Towards education for all: Strengthening data systems in conflict and crisis settings

28 February 2024
Agenda

Welcome, opening remarks, and introduction by the Chair
Evans Atis, Data & Evidence Lead, GPE

ERICC presentation on emerging findings on EiE data systems from cross-country and political economy analyses
Marlana Salmon-Letelier, Education Researcher, IRC and Olha Homonchuk, Senior Research Officer, ODI

Politics of data and evidence-informed decision-making
Tomoya Sonoda, Chief of Education, UNICEF Kyrgyzstan

Perspectives on data in refugee education
Cirenia Chávez Villegas, Education Officer, UNHCR

‘Systems and issues’, monitoring and transparency to improve estimation of global indicators
Manos Antoninis, Director of the GEM Report

Perspective from the International community
Freya Perry, Education Advisor for ERICC, FCDO

Discussion / Q&A
Moderated by the Chair, Evans Atis
NEXT STEPS FOR DATA-SYSTEMS IN CONFLICT-AFFECTED SETTINGS:
Learning from Nigeria, Bangladesh, & Jordan

Dr. Marlana Salmon-Letelier
International Rescue Committee

28th February, 2024
ERICC Research Programme Consortium is a multi-year multi-country research consortium funded by the UK Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office (FCDO)

- Designed to build a context-relevant and actionable evidence base that will spark bold reform of education policies and practices in conflicts and protracted crises

- Aims to forge the frontier of rigorous research about what works (and beyond) — specifically identifying the most effective approaches for improving access, quality, and continuity of education to support sustainable and coherent education systems — ultimately to improve holistic learning and development outcomes for children in conflict and crisis settings
Country Teams Mapped Data Systems
- Nigeria (5 systems)
- Bangladesh (17 systems)
- Jordan (14 systems)

Literature Review on Data Systems
- Reviewed 50+ articles and papers
ERICC FOCAL COUNTRIES

NIGERIA
SOUTH SUDAN
LEBANON
SYRIA
JORDAN
BANGLADESH
MYANMAR

*COHORT 1 COUNTRIES
COHORT 1: DIFFERENT TYPES OF CONFLICT AFFECTED SETTINGS

Nigeria
- Internal crisis where education under attack
- Internally displaced children fully living in host communities
- High #’s of IDPs returning and resettling
- Schools managed by the government
- Children learning accredited curriculum

Bangladesh (Cox’s Bazar)
- Refugee crisis
- Children living segregated from host community in refugee camps
- Attending NFLC managed by NGOs
- Learning from non-accredited home-country curriculum

Jordan
- Protracted refugee crisis
- Syrian refugees living in both host community and refugee camps
- Attending double shift schools managed by government
- Learning host country curriculum
ANOTHER TYPE OF SYSTEM
1. What are the data systems issues in contexts of conflict and protracted crisis?

2. What is the state of the evidence about data systems in these contexts?

3. What is needed next?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Identification &amp; Collection</th>
<th>Data Sharing &amp; Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Missing data</td>
<td>1. Lack of capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Absence of appropriate tools</td>
<td>2. Time and resource constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and methodologies</td>
<td>3. Technical and political economy restraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Emphasis on inputs (rather</td>
<td>4. Different actors with different purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>than outputs/outcomes)</td>
<td>5. Difficulty collecting and harmonizing data from multiple actors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Lack of multi-sectoral and</td>
<td>6. Fragmented data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>longitudinal data</td>
<td>7. Absence of systematic mechanisms to make data available to a wide range of users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lack of capacity</td>
<td>8. Disincentives of donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indigenous knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Overlapping Data Challenges Identified in ERICC Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nigeria</th>
<th>Bangladesh</th>
<th>Jordan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Challenges</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited Data</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Issues</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Coherence</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaggregation Issues</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety, Confidentiality, and Security Issues</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Clear Definitions, Key Targets, or Indicators</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capacity Challenges</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Invest across data value chain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Commit to data-driven behavior change (UNESCO Framework 2023)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Limited Data</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Prioritize local knowledge (Yusuf 2019)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Develop field-friendly data tools (Nicolai et al. 2016)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Expand inputs, outputs, outcomes data (Laguardia et al. n.d.; INEE 2020)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Coordinate assessments across sectors (Yusuf 2019)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Cover all disaster risk dimensions (UNESCO Guidelines &amp; Toolkit 2023)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality Issues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Keep data updated, accessible, and meaningfully organized (Dutton 2019)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Curate education data sources via a data usage approach (Buckner et al. 2019)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lack of Coherence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Involve beneficiaries in design (Yusuf 2019)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Participatory, integrated data collection (Achraouaou 2019)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Ensure meaningful feedback loops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Coordinate across data value chain (UNESCO Framework 2023)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Enhance coordination with national authorities (Dutton 2019)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Create a common platform (Nicolai et al. 2016)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disaggregation Issues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Gather data on relevant characteristics (UNHCR 2019b, 2019c, and 2020a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Incorporate crisis-affected in data system (GPE 2019)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safety, Confidentiality, and Security Issues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Prioritize local knowledge (Yusuf 2019)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Establish non-discrimination safeguards (UNHCR 2019b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Develop strict privacy and safeguarding protocols (UNESCO Framework 2023)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lack of Clear Definitions, Key Targets, or Indicators</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Coordinate humanitarian-development data (Buckner et al. 2019)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Country-driven common priorities (UNESCO Framework 2023)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Standardize definitions and measures (Eurostat 2018)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Balance standardization with flexibility (UNESCO Framework 2023)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capacity Challenges</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Invest across data value chain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Commit to data-driven behavior change (UNESCO Framework 2023)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Limited Data</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Prioritize local knowledge (Yusuf 2019)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Develop field-friendly data tools (Nicolai et al. 2016)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Expand inputs, outputs, outcomes data (Laguardia et al. n.d.; INEE 2020)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Coordinate assessments across sectors (Yusuf 2019)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Cover all disaster risk dimensions (UNESCO Guidelines &amp; Toolkit 2023)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality Issues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Keep data updated, accessible, and meaningfully organized (Dutton 2019)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Curate education data sources via a data usage approach (Buckner et al. 2019)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lack of Coherence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Involve beneficiaries in design (Yusuf 2019)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Participatory, integrated data collection (Achraouaou 2019)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Ensure meaningful feedback loops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Coordinate across data value chain (UNESCO Framework 2023)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Enhance coordination with national authorities (Dutton 2019)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Create a common platform (Nicolai et al. 2016)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disaggregation Issues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Gather data on relevant characteristics (UNHCR 2019b, 2019c, and 2020a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Incorporate crisis-affected in data system (GPE 2019)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safety, Confidentiality, and Security Issues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Prioritize local knowledge (Yusuf 2019)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Establish non-discrimination safeguards (UNHCR 2019b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Develop strict privacy and safeguarding protocols (UNESCO Framework 2023)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lack of Clear Definitions, Key Targets, or Indicators</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Coordinate humanitarian-development data (Buckner et al. 2019)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Country-driven common priorities (UNESCO Framework 2023)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Standardize definitions and measures (Eurostat 2018)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Cohort 1: Example of Overlapping Challenge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Limited Data</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● <strong>Prioritize local knowledge</strong> (Yusuf 2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● <strong>Develop field-friendly data tools</strong> (Nicolai et al. 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● <strong>Expand inputs, outputs, outcomes data</strong> (Laguardia et al. n.d.; INEE 2020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● <strong>Coordinate assessments across sectors</strong> (Yusuf 2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● <strong>Cover all disaster risk dimensions</strong> (UNESCO Guidelines &amp; Toolkit 2023)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHAT DO WE DO NOW?

Source: Doctor Science. JD Hancock.
**METHODS APPROACH**

**Formative Research**
Identify needs and understand existing practices

**Design Research**
Generate and prototype feasible, desirable, and potentially cost-effective and scalable solutions

**Implementation Research**
Assess how interventions work and at what cost by testing theories of change, tracking dosage, quality and fidelity of implementation, and by building evidence of cost-efficiency

**Effectiveness Research**
Rigorously measure impact on main outcomes, identify differential impact for different subgroups of beneficiaries, and build evidence of cost-effectiveness

**Scale**

**Costing and Measurement Research**
JUST LIKE MAIL, LET’S MAKE DATA DELIVER

- Continue to synthesize data from Cohort 2 ERICC countries
- Move beyond identifying challenges
- Conduct research on the impact of data systems strengthening interventions
Thank you

Marlana Salmon-Letelier
Education Researcher
marlana.salmon-letelier@rescue.org

https://inee.org/data-evidence/ERICC
linkedin.com/company/ERICC

Find ERICC publications here!


DEFINITIONS

● **Data:** “Information that can be analyzed or used in an effort to gain knowledge or make decisions; a set of values of qualitative and quantitative variables. Data can exist in a variety of forms and as numbers, rods, sounds, or images”

● **Evidence:** “Info that has been organized, validated, analyzed, structured, and ready to inform decision-making”

● **Data and evidence ecosystem:** “Composed of actors, processes, and incentives and covers all stages of the data and evidence life cycle, from the initial design of data collection to the use of evidence for decision-making”

(INEE draft action agenda)
IMPROVING EDUCATION DATA SYSTEMS IN PROTRACTED CRISES:
Emerging Findings from ERICC
Political Economy Analyses

Dr Olya Homonchuk
Senior Research Officer, ODI

28th February, 2024
ERICC PEA FOCUS COUNTRIES

NIGERIA

SOUTH SUDAN

SYRIA

COX’S BAZAR, BANGLADESH
NO DATA SHARING – NO COORDINATION OF RESOURCES
There is a gap between formal commitments and actual data sharing

In South Sudan:

- Strengthening EMIS and Data for Increased Resilience to Crises initiative; formal commitments to Joint Learning Outcome Assessments
- Data coordination fora are used to merely inform each other about organisation- or project-specific data collection and research plans
- Existing data is not utilized to make joint strategic decisions about education response
- Some organisations do not take part in coordination

Image Source: UNESCO 2020
CLASH OF SECTOR NORMS IN NORTHWEST SYRIA

Development sector contracting Chemonics to run the Manahel project
Humanitarian principle of not engaging with for-profit providers

Cross-sector clash of norms

Restrained capacities
Due to conflicting norms, data sharing and coordination capacities were constrained
One manifestation of this was that the development actors were excluded from coordination meetings
Lack of formal capacity to identify gaps in funding and programming

Inequitable provision with rural and most deprived areas left behind, and urban schools and camps often receiving duplicate support

Inequitable distribution of resources
‘It is really a mess. The coordination system is a mirror of the [Assad] regime people are suffering from. It is dictated […]. **even the communication between clusters of OCHA agencies is restricted. It is the same as under the regime because you cannot share information**, the information-sharing protocol has not been updated for years. And as a cluster, we are not allowed to share the names of schools with other sectors. We need 10 meetings to share the name of schools where they are doing rehabilitation […] Is it a way [for humanitarian sector] to hide and not be accountable? Is that why it has not been updated? If we cannot [share data] for safety reasons, the coordination system is responsible for creating a safe reporting way between the different clusters operating.’

Humanitarian Sector Education Specialist, Syria
DATA TRANSPARENCY HAS POLITICAL CONSEQUENCES

UNESCO’s data on out-of-school children exposes Nigerian govt’s lie

September 2, 2022  Reading time: 2 mins

Central and Southern Asia with 85 million.” The top three countries with the most children and youth excluded from education are: India, Nigeria and Pakistan.

But the Federal Ministry of Education in an unpublished response tagged, “UNESCO Global Education Monitoring Report 2022 and the Phenomenon of Out-Of-School Children in Nigeria,” obtained by The Guardian, said “Though UIS has attempted to justify the methods used in arriving at the 20 million figure, the fact remains that this report is capable of misinforming the public, misrepresenting the actual situation of the out-of-school children in Nigeria and underrating the significant efforts made by the government in addressing the OOSC challenge.”
DATA COLLECTION EFFORTS OFTEN REFLECT FINANCIAL INCENTIVES IN THE SYSTEM

In Cox’s Bazar, Bangladesh:

• Funding allocations to education providers are driven by administrative and demographic data on education access collected from each NGO and INGO operating in the area

• No data that allow us to compare and track learning outcomes and teacher quality across the 31 non-formal learning providers in Cox’s Bazar

Source: Camp Learning Centre; Source: ERICC IRC Bangladesh
In Borno State, Nigeria, some communities do not see a benefit of taking part in national surveys

- MICS survey covers only 7 out of 27 local authorities in Borno (highlighted in green)
- Limitations often accredited to prolonged fragility
- However, qualitative data reveals that community gatekeepers often do not want data collection to take place because they do not see the value these surveys will bring to their communities
KEY TAKEAWAYS

- Technical solutions and formal strategies are necessary but insufficient to promote data synchronizing and data sharing.

- ‘Good on paper’ technical solutions typically fail if they are not supported with incentives for key stakeholders across different levels of the education system.

- Lack of coordination between humanitarian and development sectors is a major source of inefficiencies, gaps in education coverage, and duplication of efforts.
Thank you

Find ERICC publications here!

Dr Olha Homonchuk
Policy Researcher, ERICC
ODI Global
o.homonchuk@odi.org.uk

https://inee.org/data-evidence/ERICC
linkedin.com/company/ERICC
Politicisation of evidence:

Education planning and practice in Syria

Tomoya Sonoda, Ed.D
28 February 2024
Webinar by ERICC and INEE
1. Empirical data for humanitarian planning

- Data analytics and severity rankings were highly appreciated
- Faith in the ‘what works’ agenda and trust in numbers

Source: OCHA 2019
2. Politicisation of evidence

I. Data fabrication:
To invent official statistics as convenient – i.e. population estimates and EMIS data

II. Political data interpretation:
To make sense of data and information in favour of particular values

III. Selective use and non-use of data:
To selectively use or deliberately neglect specific data for political/ideological ends
Feelings displacing reasons – ‘post-truth’

• In conflict, the contesting parties manufacture numbers as convenient based on what they believe to be true.

Case of Daraya under siege:

The UN estimation for Daraya was 4,000 people. … A lot of activists and opposition groups said, ‘This is outrageous. Daraya has at least 8,000 to 12,000 civilians living in it and they are being bombed by the Government’. The Government was saying, ‘This number is outrageous. Daraya has only 200 terrorists’. (UN-03)
Form II: Political data interpretation

Pro-opposition donors’ political-economy discourse

- Discourse could serve as a methodological bias that influences severity rankings.

  We’ve continued working both with the UN and with NGOs, but particularly regime areas are becoming less palatable. (Donor-03)

  There’s been a lot of work adjusting the way of severity scale calculation to make it more in favour of opposition areas. … This is always suggested by OCHA but, of course, OCHA is also under pressure from donors. (UN-14)
Form III: Selective use and non-use of evidence

Tendency to highlight convenient and observable outputs

• Aid agencies are under pressure to showcase auditable results. Auditing tends to drive them towards measurable success and shy away from reflecting on inactions.

We’re always talking about people we reach, but what about those we don’t reach? … Our system is about money, donors, what we spent, how and where. … The system is only designed to highlight what we did. It wouldn’t pick up information that we didn’t do. (UN-04)

Children were brought [to government areas], but there were some children who got detained. They got separated. … That happened, but we don’t talk about it. Too sensitive and we keep a lid on that. (NGO-04)
3. Take aways for reflexivity

• Acknowledge that science (facts and data) and politics (values and discourses) are intertwined in political conflict. What matters is to critically reflect on whose interest and priority aid professionals really serve with such data and evidence.

• Constantly reflect on what data really do and do not tell, how they are methodologically constructed, who calculates for what purposes, and what presuppositions are inscribed in measurement and quantification.

• Be sensible in that teaching and learning are not simply derived from observable and measurable entities but also constituted by unobservable and unmeasurable mechanisms.
The challenge of comparable data for out-of-school rates and populations

Towards education for all:
Strengthening data systems in conflict and crisis settings

Manos Antoninis, Director, Global Education Monitoring Report
NEE and the ERICC Research Consortium webinar
28 February 2024
Challenge of data on education in emergencies

- Too many angles – different organizations have:
  - different needs and capacities
  - different understandings of data
  - different purposes of using data

- **Comparable data** is desirable but not a priority and not feasible without shortcuts

UNESCO Conference on Education Data and Statistics (7-9 February)

1. **Bottom-up approach**
   
   Requests the TCG/EDS Commission to focus efforts on:
   (c) developing protocols and standards to capture the impact of emergencies and crises on affected populations

2. **Top-down approach**
Out-of-school estimation model

The need for a methodology that combines data sources to estimate out-of-school rates was recognized 20 years ago, when it was acknowledged that ‘some sort of composite approach may be needed for estimating time series and producing estimates for the most recent year’

Using administrative data is challenging in countries with high out-of-school rates
- enrolment records often incomplete, inaccurate or missing
- combine enrolment counts with a population measure; often negative rates
- low school capacity to record student age accurately

Cohort model developed

Following TCG decision, model estimates used for regional and global aggregates for the SDG database: 250 million in 2022
Out-of-school estimation model

Out-of-school rate: Ethiopia, by age group and sex
Adjuting the estimate to take into account emergencies

Five top crises according to the IRC 2034 Watchlist

- **Sudan**: Model estimated 5.4 million (41%) for 2022 – validated by a new survey; post-April 2023, focusing on Darfur, Kordofan and Khartoum, **4.2 million** should be added

- **Palestine**: None of **0.55 million** in Gaza has been to school since October

- **South Sudan**: Model estimated 2.1 million (60%) for 2022; cluster estimate is **+0.7 million**

- **Burkina Faso**: About 900,000 enrolled in schools that were closed in May 2023 in 5 of the 13 most affected regions; existing model estimate is about 1.5 million

- **Myanmar**: No data since 2018 so difficult to estimate; 3.7 million lack ‘access to learning’ which is not a comparable concept
Way forward

Evidence from 5 major crises (or at least 3 with reasonably comparable information) suggests that the OOS population may be underestimated by 5.5 million.

Each crisis is different, in terms of characteristics such as intensity, spread and duration, but also in terms of data availability.

Estimating the number of People in Need (PiN) of education is valuable but remains different to the OOS definition: is hard to integrate findings in official statistical reports. (clusters, after all, are assessing education needs for purposes other than global reporting)

But more can be done to at least cross-check the information they provide and take into account when it can be triangulated with reference to other sources.
Thank you