



Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies
Réseau Inter-Agences pour l'Éducation en Situations d'Urgence
La Red Interagencial para Educación en Situaciones de Emergencia

**INEE Policy Roundtable:
Education Finance in States Affected by
Fragility**

OUTCOME REPORT

DECEMBER 2008

INEE Policy Roundtable

27-28 October 2008

Brussels, Belgium

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Context	2
Highlights from Framing Paper: Education Finance in States Affected by Fragility	3
Summary of Key Points of Discussion	6
Strategic Recommendations	9

Annex A: INEE Policy Roundtable Agenda

Annex B: INEE Policy Roundtable Participant List

Acknowledgements

The Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE) would like to thank all of the 2008 INEE Policy Roundtable attendees for their active engagement and rich contributions to the event (see participant list in Annex B). INEE would also like to thank the following individuals for the special contributions to the event:

- *Policy Roundtable Chair:* Peter Buckland (World Bank)
- *Policy Roundtable Facilitator:* Mark Todd (Independent Consultant)
- *Policy Roundtable Advisory Group:* Peter Buckland (World Bank), Julia Dicum (Canadian International Development Agency), Susy Ndaruhutse and Laura Brannelly (CfBT Education Trust), John Patch (European Commission), Mary Joy Pigozzi (Academy for Educational Development), Kerstin Tebbe (INEE Secretariat)
- *Welcome and Closing Speakers:* Luis Reira (European Commission), Julia Dicum (Canadian International Development Agency), Francesca Mosca (European Commission)
- *Presenters:* Laura Brannelly (CfBT Education Trust), Kerstin Tebbe (INEE Secretariat)
- *Day 1 Breakout Group Facilitators:* Lyndsay Bird (UNESCO—IIEP), Joris van Bommel (Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs), Bidemi Carrol (International Rescue Committee)
- *Day 2 Expert Panelists:* Janice Dolan (Save the Children UK), Catherine Dom (Mokoro Limited), Keith Lewin (University of Sussex), Emily Oldmeadow (European Commission—South Sudan)
- *Framing Paper Authors:* Laura Brannelly and Susy Ndaruhutse (CfBT Education Trust)
- *Logistical Support and Notetakers:* Allison Anderson (INEE Secretariat), Marin Hodgkin (INEE Secretariat), Bénédicte Benoit-Eagleton (INEE Secretariat), Brenna O'Rourke (INEE Secretariat), Edward Roberts (European Commission)

INEE is grateful to the European Commission for hosting this Policy Roundtable on behalf of the INEE Working Group on Education and Fragility. INEE would also like to thank the UK Department for International Development (DfID) and the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) for their financial contributions to support this event.

Executive Summary

On 27-28 October 2008, INEE sponsored a Policy Roundtable on *Education Finance in States Affected by Fragility* hosted by the European Commission in Brussels, Belgium. The event was organized by the INEE Working Group on Education and Fragility, which was established in early 2008 as an inter-agency mechanism to coordinate diverse initiatives and catalyze collaborative action on education and fragility.

The day-and-a-half long Policy Roundtable brought together a diverse group of 45 representatives from donor agencies, UN and NGO practitioners, government representatives, and researchers/academics. The goals of the event were to:

- Review existing and new financing modalities for education in situations of fragility and chronic crises to determine how these modalities can better respond to the challenges faced by the sector, including the most effective mix and phasing of modalities.
- Draw upon experience and knowledge of financing modalities in other sectors and cross-sectoral linkages between education and other sectors to develop lessons learnt and improvements to financing modalities for education in fragile states.
- Develop advocacy strategies and targeted policy recommendations on the use of different existing and emerging aid modalities to effectively support the provision of education in situations of fragility.

Major points of discussion from the event included the need for simple, flexible and quick funding mechanisms; issues of trust gaps between donors and recipient countries; the role of new sources of fragility, such as the impending global recession, in driving fragility and potentially reducing funding to education; lack of capacity and knowledge at country-level to make effective choices about utilization of financing modalities; challenges of shadow alignment; and uncertainty over the role of civil society in financing of education in fragile contexts.

The event's discussions generated strategic recommendations for INEE and the Working Group on Education and Fragility. The Working Group will take up some of these in its forthcoming activities including addressing the adverse effects of global recession via advocacy for funding education in fragile contexts and developing analysis and tools for country-based actors to make informed decisions on effective financing modalities.

INEE hopes that you find this outcome report helpful to your work. We welcome feedback and encourage you to disseminate the report to your colleagues. Please submit any comments and questions to educationfragility@ineesite.org. For more information about the Working Group on Education and Fragility, please visit the INEE website at www.ineesite.org/educationandfragility.

Context

The Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE) is an open global network of over 3,000 members working together within a humanitarian and development framework to ensure all persons the right to quality education and a safe learning environment in emergencies and post-crisis recovery. In early 2008, a Working Group on Education and Fragility was established within INEE, as an inter-agency mechanism to coordinate diverse initiatives and catalyze collaborative action on education and fragility. The Working Group's goals are to:

- Strengthen consensus on what works to mitigate state fragility through education while ensuring equitable access for all.
- Support the development of effective quality education programmes in fragile states.
- Promote the development of alternative mechanisms to support education in fragile states in the transition from humanitarian to development assistance.

The relationship between education and fragility is dynamic and often mutually reinforcing; education is impacted by fragility as fragility is impacted by education. Contexts of fragility are distinguished first and foremost by instability (political, economic, social), often coupled with the risk of violence or the presence of violent conflict.

Different conditions of fragility affect various aspects of education – including access, quality, relevance, equity, and management – in a myriad of well-documented ways. Fragility's impacts on the operating environment for education, including the impacts on the financing of education in these contexts, inhibit progress towards quality and accessible education in general and towards Education for All (EFA) and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) in particular.

Since its inception, INEE has held a number of events as part of its efforts to catalyze collaborative action around key topics of interest. The 2008 Policy Roundtable was organized by the INEE Working Group on Education and Fragility to address the vital issue of education finance in states affected by fragility. The 2008 event built on discussion and recommendations from a 2006 roundtable that included discussion on identifying alternative financing mechanisms for education in emergencies and fragile contexts.¹

Insufficient funding and inadequate financing mechanisms prevent or interrupt education for millions of children living in situations of fragility. Despite accounting for half of the world's out-of-school children, conflict-affected fragile states receive only one fifth of global education aid.² Also, given findings that education has the potential to contribute to mitigating fragility, investment in education is critical.³ Therefore, addressing education finance in situations of fragility is an urgent and essential component of improving overall education in states affected by fragility.

¹ Further information on the 2006 Policy roundtable can be found on the INEE website (www.ineesite.org).

² International Save the Children Alliance. *Last in Line, Last in School*. (2007)

³ For more information, see the desk study on education and fragility commissioned by INEE and completed by the Conflict and Education Research Group (CERG) at Oxford University in early 2008. (Available on the INEE website:

www.ineesite.org/educationandfragility)

Synopsis

The framing paper for the 2008 INEE Policy Roundtable presents an overview and analysis of mechanisms for financing education in states affected by fragility within the parameters of the *OECD-DAC Principles for Good International Engagement in Fragile States and Situations*. Specifically, the paper a) examines trends in current funding flows (for domestic funding, official development assistance, humanitarian aid and non-DAC donors); b) summarizes different types of existing funding modalities and their relative effectiveness in four DAC categories of fragile states; c) develops lessons learnt for use of existing funding modalities; and d) summarizes innovative and emerging aid modalities (including health sector financing, governance-based aid, global financing channels, and outcomes-based or progress-based aid) and their links to key DAC principles.

The paper provides brief case studies on modalities used in Afghanistan, Ethiopia, Mozambique, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Sudan, Yemen and Zimbabwe to illustrate the application and outcomes of different modalities.

The framing paper analyzes the four predominantly used funding modalities. Overall findings include:

1. **Humanitarian aid:** Funding for education through humanitarian aid, particularly as part of cross-sectoral response and/or utilizing un-earmarked funds, can be successful, but requires decision-makers to see education as a priority in humanitarian response. This is often not the case.
2. **Projects:** Funding provided for stand-alone projects typically bypasses the state. Unsustainability and difficulties with coordination and systems alignment⁵ are often obstacles with project funding modalities.
3. **Multi-donor trust funds (MDTFs):** Pooled funds from multiple donors, often managed by the World Bank or a UN agency, can theoretically be most successful for support state-building and alignment. However, in practice MDTFs often face challenges in their practical implementation, resulting in delays in disbursement of funds and the potential of civil society exclusion from the funds.
4. **Budget support (general or sectoral):** Aid provided directly to state ministries faces problems of low predictability, low sustainability, and low state capacity to absorb funds, among others.

Additionally, the paper highlights findings from innovative or emerging funding modalities:

1. **Health sector financing:** Funding for the health sector is generally similar to that of the education sector but with more global-level financing initiatives.
2. **Governance-based aid:** USAID in Guinea has linked improvement in education to improvement in governance in programming, with implementers responsible and accountable for both simultaneously.

⁴ The framing paper from the Policy Roundtable, developed by CfBT Education Trust, can be found on the INEE website (www.ineesite.org/educationandfragility).

⁵ Throughout this document *alignment* is referred to as funding systems separate from and/or in collaboration with government systems (operationalised by donors, NGOs, or other agencies) which align with government priorities and existing processes and systems. Alignment may also refer to aligning with government policies or proposed policies. Alignment can promote ownership and build capacity for sustainability. *Shadow* alignment parallels and/or supports government systems which are weak or absent due to lack of capacity and/or will.

3. **Global financing channels:** The realization of the FTI/UNICEF Transition Fund could become a primary means of acting quickly and flexibly to support education in fragile contexts via support of interim strategies or plans.
4. **Outcomes-based or progress-based aid:** Outcomes-based aid has promise for addressing scale up issues while building local capacity and strengthening systems via payments made against progress towards a goal. However, there are challenges for benchmarking and monitoring progress, a focus on quantity rather than quality, and resources being channeled primarily to high performers.

Lessons Learnt

The analysis of existing funding modalities includes lessons learnt on use of these modalities judged against the *OECD-DAC Principles for Good International Engagement in Fragile States and Situations*. The paper focused on three of these principles: Principle 1, take context as a starting point; Principle 3, focus on state-building as the central objective; and Principle 7, align with local priorities in different ways in different contexts. Country examples are provided with each lesson.

DAC Principle 1: Context

Case studies in Somalia and Nepal illustrated that using a variety of aid depending on the context is more effective than following a “one-size-fits-all approach.”

As illustrated by the case of Pakistan, external stakeholders need to examine the level of capacity in government and amongst non-state actors, the reliability of public financial management systems, and the legitimacy of the government before deciding on which modality or set of modalities to use.

DAC Principle 3: State-building

Building capacity even when governance structures are weak or in the early stages of development is challenging but possible. This was demonstrated in DRC, Myanmar, and Eritrea.

As illustrated by cases in Sierra Leone, Somalia, DRC, and Afghanistan, working with a broad range of stakeholders including non-state actors leads to more holistic and sustainable state-building.

DAC Principle 7: Local priorities

Harmonization and alignment are important and, even where illegitimate governments and poor governance exist, it is still possible to plan a strategic response through shadow alignment, in which donors or other non-governmental agencies act as service providers to support, replace, or parallel existing systems with low capacity and/or will. This was demonstrated in Afghanistan, Myanmar, Somalia, and Yemen.

Having a country programme or education project that broadly supports the government’s education sector policy and plan (where available) leads to a more coherent and comprehensive and strategic intervention. Cases in Eritrea, Yemen, Côte d’Ivoire, Sierra Leone, and Liberia illustrated this lesson.

Recommendations for Future Action, Advocacy and Research

As the framing paper noted, financing of education in states affected by fragility must simultaneously address multiple needs including immediate service delivery, institutional strengthening and governance reforms, and good donorship in line with the Paris Declaration. The paper concludes that the real challenge is identifying combined approaches that are flexible enough to respond to

opportunities and progressive enough to break cycles of weak governance and capacity. Recommendations proposed in the paper followed from these conclusions including:

- ***Bridging the transition from humanitarian to development assistance:*** Emerging global initiatives (such as FTI, INEE and IASC Education Cluster) should continue to increase awareness of the needs for education in states affected by fragility and generate further global debate on the particular challenges faced.
- ***Role of non-state actors:*** All stakeholders need to engage in more open dialogue to explore partnership frameworks between the private sector, NGOs, civil society, UN agencies, donors and government. Additionally, there is a need to identify how non-state actors have addressed risks and challenges of as well as possible means to enforcing government accountability.
- ***Use of multi-donor trust funds (MDTFs):*** Further analysis is needed to identify how well activities funded through MDTFs have performed in comparison to similar activities financed through other channels, and to distinguish the real advantages and disadvantages of pursuing MDTFs.
- ***Strengthening the evidence base for best ways of engaging in education finance in fragile contexts:*** Research and knowledge-sharing between agencies is needed to document lessons learnt and emerging good practice in funding education programmes and projects.
- ***Evaluation of aid modalities:*** Once pilots/initial stages of the innovative/emerging new aid modalities have been completed, a comparative evaluation report is needed to guide policymakers on the likely strengths and weaknesses of these approaches in providing education financing in states affected by fragility.
- ***Addressing emerging aid modalities, new financing actors and changing situations on the ground:*** There is a need for close international cooperation between all stakeholders – governments, donors, UN agencies, INGOs, and CSOs – to develop an agreed upon *modus operandi*. Particularly at the country-level there is a need to ensure that policy and changes in policy translates into action within the scope of international commitments.
- ***Increased humanitarian funding for education:*** Supported by the IASC Education Cluster and INEE, further advocacy work needs to be undertaken to encourage greater overall financing for education as a humanitarian response and also to address the gap in education funding between humanitarian response and development financing. In support of the former, all DAC donors should incorporate support to education into their humanitarian policies.
- ***Guidance on funding modalities, options and lessons learnt:*** INEE or FTI should undertake a stakeholder analysis to identify needs for guidance materials, particularly for education finance teams within states affected by fragility.

Discussion on Framing Paper Presentation

Several challenges and issues were brought up by participants following the presentation of the paper at the Policy Roundtable.

Participants noted that there is a general disparity between overall funding needed and funding provided to states affected by fragility. It was also acknowledged that while external funding must increase, domestic funding is critical. However, there is a lack of data available regarding national

budgets and domestic spending on education, which makes the impact of domestic funding difficult to track. Budget support lacks accountability when governments do not monitor or report on funding flows. On funding disbursement, participants noted that funding mechanisms in general are often slow to disburse funds. Therefore, certain modalities (such as multi-donor trust funds) have demonstrated a lack of predictability due to slow disbursement and diversion of funds.

Participants also discussed concerns of funding processes and channels. Currently, some funding processes bypass the state without strengthening existing capacities and therefore impacts on the state systems are unsustainable. Additionally, certain funding mechanisms often increase capacity demands placed on education systems and have repercussions for systems and funding channels that may already have low capacity. A final challenge expressed was that funding modalities are often not coordinated in the transition from humanitarian aid to development in order to support absorptive capacity sufficiently.

The presentation of the framing paper concluded with suggestions from the authors to improve the effectiveness of funding mechanisms. Participants made additional suggestions including the needs to:

- Scale up aid – more commitments and more funds are needed.
- Broaden the evidence base regarding the utility and effectiveness of funding modalities in order to improve the choice and implementation of funding mechanisms for education in fragile states.

Summary of Key Points of Discussion

Main Points

A number of main points served as themes throughout the discussions at the Policy Roundtable. As was noted by participants during the event, the majority of the dialogue during the Policy Roundtable was focused not on the specific details related to the use of various financing modalities but rather on the contextual issues that impact the implementation of different mechanisms and present challenges to their effectiveness.

Two themes were discussed that dealt directly with modalities and their improved effectiveness. The first theme was that financing must ultimately be **simple, flexible, and quick**. The less simple, flexible and quick financing modalities are, the higher the transaction costs will be. Higher transaction costs increase the risk that money will not be disbursed and education will not take place. Transaction costs must be reduced.

The second point regarding financing mechanisms continued the theme from the framing paper's recommendations that more guidance is necessary to facilitate effective decision-making on the choice of modality. Making **decisions about financing modalities** is a complex process. A number of factors drive the choice of modality(ies) including government capacity and knowledge about implications of different modalities, the specific context of fragility, donor agendas and respective promotion of particular modalities. Country-level stakeholders are often not sufficiently informed and/or lack capacity to make effective choices about the utilization of financing modalities. Guidance for stakeholders, particularly governments, will support informed decisions on the choice of modality or mix of modalities including the requirements, implications, and administrative burdens of certain modalities.

There was also consensus among participants about a range of critical contextual issues that impact the use of different financing modalities. First, countries affected by fragility must establish a

transformational agenda. The transformational agenda is a strategy towards a continuum of transition that progresses towards stability and resilience. The transformational agenda varies depending on the specific case and context and, though recognized as non-linear, is necessary to envision longer-term gains towards development and peace. Establishing a transformational agenda in a fragile context requires innovation; fundamentally, transformation is not only about what is being done but also how it is being done (i.e. processes).

Trust gaps exist where donors lack trust in a recipient to use their funding effectively. Trust gaps vary from context to context. A clear and realistic transformational agenda demonstrates a positive trajectory that can assuage trust gaps.

Civil society has an important role to play in financing. Civil society is not only a service delivery provider, but can and should also support accountability mechanisms for funding channels. However, exactly how civil society can best support service delivery and accountability needs further research and delineation.

The concept of **shadow alignment** was discussed as being important but complex, particularly in regards to state-building. In order for shadow alignment to be successful, it is necessary first to understand the systems and channels that can be used. Alignment is most possible and successful when the system is intricately understood including what parts of the system should be aligned with and what parts need to be changed and why.

A final major contextual theme in the discussion was **emerging global drivers of fragility** such as the food crisis, energy crisis, financial crisis, and the global recession. There was general agreement that it is necessary to advocate broadly, including outside the education community, to ensure that the gains achieved to date with financing of education in emergencies and fragile contexts are not lost.

Breakout Groups

During the afternoon of Day 1, Policy Roundtable participants divided into three breakout groups to discuss financing mechanisms in relation to the three DAC principles of context, state-building and local priorities.

Main Points: Context

Though a variety or mix of financing mechanisms may be most effective, a situation analysis and needs assessment are essential to ensure that mechanisms chosen and the mix of these are the most appropriate. Agreement on the most appropriate funding mechanism is often difficult even after such analysis and assessment takes place.

Financing needs shift over time and the mix of modalities of yesterday is not necessarily suitable for today. Donors and agencies should engage in phased monitoring and periodic financing evaluations to review the effectiveness of modalities being used and potentially shift modalities to respond to changing contexts.

Donors should create and build ownership by governments to drive the selection of context-appropriate financing modalities. To do so, governments must be better informed with knowledge of funding modalities. Such guidance should be provided to government stakeholders to encourage and improve decision-making.

The capacity of financial systems often drives the choice of financing mechanisms. For example, donors must ensure that government capacity is built, not undermined, so that proper choices can be

made without capacity constraints. Importantly, government capacity must also be built to coordinate financing mechanisms.

Main Points: State-building

Long-term sustainability of education requires state-led support and facilitation. It is necessary to balance the need for immediate service delivery (e.g. by NGOs) and the involvement of or engagement with the government. The state cannot be disregarded or disempowered and must incrementally take an active role in service delivery to ensure sustainability. Governments should be engaged in this as far as possible.

Two primary processes are essential for state-building:

- 1.) *Capacity building* requires increased education and training, including expanded higher education opportunities for civil servants. Capacity building is not limited to technical assistance, however, and also requires developing capacity to implement and harmonize funding sources. In fragile contexts, governments often lack information necessary to make informed choices about which financing mechanisms to use.
- 2.) Ensuring government *accountability* is the second essential process for statebuilding. Local communities and organizations can play a role in holding government accountable and linking civil society with government may position it to check the actions and power of government.

The role of civil society in state-building is complex. Civil society can deliver services, help manage popular expectations, and serve as a mechanism for government accountability. However, there are both benefits and risks in engaging civil society; such as corruption and representation of different groups (including lack of voice, misrepresentation, inequitable representation across groups, etc.). Donors and agencies must assess and address civil society's own position and level of trust from society.

Main Points: Local Priorities

The definition of "local" is complex and can be defined at different levels (country, region, or community). In relation to funding, "local" is often discussed in terms of the country level; however, different levels of "local" must be engaged with each other. Additionally, "local" must be inclusive of non-state actors (e.g. civil society) as well as the state, particularly in fragile contexts.

The inclusion of local priorities in funding processes should create space for critical voice to enable funding harmonization for maximizing effectiveness. However, local representation is often diverse and complicated as it often includes not only government, but various civil society groups as well. Donors and agencies must be aware of whose priorities they are responding to or representing, particularly if some voices, which may not be representative, are louder than others. Additionally, just as local priorities may differ based on which local group is being represented, priorities also depend on the context of fragility.

Donors must better coordinate and involve local priorities in the transition or transfer from shadow alignment to sustainable service delivery, particularly with the government. The transition from humanitarian to development funding should be recast as a process of articulation, which focuses on when and how to make shifts.

Expert Panel

On Day 2, four participants (Janice Dolan, Save the Children UK; Catherine Dom, Mokoro Ltd.; Keith Lewin, University of Sussex; Emily Oldmeadow, European Commission—South Sudan) served as an

expert panel to further specific points of discussion developed on Day 1. The panelists' presentations and the plenary discussion that followed came to some concluding suggestions for improved financing.

The first conclusion suggested that understanding the *exceptionalism* of fragility is critical to improved financing. Contexts of fragility are unpredictable and complex, and systems have to be set up in order to respond effectively to these conditions.

The use of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) as a singular agenda does not adequately address the complex needs and challenges of fragile contexts. The asymmetries of fragility require asymmetrical responses that may require broader focus (and more financing) for some parts of the system than others. Although the MDGs are a useful international advocacy and policy tool, more nuanced approaches must be used for planning and financing education in fragile contexts. (For example, universal primary education in fragile situations may not impact disenfranchised out-of-school youth that can undermine stability and exacerbate fragility. In such a situation, a more tailored education intervention can lead to increased stability and improved learning outputs.)

At the same time, simplifying financing modalities is critical so as to reduce transaction costs and diversions of funding. Additionally, blockages in financing flows must be identified and reduced. Above all, resources have to flow and flexibility and adaptability must be improved to disburse funds more quickly for maximum impact.

The final conclusion urged that the global economic recession be taken into account and prioritized as a new driver of fragility. It will have widespread effects and exacerbate existing and diverse conditions of fragility—ranging from conflict to famine to negative impacts on natural resources—worldwide.

Strategic Recommendations

Policy Roundtable participants made the following recommendations for potential action by INEE and the Working Group on Education and Fragility. While some recommendations do not fit within INEE's mandate and scope, the following is inclusive of all recommendations that participants made.

- Develop **guidance and tools for country-level stakeholders** – particularly governments – on making effective choices for utilizing different financing modalities.
- Facilitate further discussion on the **role of civil society** in state-building.
- Facilitate further guidance or research on **trust gaps** including clarifying the terminology, documenting examples of trust gaps, and identifying effective strategies for addressing them.
- Facilitate or advocate for monitoring and appraisal of **financial flows** to education in states affected by fragility.
- Commission or facilitate **research on financing mechanisms**, coordination and alignment including case studies and a broader research scope, both geographically and historically.
- Find ways of addressing **new sources of fragility** (food crisis, energy crisis, financial crisis, global recession) including by strengthening advocacy on the need for a consistent focus on and support to education in states affected by fragility.

As determined during deliberations at the biannual meeting of the Working Group on Education and Fragility that followed the Policy Roundtable (28-31 October 2008), the Working Group will take forward many of these strategic recommendations. Specifically, the Working Group will:

- ***Support the Education Transition Fund:*** The Working Group will support the development and operationalisation of the UNICEF/FTI Education Transition Fund to integrate the need for simple, flexible and quick funding. The Working Group will serve as a sounding board to review and provide technical inputs towards the successful operations of the Education Transition Fund.
- ***Advocate for investing in education in states affected by fragility:*** The Working Group will develop messages for and advocate the economic case for funding education in situations of fragility in an effort to combat any potential adverse impacts of new sources of fragility on financing of education in states affected by fragility. The Working Group plans to commission an expert economist to conduct an analysis of the economic return on supporting education in fragile situations.
- ***Facilitate further research on financing mechanisms:*** The Working Group will incorporate analysis of in-country finance mechanism utilization into broader country-based research to be undertaken on education and fragility.
- ***Develop guidance and tools for decision-making by country-level stakeholders:*** The Working Group will undertake in-depth analysis of financing modalities including effectiveness in varying contexts; complementarities between different mechanisms; alignment with government systems and capacity; and implications of modality choice on programming, coordination, state-building, etc. The analysis will be used to develop tools for country-based actors to make informed decisions on effective financing mechanisms.

Further information and updates on activities related to the 2008 Policy Roundtable can be found on the INEE website at www.ineesite.org/educationandfragility.

ANNEX A

INEE Policy Roundtable: Education Finance in States Affected by Fragility

27-28 October 2008

Agenda

DAY 1: MONDAY 27 OCTOBER

8:30—9am Registration

9—10:30am Opening: Concepts and Contexts

Opening presentation on the INEE Working Group on Education and Fragility and the terminology, concept and contexts of education and fragility.

10:30—11am Break

11—12:30pm Presentation and Discussion: Education Finance in States Affected by Fragility

Presentation of framing paper on education financing in states affected by fragility; discussion.

12:30—2pm Lunch

2—3:30pm Breakout Groups

Concurrent breakout groups will review lessons learnt on financing education in fragile states and develop strategic recommendations. The breakout groups will develop posters on key points and recommendations to feedback to the group.

3:30—4:15pm Poster Session

Participants will use this extended break to review the breakout session posters.

4:15—5:30pm Plenary Discussion

Reception (6—8pm) at Hotel Silken Berlaymont

DAY 2: TUESDAY 28 OCTOBER

9—9:30am Review of Day 1

9:30—10:15am Expert Panel Discussion

To be determined by previous day's conclusions on financing education in fragile states

10:15—11:00am Plenary Discussion

11—11:30am Break

11:30—12:30pm Conclusions and Implications

Specific recommendations, accompanying action points, and next steps are clarified and recorded to be taken forward by INEE, the INEE Working Group on Education and Fragility and partners.

ANNEX B

INEE Policy Roundtable 27-28 October 2008 Brussels, Belgium

Participant List

Angela Arnott
Coordinator of Working Group on Education
Statistics and Planning
Association for the Development of Education
in Africa (ADEA)
a.arnott@unesco.org

Koli Banik
EFA Fast Track Initiative (FTI) Secretariat
kbanik@worldbank.org

George Mogga Benjamin
Director for Planning and Budgeting
Ministry of Education Science and Technology,
Government of Southern Sudan
gmogga_b@yahoo.com

Lyndsay Bird
Programme Specialist, Fragile States
UNESCO—IIEP
l.bird@iiep.unesco.org

Hamidou Boukary
Senior Education Specialist
Association for the Development of Education
in Africa (ADEA)
h.boukary@afdb.org

Cameron Bowles
Director, Education Thematic Group
AusAID (Australian Agency for International
Development)
Cameron.bowles@ausaid.gov.au

Laura Brannelly
CfBT Education Trust
lbrannelly@cfbt.com

Begoña Bravo-Hevia
Education Specialist
European Commission (EC)
begona.bravo-hevia@ec.europa.eu

Bidemi Carrol
Legacy Project Director
International Rescue Committee
bidemic@theirc.org

Rozanne M. Chorlton
UNICEF Representative to Liberia
rchorlton@unicef.org

Isabelle Combes
DG, ECHO
European Commission
isabelle.combes@ec.europa.eu

Peter Darvas
Senior Education Economist
World Bank
pdarvas@worldbank.org

Lynn Davies
Professor of International Education
Centre for International Education and
Research, University of Birmingham
L.Davies@bham.ac.uk

Julia Dicum
Senior Analyst, Education
Canadian International Development Agency
julia.dicum@acdi-cida.gc.ca

Janice Dolan
Education Adviser
Save the Children
j.dolan@savethechildren.org.uk

Catherine Dom
Principal Consultant and PhD student
Mokoro Ltd and University of Bath, UK
cdom@mokoro.co.uk

Albert Theodore Dupigny
Consultant
Ministry of Education, Liberia
dupigny101@yahoo.com

Ragnhild Dybdahl
Director, Education and Research Department
NORAD
rady@norad.no

ANNEX B

Bronte Flecker
Chef de file, Fragile States
Europe Aid, EC
bronte.flecker@ec.europa.eu

Sylvie Fouet
Programme Adviser
UNICEF
sfouet@unicef.org

Sally Gear
Education Adviser
DFID
s-gear@dfid.gov.uk

Anna Haas
Research officer
EFA Global Monitoring Report Team, UNESCO
a.haas@unesco.org

Jean Pierre Jarousse
Pôle de Dakar
jp.jarousse@poledakar.org

Kim Kerr
Program Manager, Education
Save the Children Canada
kkerr@savethechildren.ca

Suezan Lee
Education Specialist
US Agency for International Development
sulee@usaid.gov

Keith Lewin
Director, Centre for International Education
University of Sussex
k.m.lewin@sussex.ac.uk

Stephen Lister
Principal Consultant
Mokoro Limited
slister@mokoro.co.uk

Stephen F. Moseley
President and CEO
Academy for Educational Development
smoseley@aed.org

Susan Nicolai
IASC Education Cluster
Save the Children
susan@savethechildren.ch

Omnia Abdul Aziz Nour
Director
Reach Out To Asia – Qatar Foundation
onour@qf.org.qa

Emily Oldmeadow
South Sudan Programme Manager
European Commission
emily.Oldmeadow@ec.europa.eu

Mary Joy Pigozzi
Senior Vice President, Global Learning Group &
Director, Quality Education
Academy for Educational Development (AED)
mjpiigozzi@aed.org

Jaime Rodriguez Torres
Sub secretary of Pedagogic and Culture
Development
Governor's Office, Department of Narino
jaimeraiz@hotmail.com

Androga Avelino Said
Education Advisor
Ibis South Sudan
androsaid@gmail.com

Boukary Savadogo
Chief Education Specialist
African Development Bank
b.savadogo@afdb.org

Eluned Schweitzer
Senior Director, Education for Children in
Conflict
Save the Children Alliance
eschweitzer@savechildren.org

Alan Smith
UNESCO Chair
University of Ulster
a.smith@ulster.ac.uk

Gene Sperling
Director, Center for Universal Education
Council on Foreign Relations
gsperling@cfr.org

ANNEX B

Michel Tache
Counsellor-Dev.
Canadian International Development Agency
michel.tache@international.gc.ca

Aleesha Taylor
Senior Program Manager
Open Society (Soros) Foundation
a.taylor@osf-eu.org

Joris van Bommel
Education Advisor
Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs
joris-van.bommel@minbuza.nl

Ellen van Kalmthout
Senior Education Specialist
UNICEF
ekalmthout@unicef.org

Christine Wallace
Education Adviser
European Commission
christine.wallace@ec.europa.eu

James H. Williams
Associate Professor
George Washington University
jhw@gwu.edu

Maryanne Yerkes
Democracy Officer, Office of Democracy and
Governance
USAID
myerkes@usaid.gov

Chair of the INEE Policy Roundtable
Peter Buckland
Lead Education Specialist, Human
Development Network
World Bank
pbuckland@worldbank.org

Facilitator of the INEE Policy Roundtable
Mark Todd
Independent Consultant
marktodd49@gmail.com

INEE Secretariat

Allison Anderson
INEE Director
allison@ineesite.org

Marian Hodgkin
INEE Coordinator for Network Services
marian@ineesite.org

Kerstin Tebbe
INEE Coordinator for Education and Fragility
kerstin@ineesite.org

INEE Interns: Bénédicte Benoit Eagleton,
Brenna O'Rourke