



# **UNESCO National Education Support Strategies (UNESS)**

**Report of the Pilot Evaluation Workshop**

**Section for Education Support Strategies  
Division of Country Planning and Field Support**

**The Education Sector**

# CONTENTS

<b>I. Background .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>II. Proceedings of the Workshop .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>III. Key Findings .....</b>	<b>4</b>
A. Rationale of UNESS: .....	4
B. Guidelines for UNESS .....	4
C. Is UNESS an Upstream Planning or Downstream Implementation Tool?.....	5
D. Some Other Issues .....	5
<b>IV. Follow-Up: Towards a Framework for Cooperation and Action .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Annexes .....</b>	<b>8</b>
Annex 1. Terms of Reference, Agenda and List of Participants.....	8
Annex 2: Reports for Plenary Sessions on Country UNESS Presentations.....	12
Annex 3: Reports on Thematic Discussions on UNESS Content and Process .....	18
Annex 4: Reports on Regional Rollout Strategies .....	29
Annex 5: Report of Closing Plenary on Recommendations for the Roll-out of UNESS .....	35

**UNESCO  
EDUCATION SECTOR**

**UNESCO NATIONAL EDUCATION SUPPORT STRATEGIES (UNESS)  
PILOT EVALUATION WORKSHOP**

**Report (16 October 2006)**

This is a synthesis report of the UNESS Pilot Evaluation Workshop organized by the Division of Country Planning and Field Support (ED/PFS) at UNESCO HQ from 27 to 29 September 2006. The main text of this report captures some essential issues that cut across the experiences and proposals of the FOs in elaborating UNESS documents during the pilot phase. Details of the rich discussions held during the workshop are presented in the annexes and may be referred to in contextualizing the major issues and findings reported in the main text.

Despite many challenges, including time constraints, capacity issues, and the new planning concept introduced by UNESS, etc., the nine Field Offices who participated in this pilot process have demonstrated tremendous determination in producing the draft UNESS documents.<sup>1</sup>

## **I. Background**

Developing UNESCO National Education Support Strategies (UNESS) is required for our Organization to play a much more strategic role in supporting national educational needs and priorities and in strengthening its partnership with other development agencies, in conformity with international development goals. UNESS documents will be designed as our in-country cooperation strategy, in light of the lessons learnt from our past and on-going cooperation with Member States. Consequently, these documents (in the form of synthesis reports) will constitute building blocks for evidence-based C4 and C5, and also facilitate our more active participation in UNCTs' common country programming exercises.

Pilot-testing of the UNESS process was launched in May 2006 for 11 so-called "CapEFA" countries (Angola, Bangladesh, Egypt, Guinea, Morocco, Niger, Pakistan, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Tanzania and Viet Nam). Nigeria was added to the list following the request of the Abuja Office. As of 26 September 2006, nine UNESS documents had been drafted for the above countries. Guinea, Senegal and Sierra Leone are still at a preparatory phase. UNESS documents have also been drafted for three additional countries at the initiative of FOs concerned: Lebanon (UNESCO Office Beirut), Cameroon (UNESCO Office Yaounde) and Iraq (UNESCO Office for Iraq).

In June 2006, the UNESS concept was officially adopted within the Education Sector Reform framework as the planning tool for preparing the Organization's Medium-Term Strategy and biennial programmes. A new Section for Education Support Strategies (ESS) was subsequently created within ED/PFS Division at HQ to lead and coordinate the UNESS process.

It was in this context that an evaluation workshop was organized to exchange the experiences of the Field Offices covering the pilot countries in carrying out the exercise in order to refine the

---

<sup>1</sup> They are available for consultation onto : [http://portal.unesco.org/education/en/ev.php-URL\\_ID=10200&URL\\_DO=DO\\_TOPIC&URL\\_SECTION=201.html](http://portal.unesco.org/education/en/ev.php-URL_ID=10200&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html)

process, the content of the UNESS guidelines, as well as the UNESS regional rollout strategies and modalities, with a view to gradually generalizing the UNESS process to all Member States requiring support from and cooperation with UNESCO in the field of education.

The absence of the Regional Bureaux for Education in Dakar and Santiago<sup>2</sup> left a vacuum in the discussions and urgent action will be taken to address the information gaps for the two regions covered by these Offices.

## **II. Proceedings of the Workshop**

The pilot evaluation workshop took place at UNESCO HQ for three days from 27 to 29 September 2006 with participation of Directors and Education Programme Specialists of Regional Bureaux and Field Offices covering Angola, Bangladesh, Egypt, Guinea, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Tanzania, and Vietnam (See Annex 1 for Terms of Reference, Agenda and List of Participants). Representatives of Institutes (IIEP, UIS, UIL and IBE) and HQ Divisions also attended this meeting.

According to the proposed agenda, the workshop was conducted in three main stages: (i) presentation of country experiences, (ii) thematic group discussions on UNESS content and process and (iii) regional discussions on UNESS rollout strategy. The following are the outline of the workshop proceedings:

The Workshop was opened by the ADG/ED who outlined the importance of UNESS in light of UNESCO's operational strategies for capacity building, monitoring, and technical assistance for Member States. DIR Bangkok situated UNESS within the wider framework of the Education Sector Reform, as well as the evolving planning and budgeting processes at UNESCO.

Plenary sessions 2-4 of Day 1 comprised country UNESS presentations by the Field Office teams on the general overview of the UNESS process, major challenges/obstacles and lessons learnt. For each session, a chair was proposed together with a rapporteur on a voluntary basis among FO programme specialists, with a co-rapporteur drawn from the HQ UNESS Team (see Annex 2).

On the morning of Day 2, two groups were formed, with Field Office participants represented in each group. Group I mainly focused on the actual content of the UNESS documents, the experiences in drafting Chapters 1-5, the proposals for improving the guidelines for constructing a UNESS document, etc. When time permitted, the Group discussed the aspects concerning the UNESS process as well. Group II mainly worked on topics related to the process of drafting a UNESS document, including the use of consultants, the interaction with (and/or technical support from) Regional Bureaux, Institutes and HQ, the participation of (and/or validation/endorsement by) government, the development partners and other stakeholders, the proposed internal validation process, etc. Plenary Session 5 on the afternoon of Day 2 comprised rapporteurs' presentations of the lessons and recommendations of the two working groups on both the content and the process of drafting UNESS (see Annex 3).

The final session of Day 2 consisted of further working group sessions, led by the Regional Education Directors, on the challenges and factors for success of regional roll-out strategies for

---

<sup>2</sup> The Santiago Office was not explicitly invited to this Workshop, since no any FO in the LAC region had participated in the UNESS pilot exercise.

UNESS. These working group sessions continued during the first session of Day 3, to develop regional strategies for the UNESS roll-out, focusing on modalities and timeframe. Presentations by the three regional teams on the regional roll-out strategies were made during Plenary Session 6 of Day 3 (see Annex 4).

In the final Plenary Session 7, workshop participants presented their findings and recommendations for UNESS roll-out to ADG/ED, followed by an interactive discussion and Q&A on the immediate follow-up actions (see Annex 5).

### **III. Key Findings**

Presentations and discussions held at plenary sessions and working group discussions by theme and by region enabled participants to draw a number of lessons, challenges and conclusions with regard to the UNESS pilot phase in particular and its rollout strategy in general. On most issues, participants arrived at a common understanding around the content, guidelines, process and modalities for UNESS rollout, except a few areas such as the nature of the UNESS document (policy, advocacy and/or intervention document), and the speed of its rollout (immediate or gradual).

Below are summarized some of the major discussions and conclusions of the workshop:

#### ***A. Rationale of UNESS:***

Participants recognized that UNESS was an excellent tool for ensuring the effectiveness of UNESCO's future cooperation with and support for Member States. For some, UNESS would be an **essential** instrument as it defines:

- the tool for cooperation priorities with Member States
- a planning tool for building the educational components of C4/C5
- a repository of information
- UNESCO's education policy positioning with Member States and development partners
- input for capacity and staffing needs at UNESCO in general and at FOs in particular
- in-country input to UNDAF, which includes the implementation of the Global Action Plan on Education for All (GAP-EFA)

Most participants proposed that UNESS process be adopted by all other UNESCO Sectors not only in defining their cooperation strategies with Member States, but also in preparing future C4/C5 documents.

#### ***B. Guidelines for UNESS***

While the participants found the draft UNESS guidelines very useful in building their country UNESS documents, many pointed out that the guidelines did not clearly elaborate on matters relating to the process, such as the participation of, and consultations with national and international institutions, the validation of the UNESS document, etc. Furthermore, for some the draft UNESS document for Nigeria, which was made available in advance for pilot countries, provided inspiration in developing their UNESS, while for others it has been a source of confusion.

Participants emphasized the necessity of reducing the size of Chapters 1 to 3 (description and analysis of overall and education development priorities, mapping of donor interventions, etc.) and making them less descriptive and more analytical. The final guidelines would specify the indicative number of pages for each chapter, while leaving some flexibility to each FO, so that UNESS documents allocate less space for Chapters 1 to 3 and more elaboration for Chapters 4 and 5. The need for more analytical work to draw the lessons learnt from past and ongoing cooperation with Member States was also conferred.

The nature of Chapter 5 on UNESCO's cooperation strategy was discussed at length. Some argued that this Chapter should remain at the level of policy statement, especially in the context of the "One UN" reform taking place at country level and given the limited resources of the Organization. Others advocated for a document which clearly indicates UNESCO's intervention strategies and support for national education development over a long period, with commitments over the current and next biennia.

### ***C. Is UNESS an Upstream Planning or Downstream Implementation Tool?***

Discussions took place on several occasions as to whether UNESS is primarily a planning tool for building evidence-based UNESCO Programmes (C4/C5) or a cooperation framework with concerned Member States and partnership positioning with other development agencies. For some participants, UNESS, once developed for each country and compiled as a synthesis drawing the main themes, would mainly serve for feeding national perspectives into general policy discussions within UNESCO's Governing Bodies (Executive Board and General Conference meetings) and in designing the C4/C5 documents. In this case it would have less validity when designing FOs' workplans since the overall priorities of UNESCO would not correspond to the specific needs and demands of individual countries. Other participants felt that the UNESS would primarily serve the need for FOs to prepare demand-driven workplans for the future biennia.

Discussions merged into a shared dual-phased vision: UNESS will first of all serve as the planning tool for UNESCO's medium term and biennial programmes and, once these overall programmes are adopted by UNESCO's Governing Bodies, will then constitute the basis for building evidence-based and demand-driven workplans by concerned FOs.

Furthermore, many stated that regardless of the use of UNESS by UNESCO HQ and the Governing Bodies, the UNESS document, updated every two years, is a necessary tool for all FOs to build a repository of information and analysis of the national education system, to position UNESCO's policy with Member States and with development partners, and, most importantly, to better design a streamlined UNESCO education strategy for cooperation and support with Member States in the field of education.

### ***D. Some Other Issues***

A number of other issues were raised and discussed, which will be further clarified in the final guidelines. These included, but are not limited to:

- Matching priorities: How to reconcile between national priorities and UNESCO's on the one hand, and among "competing" priorities as expressed by different national institutions on the other hand? Will UNESCO priorities be aligned with those identified within UNDAF or by NATCOMs? Can UNESS go beyond these limited perspectives?

- **Alignment and synchronization:** What is the place of UNESS with regard to the need for harmonization and alignment around government procedures and priorities? Will UNESCO be aligned more in the future? Is UNESS still needed in countries where SWApS are in place? How to interpret the often conflicting messages from HQ for preparing C4/C5? What is the relationship between UNESS (proposed by ED) and the Country Programming Document (CPD, as advocated by BSP) in the process of C4/C5 elaboration? How to synchronize UNESS with 34 C5/C4, CCA/UNDAF, and other major national policy frameworks?
- **Time and resource constraints:** How to draft UNESS on top of the already heavy workload of the field staff? How to ensure the involvement of the UNESCO institutes in the UNESS process? Is the recourse to (or dependence on) external consultants the right option for drafting some parts of the UNESS, at the expenses of institutional memory and ownership? How to overcome some of the challenges of drafting UNESS in countries where there is no FO? Will additional funding requirements for UNESS pilot exercise and UNESS rollout be met, while funds for supporting the ongoing review and stocktaking of EFA progress are also required?
- **Capacity development:** How to relate the need for (FOs, HQ) staff capacity development in the process of designing UNESS? How to improve the quality of gaps analysis, policy positioning and the assessment of country priorities? Etc.

## **IV. Follow-Up: Towards a Framework for Cooperation and Action**

As a result of intensive and in-depth discussions at the workshop, participants arrived at a number of conclusions for follow-up. Most of the immediate follow-up actions are based on consensus, while others still need some further discussion, with decisions made at the discretion of the FOs when elaborating their UNESS documents. The participants agreed on a number of principles and follow-up actions:

- Within the next 12-14 months (till the end of this biennium), UNESCO FOs will develop UNESS documents for some 60 to 100 countries, whose inputs and findings will feed into either 34 C4/C5 design or implementation, for 2008 onwards.
- While UNESS should be part of the regular work of FOs (thus implying minor financial resources for its development in the future), an important initial investment is required to catalyze the kick-off period, given that UNESS is new to UNESCO and there is a need for staff capacity development and the hiring of consultants. In order to establish UNESS for 60-100 countries, including a minimum staff development needs, some \$2 to \$2.5 M would be needed before the end of 2007. This sum can be mobilized not only from external funding, but also from reallocation of RP resources (HQ and FOs) for this purpose.
- Top Management at ADG/ED or higher level should send a clear message to Member States and within UNESCO (FO Directors, Institutes and HQ Divisions) on the priority given to and the rationale for UNESS development.
- FOs must assess capacity and needs for UNESS and communicate with the UNESS team re: organizing support (from RBs, Institutes, HQs, other FOs, etc.)
- Revised guidelines will be drafted by end-October 2006 and sent to all FOs.

Furthermore, the following are the recommendations for rollout strategies by region (see also Annex 4 for more details):

Asia and the Pacific Region:

- Budgetary implications of rollout to be worked out with FOs based on prioritization of countries following discussions based on 2007 UNDAF countries, BSP CPD rollout, and FO judgments
- A senior UNESS specialist be posted to BKK (with possible use of cost savings beforehand)
- Consideration of regional or sub-regional “mobile teams”
- 3 pilot UNESS completed by end March 2007
- December regional FO directors’ workshop and spring regional ‘ED Week’ training for education staff

Arab Region:

- UNESS for 15 out of 22 countries possible within 6 months if resources are available
- Phase 1: 4 pilot UNESS documents completed by Nov 2006;
- Phases 2: Jordan, Palestine, Qatar, Sudan (with FO) and Oman, Algeria, Mauritania (with no FO) in Oct-Dec 2006; Phase 3: Syria, Yemen, Bahrain, Libya (no FO presence) in Jan-Mar 2007; Phase 4: Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia, UAE, [Djibouti] in Apr-Dec 2007
- Regional Workshop in Marrakech in Dec 2006: with participation of 3 persons per country including FO directors, programme specialists, consultants

Sub-Saharan African Region:

- Regional Workshop in Zanzibar in Nov 2006 for all directors and education programme specialists; rollout details including budget to be defined at this workshop
- Clarify RB roles: RB to provide technical backstopping to clusters
- Urgent reinforcement of BREDA: human resources and administrative capacity
- 3 UNESS specialists (by language group) for the region, based in different clusters but with regional mandate
- Involvement of institutes, especially IICBA
- Financial resources directed at cluster and national offices for UNESS design

ADG/ED is to take some immediate actions with regard to the official launching of the UNESS process, including:

- Addressing official information on UNESS to Member States and UNESCO entities (especially FO Directors)
- Ensuring that necessary funds are made available for completing the UNESS pilot exercise and launching its rollout process (especially for a regional workshop proposed for the Sub-Saharan African region in early November 2006, and a kick-off seminar for Latin America and the Caribbean region). Workshops for Asia and the Pacific, and Arab regions, which are being planned for December, must be given urgent attention.



## **Annexes**

### ***Annex 1. Terms of Reference, Agenda and List of Participants***

UNESS PILOT EVALUATION WORKSHOP  
27-29 September 2006, 9:30am-5:45pm, Salle IX, UNESCO Paris

The UNESCO National Education Support Strategy (UNESS) has been piloted in 13 countries: Angola, Bangladesh, Egypt, Guinea, Morocco, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Tanzania, and Vietnam. These are mainly those countries included in the current EFA Capacity Building Programme (CapEFA). The purpose of this workshop is to evaluate the pilot UNESS documents and Field Office experiences in carrying out the exercise in order to refine the process, the guidelines and the modalities in advance of UNESS being rolled out to all Member States. Thenceforth, UNESS will comprise a fundamental building block for planning the Education Sector's cooperation strategies.

After the opening plenary session on Day 1, plenary sessions 2-4 will comprise individual presentations by the Field Office teams on the lessons learnt, the best practices drawn, and their advice to others about how to produce a UNESS document.

The Working Group sessions on Day 2 will be divided into two groups, with Field Office participants being represented in each group. Group I will mainly focus on the actual content of the UNESS documents, their experiences in drafting Chapters 1-5, the obstacles encountered, and their perspectives on the framework for building a UNESS. If time permits, this group can touch upon the aspects related to the UNESS process. Group II will mainly discuss on the actual process of creating a UNESS document, for example, the use of consultants, the involvement of government, the development partners and other stakeholders, the means of acquiring the necessary, documentation, reflections on the competencies required for crafting a UNESS, etc.

Plenary Session 5 on Day 2 will comprise rapporteurs' presentations of the lessons and recommendations of the two working groups on both the content and the process of drafting UNESS.

The final session of Day 2 will comprise further working group sessions, led by the three Regional Directors, respectively, on the challenges and factors for success of regional roll-out strategies for UNESS. These working group sessions will continue during the first session of Day 3, to develop regional strategies for the UNESS roll-out, focusing on the modalities and time-frame, and if necessary, making distinctions regarding the appropriate strategies for different kinds of countries, e.g. large, populous, federal states, countries emerging from post-conflict, countries not having a local Field Office, etc. depending on what lessons emerge from the experiences of the pilot countries to date.

Plenary Session 6 of Day 3 will comprise presentations by the three Regional Bureau Directors on the regional roll-out strategies and plenary discussion.

In the final Plenary Session 7 – to which all Education Sector Divisions will be invited – workshop participants will present the recommendations for UNESS roll-out, with closing remarks by ADG/ED.

## AGENDA OF THE UNESS PILOT EVALUATION WORKSHOP

	<i>27 September (Wednesday)</i>	<i>28 September (Thursday)</i>	<i>29 September (Friday)</i>
9.30 -10.30 am	<p><b>Plenary Session 1:</b> Chair: Mr M.A. Husain, DIR/PFS Welcome by Mr P. Smith, ADG/ED Introduction by Mr S. Shaeffer, DIR/Bangkok Presentation of Agenda by Mr M. Radi, C/ED/PFS/ESS</p>	<p>Thematic discussions: UNESS Content and Process Group 1: Chair: Mr J. Sequeira, DIR/Islamabad  Group II: Chair: Mr E. Matoko, DIR/Bamako</p>	<p>Group Work on Regional Roll-out Strategies: Challenges &amp; Factors for Success (contd.)</p>
10.30-10.45 am	<b>Break</b>		
10.45 -12.30 pm	<p><b>Plenary Session 2:</b> Chair: Mr M. Bray, DIR/IIEP 4 FO presentations (15 min. each) &amp; Discussion on Angola, Bangladesh, Egypt, Lebanon</p>	<p>Group Work I &amp; II (contd.)</p>	<p><b>Plenary Session 6:</b> Presentations of Regional Bureaux’ proposals for Roll-out Strategies and Discussion Chair: Mr S-K Chu, DIR/Hanoi</p>
12.30 - 2.30 pm	<b>Lunch</b>		
2.30 – 4 pm	<p><b>Plenary Session 3:</b> Chair: Mr A.M. Osman, DIR/Beirut 3 FO Presentations &amp; Discussion (contd.) on Morocco, Niger, Nigeria</p>	<p><b>Plenary Session 5:</b> Chairs: Mr J. Sequeira, DIR/Islamabad, and Mr E. Matoko, DIR/Bamako Rapporteurs’ presentations and discussion</p>	<p><b>Plenary Session 7:</b> Chairs: Mr M.A. Husain, DIR/PFS and Mr E. Matoko, DIR/Bamako Recommendations for UNESS Roll-out <i>by workshop participants</i> <b>Closing session with ADG</b></p>
4 – 4.15 pm	<b>Break</b>		
4.15-5.45 pm	<p><b>Plenary Session 4:</b> Chair: Ms C. Harvey, DIR/Windhoek 3 FO Presentations &amp; Discussion (contd.) on Pakistan, Tanzania, Viet Nam  <b>Cocktail:</b> from 6.00 pm</p>	<p>Group Work on Regional Roll-out Strategies: Challenges &amp; Factors for Success Chairs: DIR/Bangkok for APA DIR/Beirut for ARB DIRs/Dar-es-Salaam, Windhoek and Bamako for AFR</p>	

# UNESCO National Education Support Strategy (UNESS) Pilot Evaluation Workshop

## List of Participants

*Paris, 27-29 September 2006, Room IX*

---

### **WINDHOEK (Angola)**

Ms Claudia Harvey	Director of UNESCO Windhoek Office
Mr Edem Adubra	Education Programme Specialist

### **DHAKA (Bangladesh)**

Mr Hassan A. Keynan	Education Programme Specialist:
Mr. Abdur Rafique	Education Programme Specialist

### **CAIRO (Egypt)**

Mrs Ghada Gholam	Education Programme Specialist
------------------	--------------------------------

### **RABAT (Morocco)**

Mr Sobhi Tawil	Education Programme Specialist
----------------	--------------------------------

### **BAMAKO (Niger)**

Mr Edouard Matoko	Director of UNESCO Bamako Office
Ms Valerie Djioze	Education Programme Specialist

### **ABUJA (Nigeria)**

Mrs Iyabo Fagbulu	Education Programme Specialist
-------------------	--------------------------------

### **ISLAMABAD (Pakistan)**

Mr Jorge Sequeira	Director of UNESCO Islamabad Office
Ichiro Miyazawa	Education Programme Specialist

### **DAR-ES-SALAAM (Tanzania)**

Mr Cheikh Tidiane Sy	Director of UNESCO Dar-es-Salaam Office
Ms Cecilia Barbieri	Education Programme Specialist

### **HANOI (Viet Nam)**

Mr Shiu-Kee Chu	Director of UNESCO Hanoi Office
Mr Eisuke Tajima	Education Programme Specialist

---

### **REGIONAL BUREAUX**

#### **BANGKOK**

Mr Sheldon Shaeffer	Director of UNESCO Bangkok Office
---------------------	-----------------------------------

#### **BEIRUT**

Mr Osman, Abdel Moneim	Director of UNESCO Office Beirut
Mr Ramzi Salame	Education Programme Specialist

---

**INSTITUTES****International Bureau of Education (IBE)**

Mrs Dakmara Georgescu Coordination with Member States

**International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP)**

Mr Mark Bray Director IIEP  
Ms Gabriele Göttelmann-Duret Programme Specialist  
Mr Naduvilapa Varghese Head of Higher Education Unit

**UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning (UIL)**

Mrs Ulrike Hanemann Education Programme Specialist  
Mrs Bettina Bochynek Education Programme Specialist

**UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS)**

Mr Hendrik van der Pol Director UIS

**HQ Units and Divisions**

ED Programme Coordination Chief and Programme specialists  
ED Basic Education (EC – K12) Programme Specialists  
ED Higher Education Programme Specialists  
ED UN Priorities Programme Specialists

**Division of Country Planning and Field Support**

**Mr M. Asghar Husain** Director, Country Planning & Field Support

**UNESS Team Paris**

Mr Mohammed Radi Chief, Education Support Strategy Section  
Mrs Abby Riddell Programme Specialist, ED/PFS/ESS  
Mr Ilyong Cheong Programme Specialist, ED/PFS/ESS  
Mr Gwang-Chol Chang Programme Specialist, ED/PFS/ESS  
Ms Faryal Khan Programme Specialist, ED/PFS/ESS  
Mrs Lily Neyestani-Hailu Programme Specialist, ED/PFS/ESS  
Mrs Rama Bah ED/PFS/ESS

**HQ Regional Focal Points**

Ms Soo-Hyang Choi Chief, Field Support & Coordination Section  
Mrs Ranwa Safadi Programme Specialist, ED/PFS/FSC  
Mrs Mania Yannarakis Programme Specialist, ED/PFS/FSC  
Ms Mami Umuyahara Programme Specialist, ED/PFS/FSC  
Mr Hilaire Mputu-Afasuka Programme Specialist, ED/PFS/FSC  
Ms Theophania Chavatzia Programme Specialist, ED/PFS/FSC

**Institute Coordination Office**

Mr Alexander Sannikov Chief, Institute Coordination Office

## ***Annex 2: Reports for Plenary Sessions on Country UNESS Presentations***

In order to allow for cross-country and cross-regional experience-sharing, three plenary sessions (2 to 4) were dedicated to FO presentations by alphabetical order of pilot countries. At the first of these plenary sessions, UNESS documents for Angola, Bangladesh, Egypt and Lebanon were presented. The session was chaired by Mr Mark Bray, Director of IIEP. Ms Iyabo Fagbulu, NPO at UNESCO Abuja Office, volunteered as the rapporteur for this session, together with Mr Gwang-Chol Chang, Programme Specialist at the HQ UNESS Team. For the second plenary, it was the turn of Morocco, Niger, and Nigeria. The session was chaired by Mr Abdel Moneim Osman, Director of Beirut Office. Ms Cecilia Barbieri, Education Specialist at UNESCO Dar-es-Salaam Office, volunteered as the rapporteur for this session, together with Ms. Faryal Khan and Mr. Ilyong Cheong , Programme Specialists at the HQ UNESS Team. The last plenary session on country presentations was allocated to experiences in Pakistan, Tanzania, and Vietnam. The session was chaired by Ms Claudia Harvey, Director of Windhoek Office. Mr. Hassan Keynan, Education Specialist at UNESCO Dhaka Office, volunteered as the rapporteur for this session, together with Ms. Faryal Khan, Programme Specialists at the HQ UNESS Team.

FO representatives broadly followed the presentation guidelines proposed by HQ UNESS Team. The presentations given illustrate the specificity of each country in terms of the contexts in which UNESS is being developed, as well as the perceptions that each FO has had vis-à-vis UNESS and the expectations that may be created from Member States (MS) and Development Partners (DPs) by UNESS. Notwithstanding these differences, there were some issues that were recurrent and frequently raised both during presentations and the ensuing discussions, including:

- Synchronization of targets, priorities and timelines: with other development partners in country, especially at time of planning cycles such as CCA/UNDAF, PRSPs, etc. and *with* UNESCO biennium and mid-term strategy (Timeframe of UNESS: UNESS should be a medium-term rolling plan to be revisited every two years).
- Sharpening of priorities: Crucial for UNESCO to have a matrix of country priorities ready for the Governing Bodies and to draw distinction between UNESCO's overall priorities and countries' specific priorities.
- Communication on UNESS: Member States' commitment is essential with the understanding by government and partners that UNESCO is not financing all gaps identified, rather tackling the gaps would be a joint partnership
- UNESS guidelines: Revise and shorten chapters 1,2,3; Revise guidelines after seminar to make them responsive to country office needs; Avoid wish-lists
- Validation: Is UNESS to be validated/endorsed by Government and how/when? When MOE is to be involved? Is the MOU between UNESCO and the Government the solution for legitimizing UNESS, and if yes at what stage?
- Matching priorities: How to reconcile the "tension" between the national priorities and UNESCO's on the one hand and among "competing" priorities as expressed by different national institutions on the other hand? Will UNESCO priorities be aligned with those identified within UNDAF or can UNESCO go beyond?
- Paris Declaration: While recognizing that donor coordination is important, what is the place of UNESS with regard to the needs for harmonization and alignment around government procedures and priorities? Will UNESCO be aligned as other DPs try to?

Is UNESS still needed in countries where SWAps are in place? How does UNESS situate itself in the UN joint country plan? Can UNESCO say NO to the demands of Member States (and of the different national institutions)?

- C4/C5 and nd BSP's CDP: How to interpret the often conflicting messages from HQ for preparing C4/C5? What is the relationship between (and sequencing of) UNESS (proposed by ED) and the Country Programming Document (CPD as advocated by BSP)?
- Time and resource constraints: How to draft UNESS on top of the already heavy workload of the field staff? Is the recourse to (or dependence on) external consultants the right option for drafting some parts of the UNESS, at the expenses of institutional memory and ownership? Additional funding requirements? How to make use of the expertise of the Institutes (e.g. UIS) and ED Divisions?
- Upstream v. downstream: Is UNESS for upstream support only? What could be the added value of UNESCO with small money besides big players such as the World Bank? Can UNESCO concentrate on capacity development and filling in strategic gaps through UNESS? If the needs are for downstream implementation, will UNESCO support with risk of dispersing its small resources and/or competing with other players?

The above issues are only parts of some common issues raised in Plenary Session 2. The level of importance given to them and the flexibility taken by FOs in this regard were however different across FOs. The following are the issues raised for consideration and further discussion between participants:

Country	Overview	Problems/Obstacles	Lessons Learnt	Proposals
Angola	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UNESCO Windhoek covers 5 countries</li> <li>UNESS drafted using the guidelines, Dakar meeting was useful</li> <li>A consultant (Mozambican) recruited for UNESS (for his experience and Portuguese language)</li> <li>Consultations through individual meetings with various MOE departments, NGOs, UN, but not with non-UN agencies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explaining and justifying UNESS on top of UNDAF</li> <li>Difficulty to access (sometimes politically sensitive and conflicting) data and information</li> <li>Language problem</li> <li>Conflicting issues and priorities among MOE departments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UNCT welcomes UNESS</li> <li>UNESS as a tool for mapping, streamlining with no duplication</li> <li>Matching UNESCO priorities and Government needs through UNESS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More and systematic advocacy on UNESS with MS and DPs</li> <li>Criteria for UNESS validation and timeline clearly defined</li> <li>Need for strengthened capacity of FO for rollout</li> <li>Need for rollout of UNESS to other UNESCO sectors</li> </ul>
Bangladesh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UNESS very useful, timely and challenging</li> <li>UNESS as a tool for comprehensive mapping, harmonization and streamlining for UNESCO and positioning within UNDAF</li> <li>Guidelines useful in conducting the process</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Time constraints</li> <li>Capacity and readiness to carry out UNESS</li> <li>Convincing the Gov and DPs of the value-added of UNESS</li> <li>Conflicting data and statistics</li> <li>UNESS and UNDAF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More CB needed for constructing quality UNESS</li> <li>High expectations from Gov and DPs for UNESCO as coordinator and honest broker</li> <li>Closer interaction between FO and HQ</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to reconcile timelines of UNESS (-year cycle?) with those of Gov and DPs (ex. UNDAF)</li> <li>Need for UNESCO to be aligned as other DPs try to (Paris Declaration)</li> <li>CB for UNESS as a tool for ED reform</li> </ul>
Lebanon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not a UNESS pilot country</li> <li>C4/C5 guidelines restricting FO support, UNESS is a comprehensive framework</li> <li>Whatever use is made of it, UNESS is first of all good and needed for FO</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UNESS is for C4/C5 or workplan for FO?</li> <li>Contradiction and conflicting agenda between CPD and UNESS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For Lebanon, UNESS can be workplan as well</li> <li>UNESS to be validated by Gov</li> <li>Longer-term and streamlined commitment of UNESCO through UNESS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to generalize "UNESS" for other UNESCO sectors</li> <li>UNESS should be at least of 4-year perspective</li> </ul>
Egypt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UNESS guidelines very useful</li> <li>Availability of Nigeria UNESS helpful</li> <li>UNESS helps create a holistic picture</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Time constraints</li> <li>No consultations with Gov and DPs yet</li> <li>Data and information dispersed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need for right consultants</li> <li>The clearer role of Gov needed for UNESS and its validation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UNESS guidelines be more explicit not only on content, but also process</li> <li>Multidisciplinary team needed for UNESS design</li> <li>Need to systematically involve Gov and DPs</li> </ul>
Morocco	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Experience in CCA, MDG report</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Communication Gap</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relevance: UNESS allows</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Modalities for ownership</li> </ul>

Country	Overview	Problems/Obstacles	Lessons Learnt	Proposals
	<p>(2005) and policy and strategic frameworks (2005) served as a base</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Being a LIFE country, brought bias, but UNESS gave opportunity to look at other areas</li> </ul>	<p>between HQs and FOs between initial discussion and launch</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Time frame for UNESS is unclear, especially alignment with UNDAF (already adopted for 2007-2011)</li> <li>▪ Inherent tension between bottom-up approach and feeding into C5.</li> <li>▪ Issue of replicable UNESS within cluster</li> <li>▪ Time and staff constraints (need for ED sp)</li> </ul>	<p>for clear identification of priorities, synergy, and complements work of partners</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Structure: Chapter II should be a stand-alone piece that adds value by complementing analysis on trends (CCA section on ED is often limited)</li> <li>▪ When capacity is lacking in a UNESCO office, support can be mobilized from the region</li> <li>▪ If UNESS is to be a bottom-up process, it must feed into decisions of governing bodies.</li> <li>▪ A process of consultation and consensus</li> <li>▪ Went beyond following guidelines</li> </ul>	<p>and validation will be discussed with UNESCO Nat Com &amp; authorities concerned</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Let us not be too dependent on consultants and use UNESS as a means to strengthen our own capacities for educational policy analysis.</li> </ul>
Niger	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Started UNESS in Aug 2006.</li> <li>▪ A consultant was hired and a mission undertaken to Niger</li> <li>▪ SWOT undertaken</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Need to explain legitimacy at early stages (otherwise partners don't share resources)</li> <li>▪ Lack of clarity on UNESS compatibility with 33 C/5</li> <li>▪ Not evident to have good consultants</li> <li>▪ Follow-up challenging in the absence of a FO</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Real team work and ownership</li> <li>▪ Validation essential for legitimacy</li> <li>▪ Inputs from other sectors with whom there is cross-sectoral activities</li> <li>▪ Need for clarity on priorities so as not to raise false expectations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Firm technical and financial commitment required to meet expectations</li> <li>▪ UNESS as a means to align priorities with government</li> <li>▪ UNESS aligns with C4/C5</li> <li>▪ Need to resolve practical issues such as: How to operate in countries where there is no FO?</li> <li>▪ Strict protocol in some countries demands an official launch of UNESS</li> </ul>



Country	Overview	Problems/Obstacles	Lessons Learnt	Proposals
				exercise through letter from ADG
Nigeria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Team led by ADG, which brought together Ministries and government commitment</li> <li>▪ 4<sup>th</sup> draft is ready</li> <li>▪ Mission identified areas for intervention</li> <li>▪ MOU has been signed with the government, covering UNESS over 10 yrs, with funds earmarked for LIFE, TTISSA, EDUCAIDS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Good relation with Nat Com has facilitated the inclusion of UNESS in 10 yr plan</li> <li>▪ NAT COM should be involved in the preparation of UNESS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪</li> </ul>
Pakistan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Useful initiative</li> <li>▪ Relevant and much needed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Little consultation with Govt</li> <li>▪ Govt reluctant to provide data</li> <li>▪ Office was busy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ UNESS is voluminous: combine chapters 1,2,3</li> <li>▪ Alignment with UN reform</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Need to synchronize with timelines</li> <li>▪ Sharpening of priorities</li> <li>▪ Where will UNESS be located?</li> </ul>
Tanzania	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ UNESS good initiative</li> <li>▪ Started in May 06</li> <li>▪ Data available</li> <li>▪ Shared with Gov</li> <li>▪ Good aid coordination</li> <li>▪ Different from old top-down approach</li> <li>▪ Guidelines helpful</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Time constraint</li> <li>▪ Many countries in the cluster</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Enables strong partnership for costing and implementation</li> <li>▪ Development Partners Group exists and is an asset in planning practice</li> <li>▪ Best planning practice so far</li> </ul>	
Vietnam	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ UNESS useful</li> <li>▪ Guidelines helpful</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Duplication of information</li> <li>▪ Linkage with UNDAF and UN</li> <li>▪ Descriptive not analytical</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Enabling factors important</li> <li>▪ Coordination with on-going international assistance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Better coordination within ED sector</li> <li>▪ Strengthening UNESCO network (HQ, RB, FOs, Inst)</li> </ul>

Country	Overview	Problems/Obstacles	Lessons Learnt	Proposals
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Guidelines need further development</li> <li>▪ Time constraint</li> <li>▪ Formal consultation with Gov</li> </ul>		

### ***Annex 3: Reports on Thematic Discussions on UNESS Content and Process***

This is the collation of the discussions and reports of the two breakouts, thematic working group sessions: Group I mainly focused on the actual content of the UNESS documents, the experiences in drafting Chapters 1-5, the proposals for improving the guidelines for constructing a UNESS document, etc. A limited time was allocated to the aspects concerning the UNESS process. Group II mainly worked on topics related to the process of building a UNESS document.

#### **Group 1: UNESS Content and Process**

This Group was chaired by Mr Jorge Sequeira, Director of Islamabad Office. Rapporteurs were Ms Cecilia Barbieri from UNESCO Dar-es-Salaam Office, together with Ms Lily Neyestani and Mr Gwang-Chol Chang from HQ UNESS Team.

After the Group discussions, Ms Cecilia Barbieri reported on the conclusions of the Group as follows:

#### Why UNESS?

- UNESS will allow the FO's planning for country support to take place after a thorough analysis of Chapters 1-4
- Identification of support strategies for Member States
- Depository of information for UNESCO - All UNESCO entities should contribute to it
- Role of UNESCO Institutes should be envisaged in the process of development of UNESS

#### General suggestions on UNESS content:

- Need for shift from descriptive to analytical presentation of UNESS
- Need for more refined guidelines – what information need to be put in each chapter
- Specific guidelines for countries without FO and in special situations
- Leave flexibility for each field office
- Length of the document could be specified, data, tables, etc. can be annexed
- Detailed reference of all docs, interviewed people and resources used
- Source of statistical data can be decided by FO, but focus should be on analysis of trends
- Use of a policy matrix instead of logframe
- Keep the actual structure of chapters, while:
  - Chapter 1 – useful across sectors (possibility of use for other UNESCO Sectors)
  - Chapter 2 needs to be shortened, strengthened and more analytical
  - Chapter 2.1 and 4 should be circulated within UNESCO and institutes for inputs
  - Chapter 3 should be analytical to help identify gaps and establish/strengthen partnership
  - Chapter 4 and 5 – should be done by FO
  - Chapter 5 needs to be very focused and strategic and to reflect the analysis of 1-4
  - Chapter 5.1 – important analysis/assessment of gaps should not be a repetition of what listed in Chapter 1 and 2
  - More details should be given to guide development of 5.2
- UNESS identifies Medium/long term strategies
- Timeframe could be synchronized with countries' development plans
- Based on UNESS, biennial workplans and budget will be developed (C5)

### Suggestion on modalities:

- Involvement of Government & other stakeholders – be careful not to create false expectations
- Keep the UNESS exercise as much as possible within the office – to be seen as capacity development process for office
- Capacity of office should be seriously considered for the UNESS exercise
- Should ensure that national consultants used are familiar with UNESCO
- Suggestion for FO to assess capacity and needs and report to UNESS team for considering modalities of support
- Support from regional offices? Regional technical team?
- Assistance from IIEP?
- Suggestion for Directors to be brought together to consult and make decisions on implementation modalities

Additionally, below are presented some more details of discussions and opinions exchanged at the working group session before arriving to the above conclusions of the Group:

### Purpose of UNESS

- Bringing coherence to our planning and avoiding random commitments from top management;
- This is a rolling document. As a repository of information, it should draw on all information across UNESCO entities (and can be used to better brief the DG);
- How is UNESS different? It is an analysis of the validity of what governments are saying in respect to UNESCO's priorities, and a chance to "question" these;
- UNESS can serve as the tool for us to act coherently and fulfil real needs – it is a niche to determine where UNESCO can make an important impact;
- It is an identification of needs, should not just be about what UNESCO can do, but must also help to identify funding sources;
- What we are implementing in the FO is the C5 which is the decision & approval by governments and they have other priorities which we can expand on through UNESS;
- UNESS is a tool for identifying needs, gaps, priorities and strategies in national education system, which will serve both the Member States and UNESCO to arrive to an understanding of policies and action plan and which enable us to contribute to the development of education in the Member States. It is changing the way we are planning;
- UNESS will be an important tool in light of the GAP which will help us have more active coordinating role and to the ground. It will also enable us to have a clearer position;
- It links up with the GAP by giving UNESCO in a specific country a stronger & clearer platform for coordination or coordination mechanisms, and will structure not only UNESCO's actions but will be an input into the collective thrust;
- It could be a medium term strategy/commitment on the part of UNESCO in line with the C4 and the C5 and for the next biennium will give us a broad idea of the resources that FO will have – therefore a medium term commitment situated within longer term development perspectives;
- Will help in identifying capacity needs of FO staff and to have better alignment of profiles with staffing needs in FOs and expertise in RB to ensure that chapter 5 can be met.

### Priorities

- Brief discussions re UNESCO vs. country priorities;
- Through what process are UNESCO's priorities declared at present?

- Is there a difference or conflict between UNESCO and government strategies? The difference is not at the policy level but at the level of interventions – we are decoding government strategies through action strategies.

### Chapters

In order to revise & improve the guidelines in preparing for expansion to other countries, what are the gaps in the guidelines?

- First chapters should be given sufficient attention as very different contexts exist in the various countries, and the geopolitical and educational contexts are essential for setting a theoretical framework, but they should not be too long;
- Chapters 1 – 3 (or 1 & 2) could be combined as single chapter to lay the ground for last 2 chapters;
- Versus all chapters could stand alone as there is a logical flow and each separately sets context. Also allows us to bring forth our unique sector-wide outlook;
- Size of Chapters 1 – 3 should be reduced to allow more analytical than descriptive;
- Drafts should specifically identify areas of UNESCO intervention and should take into account EFA plans, SWAps, etc. so that it becomes supportive and complimentary to these;
- Tables, charts and statistics can be annexed;
- Detailed references should be added to see sources used, interviews and consultations held.
- For the intervention strategies/priorities, a logframe would not fit as could be seen as project mode. Rather a policy matrix would be used;
- Chapters 2 and 4 could comprehensive analyses and should be shared throughout all UNESCO entities;
- Chapter 5 needs to specify a timeframe and propose interventions that are sustainable. Need to be realistic otherwise can confront pressure of mobilise funds;
- Further explanations of each chapter and more refined guidelines, specifying stats needed;
- However shouldn't have too rigid of a structure – some general guidelines re number of pages, etc. but leaving some flexibility to each FO.

### Modalities

- Is HQ ready to back them up? They cannot wait around to compile necessary information when institutes & HQ divisions do not respond. HQ readiness and responsiveness is crucial, as well as support from Institutes and RB;
- What is role of the UNESS Team – are there resources for them to move around and provide support for FOs?
- FO staff should as much as possible draft the UNESS as it is an important learning process, and Regional Bureaux and HQ can provide support when capacities are not there;
- Wherever possible, FO staff should draft the UNESS in order to develop the capacities of staff and strengthen the office;
- In countries where there is no UNESCO field presence, the UNESS preparation will be challenging, so need to be realistic and take this into consideration;
- In the case of Hanoi they worked closely with their Regional Office, whose guidance was very helpful;
- How often will revisions of the UNESS take place?
- UNESS should endure for longer term and not change every 2 years – that's what is wrong now: we just keep adding more UNESCO "priorities" out of context;

- The Strategies can be longer term and on that basis shorter term (2 year) work plans and budget can be drafted;
- Accountable decentralisation: UNESS will eventually move away from HQ (Team) and to Regional offices. HQ's task will be draw syntheses from country UNESS';
- Central services and BSP will be implicated and they need to understand the process;
- Country programmes should not be driven by needs SISTER needs;
- If we use UNESS correctly priorities will not keep changing and will remain rather constant over years;
- Will help Field Offices in orienting all others re in-country education programmes – Funds go to FO who will decide, and Institutes and Divisions and others will act accordingly;
- Interactions with multiple stakeholders can be built on in terms of ongoing coordination with our EFA partners;
- UNESS is as an opportunity to anchor within broader CCA/UNDAF in countries; UNESCO's unique perspective which should be reflected in UNDAF, which could be brought forward through the UNESS.

#### Institutes

- Representatives of Institutes (IBE, IIEP) offered their assistance and stressed the importance of consulting with them throughout;
- The key word for them is support strategy, which can include funding in a comprehensive way;
- They are present at this workshop to understand and identify the needs in order to respond to them.

#### Consultants

- National consultants who are familiar with that country should be used;
- More importantly the consultant should be familiar with UNESCO from a normative perspective, and with our experience;
- For Niger a national consultant was used but this was challenging due to lack of UNESCO understanding;
- If using consultants FO staff should better prepare them for the task.

#### Data

- Data challenges exists as there are often conflicting data at country level;
- Which statistical sources are we using for the UNESS? Are we going to take what is provided by governments or do we screen and do a comparative data analysis? What about UIS data?
- A move from descriptive to analytical – Data requested are all secondary sources;
- In Vietnam there were many conflicting data of agencies so they decided to use only MOE data – this should be specified in the document.
- Government data could be inaccurate and often not reflective of reality;
- FO will judge in each case;
- Operating rule will be to seek objective trends in data rather than focusing on numbers.

#### Other Issues Raised

- Will this “identification” document serve to draft an official one? What is the validity of the UNESS if it is not official?
- The case of Nigeria was unique and externally driven.
- UN reform deals with emergencies and not just development – shall we include in UNESS responding to critical crisis and emergency situations? Should look into

specificity of countries. UNESS can help UNESCO give comprehensive responses – what is our position in emergency situations if these are the priorities of the government?

- Do we want an independent UNESCO strategy or be held hostage to other development partners?
- Beyond strategies our intervention proposals have to be well calculated so that another partner does not come in and take over. We must be prepared and responsive;
- At the same time we must be careful not to give false expectations – involving means stakeholding, which could mean commitment and this could be too premature;
- Shortage of time was a challenge (not enough involvement and consultation for gathering information), but the capacity of field offices and Programme Specialist was also a challenge and should be looked into;
- There should be a stock taking in each office as to where they can do very well and what is missing
- BREDIA not present at the workshop but supposed to backstop its FOs;
- Each RB was supposed to have a P5 planner but this may not happen until next year. What are the sets of competencies needed for UNESS “teams” that could go around to countries and help them get started on the process?
- How do we choose the countries we will give priority to?

#### Follow-Up

- There was general agreement that the UNESS is an essential tool for the Organisation. We now have to work on refining this;
- Pilot country FOs should take another look at their drafts and discuss them more thoroughly;
- FOs should rethink their actual capacity to finish the task they have started and where are the specific areas where they need specific expertise;
- Guidelines could specify how UNESS falls into overall planning processes;
- HQ planned this workshop so they should now set follow-up deadline and responsiveness, based on FO proposals for time frames.
- If UNESS is an important critical document for UNESCO’s future planning, then all directors should be brought together and consult on the process and make decisions and provide the tools and resources;
- The Education Sector is far ahead with the reform and we are seeing the various issues to be addressed through the creation of UNESS. One day these same FOs will be asked to formulate “UNESS” covering other sectors so our education hierarchy should speak as soon as possible with BSP in order to synchronise efforts.

#### **Group 2: UNESS Process, Modalities and Timeframe**

This Group was chaired by Mr Edouard Matoko, Director of Bamako Office. Rapporteurs were Mr Eisuke Tajima from UNESCO Hanoi Office, together with Ms Faryal Khan and Mr Ilyong Cheong from HQ UNESS Team.

After the Group discussions, Mr Eisuke Tajima reported on the conclusions of the Group as follows:

#### Process:

- Official launching and notification to the governments and development partners
- Designing of the country process and identifying key partners on broad
- Clarify benefits of UNESS to Member States and partners’ role

- Existing policy documents to be related, e.g. UNDAF, SWAPs, EFA National Plans of Actions, GAP-EFA, etc.

#### Modality:

- Internal validation precedes external validation
- Who validates internally? Country directors before sending to HQs to feed into C/4 and C/5 planning processes
- Who validates externally? Depending on context, NATCOM, MOE, etc.
- Distinction between validation of needs identified and UNESS interventions
- Internal validation is a simplified, light, and speedy process with Institutes and Divisions
- ADG arbitrates in case of competing priorities

#### Macro-Timeframe: Integration with C4/C5:

- Synchronize timing to feed UNESS in C4 and C5
- Blue note for next planning cycle is scheduled for Oct 2006
- When possible, we include the 13 pilot cases in this biennium
- Ideally most countries prepare UNESS to inform C5 for 2008-2009.

#### Issues raised:

- Is UNESS a policy or intervention document?
- Enables UNESCO to strengthen advocacy for country needs in ED in on-going planning/programming
- Validation: Role of Regional Bureaux in the UNESS process?
- Is C5 flexible enough to accommodate the priorities of 191 Member States? Or would they have to fit under the ED Sector priorities?
- Organizational learning of UNESS process during transition period
- Do we need a Regional Strategy (URESS)?
- Does HQs have the capacity to synthesize/validate all UNESS?

Additionally, below are presented some more details of discussions and opinions exchanged at the working group session before arriving to the above conclusions of the Group:

#### Launching UNESS

- Official institutional launch and notification of UNESS to the governments and development partners. While an “internal signal” has been sent to FOs, an official “external signal” has to be sent to Member States and partners. “Silent delegations” sent so far have to explain and justify on behalf of their institution.
- Context-specific country processes depending on FO relations
- Clarity on added value of UNESS to Member States and identification of partners’ role
- Synergy with existing policy documents, e.g. UNDAF, SWAPs, NPA, GAP, etc.
- UNESS as a tool to strengthen UNESCO collaboration with other partners in on-going country planning/programming
- Communication flow between FOs and HQs UNESS team at kick-off phase to clarify ambiguities

#### Links with UNESCO Planning Cycles

- Synchronise UNESS preparation to inform C4 and C5 (don’t miss the boat!)
- Blue note for next planning cycle is scheduled for Oct 2006
- Priorities identified in pilot cases are integrated in upcoming biennium’s programme priorities
- Ideally most countries prepare UNESS to inform C5 for 2008-2009.



- A rolling document on a medium term time frame
- Update UNESS every two years

### Validation (content and processes)

Validation means two things:

- a. Whether countries accept priorities (content and processes) identified
- b. Actions to be taken by UNESCO (risk is a reductionist approach)
  - Validation is often initiated through sharing information over stages, consultations, correspondence, etc. during UNESS preparation process, and culminates with a legal or formal contract/commitment
  - Internal validation precedes external validation
  - Who validates internally? Country directors before sending to HQs to feed into C/4 and C/5 planning processes. While validation should be a flexible process (no straight jackets!), there could be some objective criteria/guiding steps suggested to insure quality and reliability of priorities identified (considering variations of ED capacities available in country offices).
  - Who validates externally? Depending on context, Nat Com Secretary, MOE, etc. Try to avoid external validation from becoming a heavy political process!
  - External validation primarily endorses the alignment of country priorities.
  - Internal validation transforms “selected” priorities identified as part of UNESS process, into UNESCO actions (resolve political and funding issues)
  - Internal Validation is a simplified, light, and speedy process with Institutes and Divisions
  - ADG arbitrates in case of competing priorities (in cases where there is tension between country priorities and allocation of HQs and/or RB resources)

### Pending Issues/Concerns

- Is UNESS a policy document or an intervention document? Perhaps it’s a “policy-positioning” of our offices so that they are proactive rather than reactive.
- Is C5 flexible enough to accommodate the priorities of 100+ Member States? Or would they have to fit under the ED sector priorities (the 5 MLAs)?
- Education is not exclusive to ED sector and is interlinked with other sectors. One UNESCO, One Strategy at Country level!! Culture and CI need to be integrated as phase one in UNESCO National Support Strategy (UNeSS) followed by other sectors. College of ADGs should converge UNESS so that we can speak as one UNESCO, and not work in half measures. This is an opportunity for us to do some fundamental thinking.
- As the UN moves towards a converged system of delivery, why are we initiating parallel processes? Our tools are not adequate in comparison with the analytical and working tools of other agencies. Usefulness of this exercise would be to equip UNESCO FOs with a tool that is a “comprehensive entry point” within the joint UN programming processes! A UNESS that comes up with a shopping list or has a different way of operating with pilot projects is counterproductive! UNESS mustn’t be a standalone exercise at country level.
- Other agencies have budgets linked with their country programmes. We need some financial support from our HQs, otherwise we raise false country expectations.
- DG’s generosity in ED at country level has to be aligned with UNESS priorities (in collaboration with BSP)
- How do we reconcile questionnaire sent to NATCOMs with UNESS process?

- Resolve “internal contradictions” first! FOs do one thing, Institutes another, HQs another!
- How can we ensure Institutes do not initiate parallel initiatives, outside the framework of UNESS, with RB and FOs?
- Validation: Role of RB in process?
- Do we need a URESS?

After presentation of the group reports, participants exchanged views and opinions with regard to the findings of both working groups on both the content and the process of drafting UNESS documents. Below is a detailed report of Plenary Session 5 on Day 2 on Q&A between participants (Rapporteur: Lily Neyestani-Hailu from HQ UNESS Team).

Following the presentation of Group 1 (see above in Annex 3), the following points were raised and discussed:

- Inputs from Institutes and their participation are essential;
- When return to their offices, all FO staff should re-discuss UNESS;
- The timeline for completing the drafts must be set;
- Re-emphasis on the need for UNESCO staff to draft the document as much as possible in order to develop their institutional memory and capacities.

Following the presentation of Group 2 (see above in Annex 3), the following points were raised and discussed:

- UNESS document could have 3 parts: (i) Country situation analysis (trends issues, etc); (ii) Needs analysis for the education sector; (iii) UNESCO’s intervention strategy;
- To say this is what UNESCO can and will do in this country would be only when we have the resources available.
- UNESS could have a separate section with a synthesis/summary, or at least an internal one for us.

General Discussion Points/Issues Raised at Q&A Session:

#### Modalities

- Mandate and capacity of UNESS “Teams” at FO and HQ are not clear. What will be the extent of communication between the field and the HQ UNESS team?
- UNESS Team explained that we are in a period of transition and we have no set answers as everyone else. The dialogue from the Field will help to clarify all of these issues. Consensus on the need for a great deal of communication between the two;
- Many of the 12 pilot countries are in Africa, so if we are to define a strategy from Regional Bureau to clusters (since staff and expertise vary and sometimes even more than at regional level) that could be the failure on the UNESS;
- We should examine case by case or region by region the realities of those offices;
- Policy or interventions? Let us move away from these binominal terminology and focus on the need for a well-written document to feed into the C4 & C5;
- UNESS will be developed for each country then sent up to Regional Bureaux where they allocate resources for all countries in the Region (accountable decentralisation)? Is it medium term?

#### Capacities

- According to a FO Director, DIR of BREDIA is absent because the Office is not properly staffed and they did not have enough resources to carry out the work. This is a clear

example of weak regional and even cluster offices, who in some cases have only 1 education specialist and have to cover several countries;

- The UNESS speaks critically to capacity issues – Regional Bureaux cannot carry out if they have no enough specialists;
- According to a Regional Director, originally the idea in the reform was that by 2008 P3-P5 positions (including ALD) would be flexibly provided for HIV, ESD, teacher training and community colleges to strengthen Regional Bureaux to meet demands;
- If there is no increase of the capacities in the field and at HQ, this exercise will not meet the needs of countries.

### Validation

- What kind of validation is required? How will be the validation of UNESS at the Regional level?
- “External validation”? Role of NATCOMs? If we try to validate externally, priorities will keep adding up;
- Is there a need for 2 validations: for needs and strategies? Or validation of needs could be the first phase of analysis (i.e. external validation); then these priorities can be brought into UNESCO planning processes where a choice is made as to which of these needs are transformed into action (internal validation).

### Planning

- Extent to which UNESS can inform C5 process in next biennium? Will funds be available for all or only for selected countries? How will UNESS documents synchronise and influence on next biennium?
- After the last C4 regional strategies were developed, but there is need for a more systematic synthesis of UNESS documents to come up with some strategic symmetries and commonalities across;
- How exactly do we combine the UNESS with the planning of the 34 C/4 and C/5? This can be discussed in regional roll-out strategy discussion, according to their needs, capacities and specificities.

### Greater Implications

- Are other UNESCO Sectors preparing the same kind of strategy for countries and how?
- Responsiveness vs. pro-activity – going from policy/position to intervention papers. What do our other sectors want us to bring?
- At a certain level, there will be competition of allocation of resources. If at HQ level the UNESS has to be recognised by all stakeholders and if it concerns all Sectors then it will need the involvement of the ADGs of other Sectors to validate decisions.
- Discussion regarding the need for Regional Bureaux if we have Institutes – why are we splitting capacities into segments? Let us put all capacities in Institutes who have actions on the ground at country level. Countries could reach out to Institutes and HQ Divisions for capacity and remove the anomaly of RB (and cluster?) forced upon them;
- Could there be a regional URESS or cluster UCESS? Questions of whether clusters will continue to exist – few examples of cluster offices that have developed cluster strategies but no clear guidance from BSP/BFC on this.

### Wider Context

- We are in a fundamental discussion about the Organisation and where it is going. With UNESS we are discussing mandate, function and meaning at country level and it is a very engaging discussion.

- We need this overarching framework which says this is what UNESCO identifies and from that this is what we can do. This needs to take place across the Sectors;
- As part of the UN reform, we must incorporate the UNESS into country UN programmes and UNCTs, in which UNESCO will play a role and the C5 will allocate resources. Those in the field will be touched sooner or later but the UN reform and the UNESS will allow for this.
- Pakistan and Vietnam are going through UN pilot phase. UNESS can bring them closer to the UN and towards joining the UN reform in a positive way.
- Our main interlocutor would now be the country and/or UNDAF – so away from NATCOMs. Bottom-up meant discussions were coming from the bottom up, but now NATCOMs become minor actors since the UNESS places the MOE as a higher actor;
- Does the UNESS (acronym) imply that we have raised expectations in countries – the dotted line that support will come from UNESCO?
- Re expectations, multilateral banks have programming cycles over several steps which have created expectations, so we have to be able to manage similar challenges. If we apply two phases: first the identification then the workplan and budgeting, that would work, so we should not have apprehensions. It is a question of managing the phases and expectations.

#### Other Issues Raised

- Reference to the multiple circles in Vietnam’s country PP presentation where it zooms in the UNESS as the centre juncture of all the frames. Should UNESS rather be the outer circle?
- All the frameworks in Vietnam are still too broad and sketchy and are missing a comprehensive education sector assessment. So in order for UNESCO to contribute we must try to help in filling the gaps in the identification/assessment.
- Chapter 5 gives impression that our role would be after seeing what the others have been doing to then fill the gap. We need to clarify this – are we there to fill the gap? Also to show that we play a normative role and that we have competencies in sub-sectors that other donors may be handling, but perhaps to ensure their greater quality and effectiveness. Do we limit ourselves in relation to what the others are doing? We may not have money but we have expertise.
- Although we are not a funding agency, we have technical competences which UNESS puts us around the table and gives us legitimacy IF in chapter 5 we have done a critical analysis of what partners are doing – can critique the capacity building being created from other agencies;
- We need to know what it is we will bring to the table if we are talking only about gap analysis. There has to be something that we uniquely bring to a country as an Organisation. UNESS is helping us decide what that is and how we are going to bring it. Again we are dealing with fundamentals of how we are going to contribute.
- How can the resources which exist cover this task? What are the conditions for each RB to roll out and at what rhythm?
- Must keep in mind that other agencies are also in these countries with strategies but with a bigger envelope;
- We are simply “identifying” the needs. Then what is the link between these and the missing envelope? Are FOs at all being put in an uncomfortable position?

#### Follow-Up

- Greater mobilisation of FO – top management at HQ needs to talk with Heads of Offices for full support of UNESS. The seriousness with which this exercise should be pursued is not yet there from top management;

- This process should involve all Directors including Institutes, etc. and they should be fully aware of the importance of this work;
- The next step should be for FOs to take stock of what human resources are needed to compile UNESS within a specified timeframe. First will be finishing what they have started, second figuring out the rollout. For Africa, a strategy is to see how national authorities can synchronise UNESS plans with regional plans that may exist;
- When choosing countries, we would have to consider UNDAF 2008 countries, and those UNESS' should be complete before then in order to position us;
- We should roll out as soon as possible not to “miss the train” for the upcoming planning process. If not it can serve at least for the work plans since work has been done at level of country.

## ***Annex 4: Reports on Regional Rollout Strategies***

The final session of Day 2 consisted of three working group sessions, with continued during the first session of Day 3. These sessions were led by the Regional Bureaux Directors (except for Sub-Saharan African region) on the challenges, factors for success of regional roll-out strategies for UNESS as well as their implementation modalities and timeframe. Presentations by the three regional teams on the regional roll-out strategies were made during Plenary Session 6 of Day 3 as follows:

### **Asia and the Pacific Regional Rollout Strategies**

Pilot Countries: Bangladesh, Pakistan, Vietnam

#### Launching the process:

- WHEN: Within the next 6 months
- WHO: Officially launched by the DG or the ADG
- WITH: High-level MOE officials (Minister or Deputy Minister)

#### Follow-up to the workshop:

- Report of the Evaluation Workshop to be shared with the participants and its main conclusions presented at the ED Sector leadership team (10-11 October 2006)
- Revision by HQ UNESS Team of the guidelines by mid-November at the latest
- Letter with “how to” tools, templates, examples of processes, timeline to be attached to the guidelines
- Revision and completion of UNESS documents in pilot countries (Bangladesh, Pakistan and Vietnam) by end March 2007
- Information letters by DG or ADG/ED to the national authorities of the pilot countries (Education Ministers, NATCOM, etc.) to announce the launching of UNESS as an Organisation-wide initiative (as opposed to an office-initiated exercise), explain its purpose and process, and request the engagement of the national constituents. Some countries (e.g., Vietnam) need such a formal invitation in order to start more serious consultations with the governments and obtain the validation of the final UNESS (there may be two letters needed, the first informing the governments on the launching and the second requesting their direct involvement in finalisation/validation). It is also desirable that the DG mention the UNESS initiative in his speeches given at high-level meetings, such as the EFA High Level Group meeting.
- The involvement of civil society organisations is considered important, particularly during the consultation stage. The validation of UNESS, however, should be between UNESCO and the national governments.
- As part of regional roll-out strategies, the following ideas were discussed: (i) ADG/ED will send all Field Offices the revised guidelines with view to selecting countries for the next round of UNESS preparation, which should be completed by fall 2008, in time for the 35C/5 planning. Each Cluster Office should recommend priority countries to work with, taking into consideration the CCA/UNDAF process; (ii) Given the on-going UN Reform, the Resident Coordinators of the countries need to be kept informed, and the DG or ADG/ED letter addressed to them should emphasise that UNESS is in line with the UN Reform; (iii) Examples of the UNESS preparation processes (e.g. data collection, consultation, prioritisation, validation, timeline) with different scenarios would be helpful and should be attached to the guidelines.

- Internal meetings foreseen in the region can be utilised for information and/or training purposes for the UNESS roll-out: a) meeting of Heads of Office (13-15 December) and b) training seminar of education specialists “Education Week” planned in early next year. There are two global internal meetings foreseen at the Headquarters in February 2007: a) the Heads of Field Office and b) senior FO management staff. These meetings also present an opportunity for introducing UNESS to other Offices and encouraging them to commit themselves to it. It is crucial that the Heads of Field Office give priority to UNESS, so that their Offices allocate sufficient resources to it.

#### Budgetary Implications:

- Costing? Sources: EFA (capacity building) for pilot phase – prospect of additional funding from Norway and Denmark
- Other sources need to be identified

#### Human Resources:

- Stock-taking: FOs to take stock of capacities for UNESS and if lacking, communicate with RB and HQs
- Senior UNESS specialists appointed in each regional bureau
- Set up regional or sub-regional “mobile teams”

#### Quality Assurance:

- Consistency of data (UIS data vs. country data)
- Sub-sector expertise may be needed in drafting UNESS (e.g. higher education)
- The idea of a “Regional reading group” to have draft UNESS commented on by colleagues in other countries can be also explored (cf. UNICEF leads a regional UNDAF reading group in APA)
- Country commitments (e.g. ratified conventions, MOU with UNESCO), so that UNESCO can play an advocacy role (cf., compendium of conventions and treaties related to human rights and inclusive education, published by UNESCO/Jakarta and a Norwegian organization)
- Periodical review (UNESS is a rolling document).

#### Some Challenges:

- Advocacy vs. responsiveness: the participants discussed the dilemma between being responsive to country priorities expressed by the governments and UNESCO’s proactive advocacy role in addressing obvious education challenges in the countries (e.g., gender, HIV/AIDS preventive education)
- Following up and integrating its commitments, such as the UN decades (e.g., DESD and UNLD) and the EFA core initiatives (LIFE, TTISSA and EDUCAIDS).
- Synchronisation with CCA/UNDAF (UN Reform) and BSP-led country programming

### **Arab Regional Roll-out Strategies**

Pilot Countries: Egypt, Morocco and [Lebanon]

#### Feasibility:

- Assumption: It is technically possible to roll out UNESS in 15 out of the 22 states within the Arab region in the short-term (next 6 months through Oct 06-Mar 07) in view of feeding into the C5 (2008-09) and C4 (2008-2013) planning process, provided resources are available.

Note: Within this scenario, UNESS would be an internal document reflecting country needs and priorities for cooperation. It would have initial validation by national authorities, while final official validation would follow at a later stage.

#### Resource mobilization:

- The implementation of this short-term (6 month) roll out strategy for the Arab region would require intensive mobilization of resources.
- In the absence of the possibility of the immediate mobilization of internal UNESCO expertise in such an intensive manner, this short-term roll out strategy for the Arab region would need to rely heavily on consultants.
- A total estimated budget required for adequate resource mobilization = USD 350,000.

#### Conditions:

Two basic conditions are thus essential of the intensive short-term roll out strategy within the Arab region:

- That sufficient financial resources are available (USD 350 000) for mobilization of expertise and coordination.
- That these financial resources be immediately available (i.e. by October 2006).

#### Risk factors:

- Availability of programme specialists within both regional and cluster and national offices.
- Delays in the mobilization of experienced consultants
- Delays in the process of internal feedback and validation
- Delay due to political processes
- Social / political instability

#### Rationales of phased rollout:

- Phase 1 – Oct-Nov 06: Finalize UNESS in 4 pilot countries by end of Nov 2006 (Egypt, Iraq, Lebanon, Morocco)
- Phase 2 - Oct-Dec 06:
  - (a) 4 countries within which there is a UNESCO presence (Jordan, Palestine, Qatar, Sudan)
  - (b) 3 countries in which conditions are favourable: Oman (Doha cluster), Algeria & Mauritania (Rabat cluster)
- Phase 3 – Jan-Mar 07: 4 countries with no UNESCO presence and which represent a priority within their cluster: Syria (Beirut cluster), Yemen (Cairo cluster), Bahrain (Doha cluster), Libya (Rabat Cluster)
- Phase 4 – Apr-Dec 07: Countries which do not represent a priority and whose needs are represented by the selection in Phases 1-3. Kuwait, S. Arabia and UAE (Doha cluster); Tunisia (Rabat cluster); (+ Djibouti)

#### Resource mobilization:

1. Regional workshop (Marrakech, Nov 06): 60 000 USD  
Objectives: (i) Validate draft ToRs, timelines, and support/cooperation mechanism between offices; (ii) Introduce UNESS to non-pilot field offices  
Participants: 3 participants per country from each of 8 offices (Director, Programme specialist + consultant)
2. Regional coordinator (6 months): 60 000 USD
3. Consultants 10 consultants /one per non-pilot country: 150 000 USD
4. Regional consultation (Doha, Mar 07): 50 000 USD



Objectives: (1) To synthesize regional priorities identified; (2) To assess national experiences and regional process

Participants: 1 participant from each UNESS office

5. Other expenses: 30 000 USD

Administrative support; Communication charges; Documentation, printing, etc.

Total: 350 000 USD

### **Sub-Saharan African Regional Rollout strategies**

UNESS pilot countries: Angola, Niger, Nigeria, Tanzania, [Guinea, Senegal, Sierra Leone]

#### General considerations:

The following measures are for short-term considerations of the ED reform to be differentiated from overall long-term reform outcomes

#### On the role of the Regional Bureau in general:

- There is need to clarify the roles RB is expected to play
- Need to recognize BREDA's multiple functions: Cluster Office, Regional Bureau, and Representative to the cluster countries
- Underscore the urgent need to reinforce BREDA capacity, in terms of human resources and administrative capacity (as in other regions)
- Alternative to other "unconfirmed" schemes in the reform: assigning heads and specialists according to the different functions in BREDA: RB and Cluster
- RB to provide technical backstopping to the Clusters
- Staffing formats/profiles have to be adapted to the African Region's specific needs instead of following the standard provision "said to be included" in the ED Sector Reform provisions.
- Staffing the RB to follow clear profiles to fill the posts: Competencies/specializations well identified; Clusters to participate in definition of profiles
- Decentralize resources (human and financial) to clusters

#### Regional Strategy vis-à-vis UNESS:

- Provide 3 UNESS specialists (new posts, preferably on linguistic basis) to the region based in different clusters (profile: education planners, policy analysts)
- Location of these specialists should be flexible: may be based in different Cluster Offices but with the mandate to cover countries (clusters) of the Region at large
- Involve Institutes throughout the process, depending on their various areas of expertise and the needs expressed by the Offices
- Involve particularly IICBA, while making sure its capacity is strengthened
- Financial resources to be placed where implementation is taking place: ED Sector to generate funds and allocate them directly to the Clusters and National Offices for executing the tasks
- Mobile teams welcomed – but Cluster programme specialists not to be involved as this may take them away from the specific responsibilities within the cluster

#### Regional UNESS Workshop:

- 1 workshop for the Region in November 2006 (Zanzibar proposed)
- Participation of Directors and Programme specialists
  - Specialists to focus on technical work after first day
  - Directors on overall Sector Reform issues
  - BSP and UNESS Team to be involved

- UNESS team to disseminate the revised guidelines as soon as possible
- Pilot countries to update their drafts before the workshop
- Details on rollout to new countries to be defined at workshop
- Details on budget for the whole exercise to be determined and disclosed at the workshop

### **Discussion on the regional roll-out strategies**

The following paragraphs summarize the discussion on the regional roll-out strategies (Plenary 6) before and after the regional group presentations. (Rapporteurs: Mr Ichiro Miyazawa from UNESCO Islamabad and Mrs Lily Neyestani-Hailu from HQ Team).

Before presentations were made by the three regional working groups on roll-out strategies, a plenary dialogue took place with the Education Sector's Executive Office, highlighting the following points:

#### 1. Funding

Mr Svein Osttveit from ED/EO expressed that UNESS preparation could take place in 100 countries as a next step. The RB would play a more essential role than before, especially in planning. There could be mobile groups and the recruitment of local experts to join these mobile teams in order to have national consultants is necessary.

For now, UNESCO will have to rely on extra-budgetary funds but eventually it will no longer depend on large sums of money to carry out this exercise as it should become essential planning that all offices must do for the C4/C5. So far \$500,000 in extra-budgetary funds has been ensured for the UNESS. The funds may be insufficient to cover 100 countries but more will be further raised. This can initially cover about 40 – 50 to finance regional team of experts. UNESS is the main building block for bottom-up planning. These funds will be utilized for supporting the regional teams + national experts and in-house capacity building. The UNESS HQ Team will provide technical support.

Some participants expressed that the half million is not sufficient for the regional roll-out plans as much funds would be needed to provide training and hire consultants, etc. Mr Osttveit referred the case of the pilots where so far tremendous funds have not been were incurred – e.g. Vietnam where only approx \$2,000 were spent and in other cases no new expenses. We should not jump into premature conclusions that this exercise will be very expensive.

This exercise is supposed to be part of what FOs are already doing when preparing initial inputs for regional consultations in doing an analysis and determining the strategic positions of UNESCO in relation to other partners. The UNESS is a much more structured way of doing this and therefore some funds will be required at the beginning for travel, hiring competences, and making the process analytical until it becomes a normal part of the planning process of offices.

#### 2. Programme Planning Cycle

Mr Osttveit further expressed that the UNESS is an integral part of the C5 planning. So far the process has been top-down with limited consultation or substantive discussions on priorities. The idea is to now slowly change this pattern, as we are also dependent on central services and other sectors. However there are promising signs that we are heading in the right direction.

He made mentioned of the survey that was sent to the FO to get an initial idea of ED sector priorities, which will serve as the foundation to form the MLAs for the next biennium. The survey needs to be submitted to RB by the 2nd of October and will be one of the elements for

the leadership meeting of 10 – 11 October. Attention will be given to getting all services to agree that in upcoming Blue Note planning will be aligned with the Education Sector's new UNESS approach.

Plenary proceeded with regional roll-out presentations by the three regional working groups and the discussion that ensued highlighted the following points. (See above in this Annex)

#### Proposal of the Regional Bureau for Roll out Strategies (Asia)

DIR Bangkok made a comprehensive presentation which included follow-up activities, budget implications, human resources, quality Assurance, and some challenges.

Q: Could you tell us the specific date for the official launching letter from ADG?

A: The first activity after this workshop will be to revise the outline. It will depend how long it will take but it is going to be very soon.

Q: Explain more about synchronization with the BSP-led country programme

A: Last year, there was an exercise to prepare the BSP-led country programme for some countries. Its progress is not known.

Q: What did you mean by the approval of development partners?

A: Looking at the contexts of the country, the acceptance and information to those partners would be a good strategy.

#### Proposal of the Regional Bureau for the Roll out Strategies (Arab)

Rabat Office presented the discussion of the Arab group who anticipate the roll out of UNESS in the region and estimated \$ 350,000 as its minimum cost. The group stressed that the contents of UNESS need to be fed into the 34C5/C4. The group showed us the roll out plan with 4 phases with its budget breakdown.

Comment: In order to effectively roll out UNESS, the cooperation among HQ, RB and FOs is essential.

Comment: Dates for the UNESS regional workshop and coordination meeting should not collide with dates of other EFA events in this year.

#### Proposal of the Regional Bureau for Roll out Strategies (Africa)

The Africa group stressed the importance of building capacity and human resource in BREDA, other cluster offices and field offices in its region. The close cooperation among HQ, RB, CO and FO and involvement of institutes were pointed out. UNESS team was requested to revise the outline as soon as possible. This regional group sees the possibility to organize the regional workshop in November 2006.

Comment: ADG needs to officially announce when the roll-out starts. Roll out could be challenging especially in the Africa region where capacity and human resources are comparatively weak.

Comment: The regional roll-out strategy needs to be developed before the regional workshop and the results of this workshop should be informed to all directors in the region.

Comment: Around US\$ 2 million will be ensured for the UNESS roll out. Though the provisional number may not be realistic, the fund is not lower than US\$ 1 million.

## ***Annex 5: Report of Closing Plenary on Recommendations for the Roll-out of UNESS***

After presentation of key findings and recommendations by workshop participants, the floor was opened to further contributions. Participants emphasised that UNESS is essential for our work in-country, but would require immediate human and financial resources for rollout, together with the choice of capacity development modalities, to some extent determining both the speed of roll-out and the institutionalisation of capacity development.

Mr Sheldon (DIR/BKK) brought up the salary cost savings on the UNESS P-5 posts that, not appointed, could be used to fund mobile teams, planning meetings, etc. The ADG/ED responded by referring to the legal side of these posts, that first they were being offered to senior, top-level professionals whose posts had been abolished, though they constituted new jobs, as separate offers.

Ms Harvey (DIR/Windhoek) mentioned that posts were normally created at the start of the biennium. Thus, she did not concur with DIR/BKK's view that there would be cost savings. Rather, funds would need to be sought for these posts, e.g. the 3 UNESS posts for AFR. The ADG/ED clarified that though DIR/Windhoek was correct about the normal situation, in this case, there could be staff cost savings.

Mr Salame (Beirut) spoke of the need for 'take-off' and fresh money for this purpose as well as the necessary decisions to make UNESS useful for the next C/5. Once 'take-off' had occurred, we'd be able to 'cruise' on more RP funding.

Mr Keynan (Dhaka) said though money is important, it is the solid, dynamic leadership from HQs to DIR/FOs that is the top priority for UNESS roll-out and then to identify the resources available. He was not clear of the priority given to UNESS in the hierarchy of objectives and emphasised the importance that this message was a top priority.

Mr Rafique (Dhaka) made a technical intervention concerning the UNESS process in Bangladesh, that whilst they found gaps in what were 10 areas, he reckoned the system for moving from gaps to interventions was not sound and that there needed to be some process for moving from gaps, such as a matrix of priorities.

Mr Osman (DIR/Beirut) referred to the success of the pilot exercise, and that the usefulness of the workshop will help us to refine the process and guidelines for rollout in whatever number of countries. He did not want to narrow the importance to the use of UNESS in the current C/5 and hoped that money and other resources would be found for the 100 some countries, but if not, he still would not be worried, as whatever we can do to improve the process, we should do. The process would be carried on in FOs, to improve our position with our UN colleagues. We are considered the intellectual organisation. UNESS will give us the chance to maintain this.

Mr Smith, ADG/ED made several points in response to the presentation and the above additions. First, he agreed with Mr Osman's point, that we should not get fixated on the 100 countries. In 12 months, the objective is to learn enough so that we have the understanding of UNESS, in our training materials, and in future budget proposals, we will learn how to do them, to learn how to deal with results. The success of UNESS is not doing them all, but trying to learn how and because of its success, through this acquiring the endorsement at UN level and amongst bilateral DPs. On the issue on how to prioritise the needs, he said that we must remember that we are the

intellectual partner, and to remember that strategies or gaps are where capacity development is needed to move forward. This is not just our job but all IDPs. Our job is to create the strategy or gap analysis, and we will undertake what we can do, but also help to determine who will take on other parts of the agenda.

Furthermore, he agreed with the point that we need to train at once, without confusing the issue that the training itself will be different in 8-10 months as we will know more. It is important that the approach to training treats participants as intellectuals and that part of the job is to help them determine what UNESS is and how to do it better.

According to ADG/ED, we don't know yet what is either the correct linkage between UNESS and particular modalities of capacity development nor a similar linkage with monitoring and evaluation. These are connections that will become clearer for three reasons:

- 1) We will have more information, the more we do, information that is not hypothetical but concrete. This will be the big change feeding into the prioritisation of modalities for capacity development
- 2) Hopefully, we will have received funding from bilaterals to assess capacity development and its modalities across all the entities so that we will have an inventory of talent and therefore anyone can see who is available and will have to understand the different pricing schemes operative.
- 3) The same will go for monitoring and evaluation. The capacity development approach will become more stable as the connection is made clearer.

By mid-to-late spring, it should be clearer how these three things are linked.

With regard to the idea of launching UNESS and preparing ministries of education and using the EFA HLG or a launch later in January or February 2007, what is important is not that we announce UNESS in two weeks or whatever time, but that we understand what we are announcing. There will always be critics and cynics. They should not determine the timing of our launch, nor should our values be based on others' views, but on our own intellect. Therefore preparing for the launch is not to reduce the critical conversations about UNESS. Rather, it is to be clear about what it is, to make this clear to our partners and not to ask their permission. The governing bodies and the DG affiliate us to UNESS.

The GAP describes our core role, this is our chartered responsibility, at the heart of what we do. We want the GAP agencies to describe their core purpose as we have done ours. This is it. It will enable monitoring and evaluation, technical assistance and capacity development at the country level. The launch will be to tell people professionally, not politically what UNESS is.

There is calendar pressure re: the C/5. This is true, but we already have more focused questions than at the start of the workshop. We will preserve our flexibility at least until February when preparations will need to be made for the next Exec Board, but not defined until the Fall of 2007 Executive Board and General Conference.

The next C/5 will have larger and fewer envelopes, the value is that the RBs and FOs can talk about what they will do to achieve results, using expenditure lines against the results, that the modalities will be the mechanisms for achieving the results. Therefore, we won't project modalities until Fall 2007, otherwise we will be pushed back into the project mode.

Whether or not BSP is invited to Regional meetings is a question of whether one wants to turn the debate into what fits and what doesn't fit, rather than focusing on the plans. When one is changing a system, it is unfair to invite those implementing the current system. We are engaging them at HQs. I'm not sure whether inviting them will help the regional workshops.

We want the clearest views from the regions and then we will go into the political process. If you do the two simultaneously, you weaken your positions. We should be willing to talk about the calendar and outcomes, budget process at Directors' level and not at the planning events.

\$2.25m [needed for developing UNESS documents] is an achievable amount. We will need to know more. How many can we do in the next 12 months? If we can do the LDCs? You decide. We'll know more by next July from whatever has been done. NATCOMs have been doing their things; we will have some UNESS documents.

Think about if you do 15 in each region in the next 12-14 months. What is it that you're NOT going to do otherwise? We need to have some decisions soon, by 1 December 2006 or 1 January 2007 at the latest, an answer will be ready and will take \$2.25m as a target until we get more information re: the prioritisation, some things which will be less important which we can reposition. We need to consider this across all regions. Remember that by 1 November last year \$12 m was not obligated or spent (nearly 25%) with only two months to run. Saying UNESS is important, we will do it, including the DG if necessary.

Mr Radi (Chief of HQ Team) then summed up, that a report of the workshop would be sent to all, that it would be received, as well, by the hierarchy, and also by BSP, that money would be found for the regional workshops, for which proposals will be made. The accent must be on the first activities, our coming together, and the continuation of this cooperative work. He recognised that all had taken the exercise seriously, and also that problems existed as well for HQs, and not only for the FOs, e.g. having no budget. UNESS is a challenge for all. We will organise so that UNESCO will organise itself!