanisms (including decentralization and Headquarters/FOs interaction);
- (ii) be practical, operational and measurable;
- (iii) be out-come oriented and relevant to UNESCO's decision-making, overall policy and mandate and with special emphasis on EFA.

Related to the above, the issues/questions that can be addressed in this evaluation are provided in Annex 1 of this TOR.

#### **4. METHODOLOGY**

The methodology will be part of the project evaluation framework to be proposed by the external evaluator. The five-fold methodology listed here below is to serve as reference points:

- (i) Desktop studies of all relevant documentation as listed in Point 7 Annexes;
- (ii) Stakeholders' interview: World Bank's team if beneficiary country has PRSP; UNDAF team; national stakeholders on the consideration of the aspect of gender, HIV/AIDS and ICT in planning processes;
- (iii) Participating observation in the field: Meetings in national EFA groups and partnerships; focus group interviews;
- (iv) In-depth analysis of efficiency and impact at the national level in the countries visited;  
It will be of great importance to analyse the aspect of partnership in national planning (processes) for EFA and inter-agency cooperation/coordination. Stating incontrovertibly the compatibility of national EFA planning process and the activity of UNESCO with funds from Norway (impact measurement) will be central to the fieldwork;
- (v) Assessment of the comparative advantages of the activities by UNESCO, especially those under this project, and by the other EFA Partners.

#### **5. EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION**

The evaluation team will be composed of a lead external evaluator (identified by ED Sector in cooperation with IOS) who will select the other members of the evaluation team. One member shall be requested to be appointed by the donor at the donor's own costs, as by the project agreement paragraph 12.

A staff member from Education Sector's Executive Office will assist in the preparation and organisation of the evaluation exercise and take part in the field visits as an observer. The Project Officer in the Division of Educational Policies and Strategies will facilitate the work of the evaluation team by providing inputs as an information source necessary for the evaluation as requested by the evaluators.

#### **6. PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS**

UNESCO's request to the donor for an extension of the termination date of the project to 30 June 2003 was granted, and the evaluation will start in May 2003 with a preparatory meeting at UNESCO Headquarters and desk studies, followed by field visits in June 2003, and the submission of the final evaluation report by end August 2003. The nature of the project is not output oriented and defined into a narrow timeframe with a closed end, but oriented towards larger outcomes and the overall support to the ongoing process of national EFA planning in the beneficiary countries. Furthermore, as the central element of the evaluation is management, the results of the evaluation need to be presented as early as possible to influence the further implementation of the "Extra-budgetary Programme for Technical Services to Countries implementing the Dakar Framework for Action" of which the "Mobile Teams of Experts of EFA" is but one part.

:



## 7. ANNEXES

List of documents for background and desk study:

- 1) “UNESCO Policy Statement on Co-operation with Donors for the Dakar Follow-up Actions”
- 2) “Education for All: Learning to Live Together in the Knowledge Society” and “Extra-budgetary Programme for Technical Services to Countries implementing the Dakar Framework for Action”
- 3) Project Proposal “Mobile Teams of Experts for EFA”, submitted to Norway 16 October 2001
- 4) “An International Strategy to put the Dakar Framework for Action on Education for All into operation”
- 5) “The Dakar Framework for Action. Education for All: Meeting our Collective Commitments”
- 6) Tender notice Memo to FO as at 28 January 2002
- 7) Project Proposals from FO as at February 2002
- 8) Minutes of the Technical Team 7 March 2002
- 9) Decision Memo to FO as at 18 March 2002
- 10) Project monitoring reports of July 2002
- 11) Implementation Status Reports of November 2002
- 12) Progress report as at autumn 2002
- 13) “Education for All: Is the World on Track?” EFA Monitoring Report 2002

### Annex 1

#### Issues and questions that can be addressed in the evaluation

##### A. Relevance

(The relevance of the project objectives, activities and areas for support in the light of the needs of the beneficiary countries, the overall objectives of EFA and the mandate of UNESCO in the framework of EFA)

*Examples of questions:*

- A.1. Were the objectives pursued by UNESCO, the services provided, the modality employed in delivering the project (each different from a country to another) relevant to the needs of the beneficiary countries?
- A.2. Were the objectives pursued by UNESCO, the services provided and the modality employed in delivering the project relevant to the mandate of UNESCO in achieving EFA goals?

##### B. Effectiveness and outputs

(The degree to which the project has achieved the objectives of the project)

*Examples of questions:*

- B.1. Have national EFA action plans been prepared or strengthened within the period of time foreseen?
- B.2. What is the quality of these national EFA action plans whose preparation was assisted by UNESCO?
- B.3. What factors have contributed to and/or prevented from the achievement of the objectives of the project?
- B.4. What was the modality of the implementation of the project like? Was it effective in achieving the objectives of the project?

- B.5. Were coordination within UNESCO (between the field offices and the Headquarters) and between UNESCO and the partners (in particular experts and other agencies) effective in achieving the objectives of the project?
- B.6. Was an appropriate monitoring system in place and was a monitoring appropriately conducted and reported to the Headquarters?
- B.7. Has the project been progressed as scheduled? If not, why?

**C. Efficiency**

(The optimal transformation of inputs to outputs and the results)

*Examples of questions:*

- C.1. Were the project delivered within the budget and the timeframe foreseen?
- C.2. Would the same results have been achieved at lower costs?

**D. Outcome**

Changes, planned or unplanned, positive or negative, brought about by the project

*Examples of questions:*

- D.1. What changes, planned or unplanned, positive or negative, have been identified as a result of the project delivery?
- D.2. What factors contributed to those changes?

**E. Sustainability**

(Durability of the positive results of the project after the termination of UNESCO's intervention)

*Examples of questions:*

- E.1. Were the beneficiary countries involved with the project both in terms of human resources and financial resources?
- E.2. Are the beneficiary countries capable of implementing and updating/adjusting the national EFA action plans without UNESCO's technical and financial support?
- E.3. Was the assistance compatible with national institutions and were institutional sustainability requirements met?
- E.4. Are there any technical or financial support made available to the countries either from bilateral donors, NGOs or international agencies in implementing the national EFA action plans and monitoring the implementation?
- E.5. Is the approach employed in this project replicable to other countries or other projects?

**F. Risk**

(Any risks that may threaten a successful achievement of results)

*Examples of questions:*

- F.1. Are there any risks identified in the management of the project that may threaten the successful implementation of national action plans and achievement of EFA goals by the 16 beneficiary countries?
- F.2. In case there are any risks identified, are there any measures to be taken to mitigate these risks?

## Annex 4.2. Sample Itineraries

### 4.2.1. Indonesia

#### Program:

- Monday June 9<sup>th</sup>: 1300. Meeting with EFA Core Team, Ministry of National Education.  
1500. Meeting with UNESCO educational advisor
- Tuesday, June 10<sup>th</sup>: 0830: Meeting with UNICEF, UNICEF offices.  
  
1100: Meeting with Dutch embassy, bilateral aid to ESR, (Educational Sectorwide Review)  
  
1400: Meeting with EFA, WGNFE(Working group for non formal education)
- Wednesday, June 11<sup>th</sup>. 0830, meeting with Ms Dwi Fatan Liliane from Centre for the Betterment of Education (NGO) at UNESCO.  
  
1400: meeting with GTZ representative, MOEYC.
- Thursday, June 12<sup>th</sup>: Field visit to Yogyakarta, Provincial and District level EFA planning pilot project supported by UNESCO
- Friday, June 13<sup>th</sup>: 0230: Departure.

### 4.2.2. Haiti: June 1-7, 2003

Date	Time	Place	People met
June 1			Met at the airport and taken to the hotel. Received a lot of documents for the preparation of the meetings.
June 2	08:30	UNESCO	Meeting with the UNESCO representatives: Mr. Bernard Hadjadj, Mr. Gaston Georges Mérisier, UNESCO/EFA/MTE, Consultant, Education Expert, Former Education Minister in Haiti. Ms. Geneviève A. Pierre, National Program Officer, UNESCO Mr. Julien Daboué, UNESCO/MENJS (CPT Cellule de pilotage) Education Expert
	13:30	MENJS	Meeting with the Ministry on the Cellule de pilotage and EFA: Ms. Nadine Henry, National Coordinator of EFA Mr. Vernet Larose, Director of the Cellule de pilotage Ms. Caroline Legros, Executive officer responsible for EFA Mr. Charles Levelt Joseph, Director of planning and external cooperation Mr. RénoId Telfort, Director of training and vocational

			education
June 3	09:00	UNICEF	Ms. Lena Thiam, Assistant project officer education Mr. Ronald Lean-Jacques, Assistant project officer education
	14:00	UNESCO	Meeting with the person responsible for the study on life conditions: Mr. Serge Pompilus, l'Equipe de Fidel (consultancy agency)
June 4	09:00	European Union	Mr. Jens Schütz, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Secretary, Economic consultant
	10:30	World Vision	Mr. Jean-André Jean- Charles, National coordinator of educational programmes
	14:00	FOKAL	Ms. Lorraine Mangonès, General program coordinator
June 5	08:00	UNESCO	Meeting with the person in charge of the project "Alternative Education" (vocational education): Mr. Jacques Abraham, Coordinator of Centre de Recherche et de Developpement (CERDEV)
	10:00	UAPC	Unité d'Appui du Programme de la Coopération Canadienne, Agence Canadienne de Développement International (ACDI): Ms. Jeannie Claude Zaugg, Education expert
	15:00	UNESCO	Meeting with the person in charge of the Alphabetisation Project: Mr. Audallbert Bien-Aimé, ANED-Agence Nationale pour l'Education
	16:00	UNESCO	Meeting with the person in charge of the study on human resources and the quality in education, Université Quisqueya: Ms. Michaelle Saint-Natus, researcher in the field of education
June 6	10:00	UNESCO	Meeting with UNESCO representatives for an informal debriefing of my preliminary findings: Mr. Bernard Hadjadj, Mr. Gaston Georges Mérisier, UNESCO/EFA/MTE, Consultant, Education Expert, Former Education Minister in Haiti. Ms. Geneviève A. Pierre, National Program Officer, UNESCO Mr. Julien Daboué, UNESCO/MENJS (CPT Cellule de pilotage) Education Expert
	13:00	Informal lunch	Meeting with MENJS representatives and UNESCO for clarifying questions, comments and discussions: Mr. Gaston Georges Mérisier, UNESCO/EFA/MTE, Consultant, Education Expert, Former Education Minister in Haiti. Ms. Geneviève A. Pierre, National Program Officer, UNESCO Mr. Julien Daboué, UNESCO/MENJS (CPT Cellule de pilotage) Education Expert Ms. Nadine Henry, National Coordinator of EFA, MENJS Mr. Vernet Larose, Director of the Cellule de pilotage, MENJS

June 7	11:00		Departure from the hotel to leave for Norway
--------	-------	--	----------------------------------------------

## **Annex 4.3: People met and interviewed:**

### **4.3.1. Indonesia**

#### *UNESCO:*

Director: S. Mills;  
Cecilia Barbieri, Education Officer;  
Richardo Paulsen,

#### *Ministry of Education, Youth and Culture*

M.Nuh. R. ECCD working group  
Suheru M. ECCD working group  
M Adwan. Secretariat of EFA  
Sudiarwo. Secretariat of EFA  
Burharuddin Tola. EFA Quality of Education Group  
Sudradjat. EFA Life Skills working group  
Togar Sitompul EFA  
Tegum Manto ECCD working group  
Betty Sinaga ECCD working Group  
Agung Durwadi Secretariat of EFA  
Ekojatmiko Sukarfo, Literacy task force  
Perseveronda So, UNICEF  
Hamid Muhammad, Basic education working group  
Nina Sarjunani, BAPPENAS,

#### *UNICEF:*

Perseveranda So, Chief Education Unit  
Jiyono, Project Officer, Education Unit.

#### *Dutch Embassy;*

Claudine Helleman, Ist Secretary, Education

#### *Centre for the Betterment of Education;*

Ms. Dwi Fatan Liliane.

#### *MOEYC, National Coordination Forum, Education for All.*

Richardo Paulsen, UNESCO  
Dr. Arif, Dikmas  
Agus Pranats, Dikmas  
Pahala Simanjuntak, Dikmas  
Suhern Muljoatmodjo, EFA Secretariat  
Mohamad Adnan, EFA Secretariat, consultant  
Sondjaras, EFA Secretariat

#### *GTZ;*

Dr. Otto Hammes, team leader. Science Education Quality Improvement Project, SEQIP

#### *Yogyakarta District:*

EFA district level planning group including the Director, planning co-ordinator, gender advisor, statistician and one representative for NFE.

#### **4.3.2. Haiti (see previous section)**

#### **4.3.3. Cambodia**

##### *UNESCO*

Etienne Clement, UNESCO Representative in Cambodia  
Supote Prasertsri, Education Programme Specialist, UNESCO, Cambodia  
Ms. Sue Fox, NFE Project Officer  
Mrs. Tey Sambo, Liaison Officer with National Authority, Programme Officer for Culture of Peace and Family Education for ECCD: Gender Focal Point  
Fabrice Laurentin, UNESCO/UNICEF HIV/AIDS Focal Point  
Ms Leena Kuorelahti, UNV/UNESCO NFE Program

##### *UNICEF*

Louis-Georges Asenault, Representative  
Mrs. Desiree Jongsma, Head, Education Section  
Peter de Vries, Project Officer, Education  
Peaing Parac, Assistant Project Officer, Education

##### *UNDP*

Ms. Dominique Ait Ouyahia-McAdams, Resident Representative  
Ladislav Byenkya-Abwooli, Deputy Resident Representative  
Ms. Ingrid Cyimana, Team leader, Poverty reduction(MDGs)

##### *NGOs*

Kou Boun Kheang, Chair of NGOs Education Partnership (NEP), Save the Children, Norway (Redd Barna)  
Kurt Bredenberg, KAPE Cambodia  
Mrs. Yim Sokhary, Director and Founder, Street Children Assistance and Development Programme (SCADP)

##### *Cambodian National Commission for UNESCO*

Mrs Tan Thany, Secretary General  
Yuos Leng, deputy Secretary-General

##### *Ministry of Education and Youth and Sports*

H.E: Tol Lah, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Education, Youth and Sports  
Dr. Nath Bunroeun, National EFA and ICT Co-ordinator, Director of Teacher Training Department  
Thirty members of the EFA Working Groups

## **ANNEX 4.4.: List of Documents Consulted**

### **4.4.1. UNESCO Publications**

- UNESCO Policy Statement on Co-operation with donors for the Dakar Follow-up Actions.
- Education for All: Learning to Live in the Knowledge Society and Extra-budgetary Programme for Technical Services to Countries implementing the Dakar Framework for Action.
- Project Proposal “Mobile Teams of Experts for EFA”, submitted to Norway 16 October 2001.
- “An International Strategy to put the Dakar Framework for action on Education for All into operation”
- “The Dakar Framework for Action. Education for All: Meeting our Collective Commitments”.
- Tender Notices Memo as at 28 January 2002.
- Project Proposal from FO as at 28 February 2002.
- Minutes of the Technical Team 7 March 2002.
- Decision Memo to FO as at 18 March 2002.
- Project Monitoring Reports of July 2002.
- Implementation Status Report of November 2002.
- Progress Report as at Autumn 2002.
- “Education for All: Is the World on Track?” EFA Monitoring Report 2002.

### **4.4.2. Other Publications**

- Fighting Poverty: The Norwegian Government’s Action Plan for Combating Poverty in the South, Towards 2015. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Oslo, March 2002.

### **4.4.3. Sample of country-specific documents: Indonesia**

McMahon, Walter (2003) **EFA, Final Report on Financing and Achieving “Education for All” Goals, Monitoring Report**, (2003): Science Education

MOEYC (2003) **EFA Report** (draft): Jakarta, MOEYC

MOEYC (2002) **Education For All, Situational Analyses**, Book 1 and 2., Jakarta, MOEYC, (2003): **Development of EFA Action Plans in Indonesia**, Jakarta, MOEYC

MOEYC: (2003) **EFA Statistical Tables**, Jakarta, MOEYC

MOEYC: (2002) **EFA Survey Indonesia**



UNESCO: (2003) **Norway FIT, Indonesian Progress Report**, UNESCO, Bangkok.  
UNESCO, UNICEF, NZAID, Gov. of Indonesia: **Creating Learning Communities for Children, Improving Primary Schools through School Based Management and Community Participation**, Jakarta, MOEYC

#### **4.4.4. Sample of country-specific documents: Haiti**

FIDEL (2002), **Les Conditions de Vie des Populations en Haïti**.

MENJS (1996), **Le Plan National d'Education et de Formation**.

MENJS (1999), **Evaluation de l'Education Pour Tous (EPT 2000)**.

MENJS (2002), **Appel d'Offres. Rapport d'évaluation: Evaluaton des soumissions pour la réalisation de six études thématiques et une étude transversale**.

MENJS (2003), **Education pour Tous: Cadre d'Action de Dakar. Strategie Nationale d'Action**

MENJS/UNESCO/Jacques Abraham (2002), **Jeunes et Formations Alternatives**.

MENJS/UNESCO (2002), **Etude Thématique sur l'Alphabétisation**.

Mérisier, G. G. (2002), **L'Education en Haïti: Un Regard Prospectif**.

Moisset, J. J. and Merisier, G. G. (2001), **Coûts, Financement et Qualité de l'Education en Haïti. Perspective comparative: école publique et école privé**.

Nations Unis (2003), **Programme Intégré de Réponse aux Besoin Urgents des Communautés et des Populations Vulnérables (PIR)**.

#### **Other Documents**

Coopération Japonaise/FOKAL (2003), **Définition d'un cadre méthodologique pour la preparation des forum départementaux**.

MENJS (2001), **Table de Concertation des ONG. Thème: Suivi de Dakar (EPT 200) / Stratégie Nationale d'Action. Ordre du Jour**.

MENJS (2002?), **Suivi du forum mondial sur l'éducation / Consolidation du PNEF. Elaboration de la Stratégie Nationale d'Action sur l'Education Pour Tous**.

MENJS (January 2003), **HAITI -Appui fourni au MENJS par les bailleurs de fonds dans le cadre de l'élaboration de la Stratégie Nationale d'Action EPT**.

Mérisier, G. G. (as MTE in MENJS) (May 2002), **Rapport mensuel d'activités**.

Mérisier, G. G. (as MTE in MENJS) (July 2002), **Rapport périodique d'activités.**  
UNESCO-Haiti (2001), **Application pour le fonds en-dépôt norvégien.**  
UNESCO (March 2003), **Elaboration de la Stratégie Nationale d'Action EPT en Haïti:  
Etat d'avancement.**