



An international network for education in emergencies
Un réseau international pour l'éducation en situations d'urgence
Una red internacional para la educación en situaciones de emergencia
Uma rede internacional para a educação em situações de emergência
الشبكة العالمية لوكالات التعليم في حالات الطوارئ

Report from the INEE Global Consultation on Education in Emergencies and Protracted Crises

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

2. Findings and Recommendations

2.1. Global Consultation consensus on critical challenges and recommendations
(Consultation Questions 1 and 2)

2.2. Global Consultation consensus on recommendations to improve the
functioning and capacity of current architecture (Consultation Question 5)

2.3. Global Consultation consensus on principles (Consultation Question 3)

2.4. Global Consultation consensus on a fund/platform (Consultation Question 4)

3. Next Steps

Annex I. List of Participants and Acknowledgements

Annex II. Global Consultation Questions

1. Introduction

The Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE) held a global consultation on education in emergencies and protracted crises between 14-22 May in order to ensure broad input into an issues paper on education in emergencies developed by the Overseas Development Institute (ODI) that will influence the Oslo Summit on Education for Development discussions on 6-7 July. The paper outlines the challenge of education in emergencies and protracted crises, explores the current architecture, identifies key gaps, and sets out consultation questions to inform a range of possible solutions that will be proposed as part of the final paper.

Despite the short time frame of the global consultation, INEE received inputs from over 130 practitioners and policy-makers from UN agencies, international, national and local NGOs, civil society groups, academics, government representatives from Ministries of Education and donors agencies, and representatives from the business sector in Asia, Africa and the Middle East, Europe and the Americas. This includes posts via the [INEE Global Consultation discussion forum](#), responses sent directly to the consultation facilitator via email and consultations held in person or over the internet and phone. While INEE's Arabic, Francophone, Hispanophone and Lusophone [Language Communities](#) were engaged, the vast majority of responses were in English. This following report details the recommendations voiced during the global consultation process.

There is currently increased global attention on education due to post-2015 development agenda planning and associated high-level education meetings, including the World Education Forum (Korea, May); the Oslo Conference on Safe Schools (Norway, May); the Oslo Summit on Education Development (Norway, July); the International Conference on Financing for Development (Ethiopia, July), and the UN Summit to adopt the post-2015 development agenda (US, September). Furthermore, the upcoming 2016 World Humanitarian Summit, the Sendai Framework for DRR, and the COP 21 Climate Conference will serve to further elevate education in emergencies issues to the world's attention.

Within this context, the Oslo Summit is an excellent venue to discuss the humanitarian/development divide in education and address the core challenges of: (1) increasing funding for education in humanitarian responses (whether disaster or conflict-related or related to other forms of adversity); (2) agreeing how to modify existing global funding mechanisms to provide flexible, swift and responsive funding; (3) closing the gap between humanitarian and development funding for education in emergencies, including ensuring that receipt of humanitarian funds triggers an accelerated and assisted process for receiving development funds; (4) ensuring that new funds are additional, new funds rather than displacing existing funding.

2. Findings and Recommendations

2.1 Summary of Global Consultation consensus on challenges that need the most attention by high level political actors and recommendations around how to alter the response architecture in order to ensure attention to those challenges

- *Question 1: What challenge, or aspect thereof, needs the most attention by high level political actors at the Oslo Summit and beyond?*
- *Question 2: What are the top issues in terms of response architecture that should be*

addressed in order to better ensure quality education is available to all children and youth in crises?

Overwhelmingly, global consultation participants voiced strong consensus around the following related challenges that require high-level political attention, many of which are directly related to the current response architecture: lack of funding for education in emergencies, complex aid architecture, and a number of issues related to the humanitarian/development divide, including a misunderstood rationale for investing in education in emergencies; lack of adequate capacity and support for capacity building; problems with coordination and collaboration; and the necessity of preparedness, risk reduction and building resilience. Other issues that were often cited, though not as highly prioritized as the aforementioned list, as needing attention by political actors are quality and learning and inclusive education.

There are limited or almost non-existent financial resources allocated to address education in emergencies. Indeed, funding is decreasing while the number of crises globally is on the rise: overall funding earmarked to the Education sector has dropped by 10 percent since 2010. Education receives less than 2 percent of humanitarian funding, which is less than 40 percent of what is requested. Moreover, there is a dearth of predictable and flexible multi-year funding under the current humanitarian aid response architecture. This is a critical gap because an effective emergency education response needs to incorporate strategies and planning for early recovery from the very beginning. Financing, and its swift and effective coordination, requires high-level commitment and follow-through from the Oslo Summit.

Summary of recommendations from the consultation:

- High-level political actors must advocate for a greater percentage of global humanitarian funds to be given to education. Advocates such as Gordon Brown, Jim Kim and Julia Gillard must work not only with heads of state but also with heads of existing institutions such as OCHA and UNHCR to address this.
- Political will by all governments to support education in general and education in emergencies more specifically is needed to ensure sustainable financing. If governments are serious about the post-2015 development goals, more coordinated funding across the development and humanitarian sectors is needed for education. At Oslo, donors should discuss how they can mobilize additive funds to ensure that funding is made available and education is delivered in the early acute phase, to prevent gaps, ensure protection and facilitate continuity of education. Governments should include education in their humanitarian policies & strategies.
- Policy-makers at the Oslo Summit should commit to including education within their humanitarian response policies.

Complex and unclear financial mechanisms: Funding mechanisms under the current response architecture are so complex that some in positions to influence funding decision-making have difficulty understanding aid flows in humanitarian crises. In particular, members of the business community and local civil society actors reported that much of the current architecture is bureaucratic, opaque and uncoordinated. Humanitarian and education stakeholders need more and clearer information about the structure and governance of aid architecture and training on how to access the right fund at the right time (emergency, transition, development), particularly national decision-makers and local actors. In addition to clarity about funding mechanisms and processes, there is a need for more information about and clarity on the role and responsibilities of various actors (Global Education Cluster, in-country clusters, Ministries of Education, GPE, UNICEF, UNHCR, INEE) in education response in order to ensure a harmonized approach, especially for UNHCR and other actors in refugee settings /and or mixed settings.

Summary of recommendations from the consultation:

- Discussions with, presentations to and trainings for humanitarian and development actors, particularly national decision-makers and local actors, should include clear information about the structure and governance of response and funding architecture, including how to access the right fund at the right time (emergency, transition, development) and the roles and responsibilities of various emergency actors.
- More equitable distribution and coordination of funds so that smaller NGOs and local actors can access them. This will require a more user-friendly grant process than current humanitarian processes. This will also require an increased effort to strengthen the capacity of local actors, civil society organizations and communities, including marginalized populations, who hold local knowledge and expertise in order to build an inclusive and sustainable response strategy.

The humanitarian/development divide: Not only was the humanitarian/development divide cited as a major obstacle to funding, coordination, collaboration, but consultation participants also expressed their belief that policy-makers do not understand the extent to which education in emergencies, and funding for it, falls between the humanitarian and development sectors.

As cited in a consultation hosted by the global education cluster, funding for education in emergencies remains very low as a percentage of needs met, and as a percentage of overall humanitarian funding. The percentage of humanitarian funding allocated to education has been below 2% for several years now. Conversely, there is an increase in development aid to countries in protracted crises, which does not address education in emergency issues. High-level political actors may also not be aware how the humanitarian system often deprioritizes education at a 'granular' level; it is not only a question of funding. For example, education in Nepal is not a designated "emergency cluster" in the humanitarian earthquake response, and as such the sector did not receive funding from CERF, despite the fact that education development partners in Nepal expressed interest in reconstruction. The result is that responding to urgent education and protection needs of children now is not a priority, despite efforts and advocacy of education in emergencies actors on the ground. In addition, the short time frame of emergency response can be a problem, linked to architecture and funding issues. Conflicts last an average of 17 years, and in these protracted crises it is very difficult to plan a long-term coherent education response with yearly or even shorter funding cycles.

Predictable, long-term funding is crucial for delivering quality education that realizes positive development outcomes (such as health and economic gains); the fact that education requires long-term investment is partly why humanitarian donors are reluctant to engage. However, currently most agencies rely on short-term funding, which can lead to a lack of continuity or significant breaks in programming. Thus, the humanitarian/development divide presents a real obstacle to ensuring seamless education programming for children living through crises.

Current response architecture is divided into emergency and development education funding, contributing to and exacerbating the humanitarian/development divide. In a country where a crisis hits, development funding stops and emergency education actors begin to advocate for funding, which always falls short. Leveraging how existing monies, in-country education systems, staff, progress made, etc. can be reprogrammed into emergency education modalities is essential, as is bringing these implementers to the table together so knowledge is shared, information and data is abundant and collaborative, and coordinated systems of education are sustained through the crisis period and as it subsides. While there are many capable partners, they are too often operating on parallel humanitarian or development tracks without a common endgame. Given the current humanitarian/development divide, the existing multilateral architecture is not sufficiently focused on programs that would build community and Ministry

systemic capacity for education resilience and sustainability.

Summary of recommendations from the consultation:

- Expand resources that are expressly allocated for measures bridging and coordinating the divide between humanitarian and development interventions. Existing funding mechanisms and any new platform/fund for education in emergencies should allow for actors to both respond immediately to a crisis and ensure continuity in education outcomes through the transition to early recovery, thereby establishing a bridge between humanitarian and development approaches. Moreover, investments made in the wake of an emergency need to address both immediate and longer-term needs. The platform for a new fund should include a humanitarian/development transition coordination structure or mechanism.
- Create links that systematize information-sharing, coordination and joint programming between donors', NGOs, UN agencies and other stakeholders' humanitarian and development divisions and encourage donors, implementing agencies and other key actors to commit sustained engagement throughout the crisis cycle (preparedness before a crisis, response during a crisis, transition to/ development)
- Better coordination and linkages between ministries and funding bodies for education in emergencies and in development.
- Policy-makers at the Oslo Summit should discuss the humanitarian/development divide in education and set up an advisory council that can share lessons on what works and what does not. Much still needs to be understood in terms of other current or past programs and practices which have been effective across the humanitarian /development divide and can be scaled up, particularly with respect to those that are the most marginalized.
- Resources need to be devoted to strengthening programs which are valuable in the context of this divide, particularly by building cross-sectoral synergies with protection, health, psychosocial support, risk reduction (disaster and conflict mitigation), peacebuilding and incorporating these more systematically within education program design. Key obstacles to bridging the humanitarian/development divide should be addressed, such as a lack of data on current country conditions that would allow stakeholders to better plan, respond and collaborate when crises occur, and the vulnerabilities and potential disruptions to education they continue to face, among other things.
- With an eye toward the need to build capacity to increase number of capable partners for delivery (see challenge/recommendations below), prioritize capacity development of organizations rather than individuals in order to better institutionalize linkages between phases and humanitarian and development departments/divisions.
- Policy-makers at the Oslo Summit should commit to including education within their humanitarian response policies and emergencies within their education policies.
- Continue and scale-up the global effort to develop robust education sector plans that integrate preparedness and risk reduction while also including an EiE component and budget that emphasizes sustainability and resilience assets in humanitarian programming, thus linking development with humanitarian arenas

Rationale for investing in education in emergencies: There is strong consensus that high-level political actors may not sufficiently understand the rationale for investing in education in emergencies, particularly in terms of long-term stability, prosperity and sustainable development. This is directly related to the humanitarian/development divide within current response architecture that silos humanitarian (short-term) and development (longer-term) policy-makers and associated funding mechanisms. For instance, a consultation with INEE Steering Group and Working Group members highlighted that the nature of conflict and violent extremism, and its inter-sectionality with education, does not seem to be well understood by political actors: education is impacted by violence and access to and the quality of education in turn can exacerbate (or mitigate) violence. As a result of this lack of understanding and the structure of

the current architecture, short-term funding, and not enough of it, is too often allocated in an emergency without consideration of the long-term impact that insufficient funding can have, not only on the education system but also on the wider crisis environment.

Summary of recommendations from the consultation:

- The advocacy capacity and resource mobilization of the current architecture needs to be strengthened at the global level.
- Discussions with and materials for policy-makers should emphasize not only the life-saving nature of education in emergencies and the ways it can act as a positive multiplier as a vehicle for protection, health and water, sanitation and hygiene interventions as well as educational continuity, but also a) the long-term impacts of not investing immediately in education in emergencies, b) the value of ensuring continuity of education in terms of individual and societal social, economic and security returns, and c) the ways in which education contributes to achieving broad humanitarian goals, in collaboration with other humanitarian sectors, which is the spirit and intention of the [Transformative Agenda](#). Another critical point to make is that if humanitarian assistance is truly to be demand-driven and accountable to affected populations, this will mean making education a central part of humanitarian responses and financing it, since crisis-affected communities, parents and children and young people themselves prioritize education in needs assessments. Further, there is a need in humanitarian crises to look at children and adolescents as population groups with age-specific needs and vulnerabilities. For example, the lack of education in emergencies provision puts children and youth at risk, opens the door for their involvement in hazardous activities and negative coping mechanisms, as well as providing opportunities for indoctrination and recruitment. Lack of education opportunities can also lead to migration. These are all costs that should be considered if education in emergencies is not provided. Finally, it needs to be highlighted that learners need an education system that will provide the right kind of education over an extended period to have the desired long-term impact, including strengthened citizenship and the skills to make informed choices for sustainable development and realize better economic prospects in the long-term.
- A multi-year investment in evidence-based research of both short- and long-term gains, impacts, costs, what works where, and modalities for taking what works to scale is needed to help convince political actors of the benefits and importance of funding the sector. In addition, this research must inform programmatic decision-making in order to meaningfully reach more learners with improved services.

Coordination and collaboration: A lack of coordination in terms of policies and responses across the humanitarian/development divide hampers effective response and sustainability. While coordination has improved with the IASC Cluster system, coordination mechanisms between development and humanitarian actors working in the same country, and often within the same organizations, are still not effective. Moreover, more than one respondent noted a 'culture of competition' amongst various UN agencies and NGOs in response settings, leading to a lack of coordination and collaboration.

Summary of recommendations from the consultation:

- Strengthen efficiency and coordination mechanisms at all levels across the humanitarian/development divide through information sharing, partnership-building and collaboration based on mutual respect; this will help generate concrete partnerships on the ground, build consensus and encourage the effective involvement of civil society.
- For more effective coordination, all actors (donors, response agencies, Ministries of Education, school communities, private sector) should use INEE's *Minimum Standards for Education: Preparedness, Response, Recovery* as common principles or approaches to increase the quality of education.

- Collaboration across the humanitarian/development divide requires an Education Management and Information Systems (EMIS) system that can draw current data to configure program and policy options in real time, and which can move education efforts along a continuum from initial, more rudimentary steps to long-term impact and scale. A mapping tool is needed to design and implement key measures that would help bridge the humanitarian/development divide.
- Strengthen donor coordination through agreement on principles or 'rules of engagement' on how to support EiE and documentation of positive donor coordination experiences at all levels (country, regional and global), especially across the humanitarian/development divide.

Capacity building to increase number of capable partners for delivery: A lack of sustained capacity building and funding for capacity building contributes to the lack of capacity of national and local education authorities, local community organizations, qualified responding agencies/ staff, and teachers and other education personnel. In particular, consultation participants from international and national implementing agencies decried the fact under the current architecture, local and national organizations, which are essential in mobilizing community support and response at the on-set of an emergency and continue working on education long after humanitarian actors have left but before many development actors are on-scene, too often cannot access emergency funds. This is partly due to the complexity and opacity of existing funding mechanisms, but also because local actors often do not have the knowledge of existing systems and the ability to access available funds. Moreover, within an acute crisis, donors tend towards funding large well-known international humanitarian agencies and organizations, making it difficult for smaller organizations to access funding.

Summary of recommendations from the consultation:

- Strengthen understanding and ownership of and capacity for education in emergencies issues by national governments (Ministries of Education, Ministry of Youth and the ministry in charge of young children) and development actors, including improving their policies to respond to education in emergencies and integrating education in emergencies issues into preparedness, planning, sector analysis and budgets.
- Diversify education in emergencies responders through building national capacity and funding local organizations. The buy-in and input of local actors is critical to determine a sustainable investment and deploy financing in a responsible manner. Local actors, from Ministry of Education officials to local NGOs and civil society, should be supported to identify, assess, respond and monitor EiE responses, linked to an overall Education Sector Plan. Such actors should be identified ahead of time and given adequate resources to act in time for an emergency or protracted crises. A rapid response seed fund could help develop the preparedness and response capacity of these local actors through training at national and local levels, resulting in more, and more prepared, partners.
- Strengthen the capacity of responding agencies and create a rapid response initiative, which would include a permanent pool/ roster and database of trainers, specialists and volunteers in different countries that are ready to be deployed at short notice. Such an initiative might also include guidance for different audiences.
- Train teachers and pay their salaries.
- Support teacher training institutions and tertiary programs to integrate education in emergencies into its curricula.

Preparedness, Risk Reduction and building resilience: An oft-repeated phrase during the consultation was: “prevention is better than the cure.” Moreover, several consultation

participants noted that the negative impact of the Ebola epidemic on the education sector was in large part due to the fact that there was a lack of education sector preparedness.

Building resilient national education systems that integrate risk reduction measures contributes to the effectiveness of response architecture, as both governments and communities would be then better prepared and able to respond to a new crisis. This requires careful planning, implementation and monitoring of plans at all levels, which requires embedding indicators into EMIS as well as education sector budgets. Building a culture of safety and strengthening social cohesion are critical interventions that contribute to bridging the humanitarian/development divide and reducing risks proactively rather than waiting to address the consequences.

Summary of recommendations from the consultation:

- Prevention and preparedness, including contingency planning, need to be part of the regular national education planning processes of the government and all development actors, including at a local level. It is important for the current aid architecture to support strengthening the capacity of development actors to understand and plan for education in emergencies, including integrating conflict sensitive and risk reduction measures into education sector analysis, plans and budgets.
- Humanitarian actors should continue to integrate prevention and preparedness, including conflict sensitive and risk reduction measures, into their programs, policies and budgets.

Quality and learning: Flexible, adaptive systems need be put in place at the onset of a crisis to not only provide protection and psychosocial support, but also to sustain learning, staffed sufficiently with well-trained in-country education actors leading on what steps need be taken and why. The current architecture, with its humanitarian/development divide, is not conducive to a focus on quality and learning between and through the different phases of response. Without learning gains, the expected outcomes of education will not be realized. The focus on learning, and measuring learning, is a new global education priority and one that needs attention and investment (indicator development, research, monitoring and evaluation) in the field of education in emergencies.

Summary of recommendations from the consultation:

- Quality and learning demand a safe environment. Protect education from attack and train teachers and other education personnel in zones of peace. Moreover, ensure parents, caregivers, communities and school personnel, particularly teachers, support schooling for all children, and are equipped to provide and monitor safe environments for students at school and at home so that they are protected across the environments in which they live and learn.
- Prioritise financial and technical support to strengthening quality and learning in emergencies, including psychosocial support. Humanitarian actors can partner with development organizations working on measuring learning to bridge the humanitarian/development divide.
- Strengthen the representation of partners that work on quality in emergencies within the education cluster system and ensure that OCHA gives adequate resources and support to education. Expand the criteria of which activities can be supported to ensure that not only access, but also quality and learning receive support, including for marginalized groups.
- Invest in community-based education that provides children with the tailored and additional support they need to catch up on lost years, deal with differences in language and curriculum from their home country, and receive the psychological support they need to recover. While there are benefits to supporting government-run education programs, there are numerous barriers and system limitations children may face in regularly attending and learning in these schools.
- Train teachers on how to use resources and class time effectively to provide active learning

opportunities that promote students' academic skills. Also train teachers in providing instruction that targets children's social and emotional skills in order to strengthen their resilience as well as their cognitive abilities.

- Hire and ensure payment of IDP and refugee teachers
- The potential for use of digital learning tools to strengthen formal and non-formal learning programs as well as for reaching those with no educational offer with self-learning tools for household use should be explored more systematically.

Inclusive education: Despite the fact that emergencies most adversely impact the most vulnerable children, including their right to education, there is a lack of capacity in education responses to reach and include these children. Young children, girls, adolescents and youth, disabled, refugees, internally displaced persons (IDPs) in the host community, and IDPs fleeing from conflict areas to neighboring countries/cross-border were singled out as requiring serious attention by a governments and the international community. They are excluded from education due to many factors, including a lack of data both prior to an emergency leading to their not being included in response preparedness plans and in needs assessments, thus excluding them from response programs. A lack of capacity development for or training on meeting the learning needs of these marginalized groups, including inclusive pedagogy and classroom methodologies, for staff and community members, also limits inclusion in education in emergencies.

Summary of recommendations from the consultation:

- Education in emergencies responses should reach well beyond primary education: much more needs to be done at the levels of early childhood care and development and education for adolescents and youth, including post-primary, secondary and vocational opportunities, especially in protracted crises.
- An inclusive education in emergencies response strategy should expand and improve comprehensive, integrated care learning opportunities for marginalized groups, including in preparedness and planning processes. Such opportunities should nurture synergies across health, education and protection sectors. Coordination mechanisms and interventions need to be inclusive of and accessible to marginalized children as well as targeted interventions that cater for their specific needs. It is recommended that within the overall response architecture that focal points for different marginalized groups are appointed to ensure inclusion in all aspects of the response (mainstreamed and targeted).
- Build capacity of humanitarian actors and marginalized populations to respond to the education needs of the most marginalized through a) targeted capacity building of key humanitarian actors, such as governments, multi-laterals and humanitarian NGOs that are engaged in a response; b) ensuring that people from marginalized groups and their representative organizations are actively participating in all mechanisms of a response, so as their expertise informs an inclusive response; and c), including organizations with specific expertise responding to the needs of marginalized groups in a response.

2.2 Summary of Global Consultation consensus on how to better improve the functioning and capacity of current architecture with regard to improving needs assessment; strengthening information management; better responses in regional crises, in particular for refugees; and advancing planning and costing

Strengthen information management, monitoring and reporting: National Education Management Information Systems (EMIS) and other data collection systems are not equipped to collect and provide relevant data in a rapidly changing environment during an emergency. Given this lack of information on real-time needs and gaps, responses are planned and

implemented on the basis of assumptions rather than accurate information on needs.

Recommendations from the consultation:

- Improve, simplify and harmonize assessments and data collection, analysis and management in order to more effectively influence evidence-based planning, response and monitoring, especially in acute emergencies.
- Explore how new technologies may play a greater role in data collection and, where effective, support the systematic use of digital tools for assessment, monitoring and deployment, so as to allocate resources as efficiently as possible in a crisis.
- Planning for development should start from the emergency stage and, for strategic planning, policy and implementation purposes, humanitarian and development indicators and data collection should be linked more coherently within EMIS. In particular, more effort is needed to integrate the consequences of crises on school attendance and retention in national EMIS systems.
- Countries should proactively develop their Education Management Information Systems (EMIS) to record and store critical education data, learning outcomes, local assets on the ground, available technology, etc. This data must be shared with all actors, as availability and accessibility of the data can help improve coordination and the quality of educational preparedness, planning and provision.
- Data should be disaggregated by age (accounting for early childhood, primary-school aged children, and adolescents and youth), gender and with respect to marginalized groups, such as disabled and out of school children.
- The EiE community should agree upon a very small set of indicators (3) that measure progress for education in emergencies, which would allow for donors and service providers to track progress. These indicators could include a definition for increased safe access to quality education for emergency-affected children and youth with a clear delineation of humanitarian, transition and development phases, which would also allow the international community to hold donors accountable for their commitments.

Improve needs assessment

Recommendations from the consultation:

- While there are robust frameworks and needs assessment tools, such as JENA, PDNA and PCNA, there appears to be a lack of knowledge about the existence of these tools: several consultation respondents recommend the development of a uniform tool for needs assessments (and also for indicators), not realizing that there already are such tools within the education cluster. This signals the need for better information management and wider information sharing on the tools that exist. A new EiE platform could potentially be a vehicle to help close this information gap, bringing together information about (and links to) tools from networks and groups like INEE, GCPEA, GPE and the Global Education Cluster in one website. In addition, the platform could support EiE partners to better train staff on and build capacity to utilize and contextualize such tools.
- Respondents who are aware of the existence of needs assessment frameworks and tools recommend 1) simplifying them and 2) supporting capacity building in order to use and contextualize them, especially for Ministries of Education.
- Needs assessments should be inclusive of and capture information on the needs of marginalized groups, such as girls, disabled children, young children, adolescents and youth, and children who are out of school, including by the disaggregation of data. Assessment teams should be responsible for identifying marginalized children and ensuring inclusion at all stages of assessments as well as feeding the data into response plans. To facilitate inclusive needs assessments in a systematic way, better coordination, agreed principles and/or a common approach is needed and marginalized groups should be explicitly mentioned in guidance or protocols on needs assessments and budgeted into assessments.

Better response in regional crises, in particular for refugees

Recommendations from the consultation:

- Adequate availability of education for displaced populations is essential and requires cross-border coordination between humanitarian and development actors. Ensuring communication and coordination between ministries of education in refugee host and home countries on issues of certification, system and curriculum equivalencies is essential to facilitate durable solutions.
- Improve coordination between agencies and actors who are involved in the education response in the country of origin and in host countries through joint development-humanitarian planning, coordination and response. Transition plans, including for educational continuity, agreed in advance should accompany returnees.
- One way to link humanitarian and development work is to properly prepare the ground for harmonious refugee repatriation through effective delivery of social services, including education but also health, psychosocial and protection services, in the areas of return. This is particularly true for marginalized groups, such as girls, disabled children, young children and adolescents and out of school children.
- Ensure needs-based, predictable and multi-year funding for the continuity of education for those who are displaced for many years.

Advance resource mobilization planning and costing: While not voiced by a majority of consultation participants, a few respondents strongly asserted that a significant challenge is related to not just the amount of funding available, but also the planning and timing, including a balance between immediate, medium and longer term planning for these investments. There are often massive spikes in funding in the first year of an emergency, but as needs continue or increase within a protracted crisis, funds decrease. Funds need to be responsive to existing needs, especially throughout protracted situations, so that they can be utilized to reach the most vulnerable at the time that is it needed.

Summary of recommendations from the consultation:

- Both the amount of resources available and the way investments are contracted/granted and then programmed by service providers should be analyzed against benchmarks including timeliness, avoidance of duplication by geographic location/type of intervention, leveraging, and sequencing of interventions by type.
- Mapping the types of resources available and at what phase of an emergency against the various provisions and constraints that accompany these types of resources in order to uncover the misalignment of certain donors mandates with their ability to move resources quickly. High level agreement among donors that certain funders will commit to specific and discreet phases could potentially save a great deal of time, energy and funds. The same should be done for service providers, to identify which service providers have proven to be most effective, efficient in mobilizing and then programming resources; and effectively delivering education to children and youth immediately.
- Advance recovery and transition planning and costing should build in risk reduction and conflict mitigation measures as well as account for inclusion, such as specific disability needs (accessible learning materials). For example, the redevelopment of schools and early childhood settings should be planned and costed to be safe, climate resilient, inclusive, accessible, equitable and child-friendly, including all children without discrimination and removing barriers that may have existed. This includes the location and design of infrastructure, both schools and WASH facilities, and budget allocation.
- Invest in collecting basic cost metrics around key cost centers (infrastructure, teachers' salaries, teacher professional development) coupled with a better understanding of the interventions being used and their impact.

2.3 Summary of Global Consultation consensus on principles

- *Question 3: Would a set of principles agreed at a high political level make a difference? How could they be used to hold governments, UN agencies and other partners to account?*

Consultation participants overwhelmingly answered that yes, a set of common principles (or guidelines) should be agreed to at a high political level. Not only could such principles form a common global language for dialogue and action across the humanitarian/development divide, but they could also act as guidelines and provide conditionality for follow-on support to governments and other education actors from bi- and multilateral donors and, equally, for bi- and multilateral donors to hold states and other education actors accountable.

The vast majority of respondents voiced their opinion that such principles already exist, and should simply be reviewed and consolidated rather than reinventing the wheel. The following recommendations as to the content of such principles were each cited multiple times by consultation participants:

- Rights and international obligations, such as the right to education, inclusive education
- INEE's Minimum Standards for Education: Preparedness, Response, Recovery, particularly the common standards of Community Participation (participation; resources); Coordination; Analysis (assessment; response strategies; monitoring; evaluation) and the Education Policy (law and policy formulation; planning and implementation).
- INEE's Minimum Standards for Education: Preparedness, Response, Recovery thematic domains of access and learning environment, teaching and learning, teachers and other education personnel (i.e. a safe learning environment, the sufficient provision of education institutions, curriculum reviews, adequate provision of trained teachers and learning materials)
- The INEE Education Cannot Wait Call to Action: 1) Increase levels of humanitarian aid to education and improve its delivery mechanisms; 2) Keep education safe from attacks; 3) Integrate emergency prevention, preparedness, response and recovery in education sector plans and budgets
- The Education Cluster coordination principles or other principles that focus on strengthening coordination mechanisms
- Humanitarian principles such as Do No Harm and the Core Humanitarian Standard on Quality and Accountability
- OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) principles for engagement in fragile states and the New Deal for Fragile states, which focus on supporting governments differently through government owned processes and mechanisms
- The principles of safe schools underlying GCPEA's Guidelines for Protecting Schools and Universities from Military Use during Armed Conflict.
- Principles that emphasize measurable learning outcomes, available data and baseline metrics, and accountability

Several participants did recommend a new principle around bridging the gap between humanitarian and development aid, thus helping to ensure sustainability. Another new principle highlighted by multiple respondents is more of an action, calling for donors to commit to education within their humanitarian response policy.

Before a new set of principles is drafted specifically for education, a majority of respondents called for existing principles and their monitoring mechanisms to be carefully reviewed. In particular, it was noted that the relationship of any principles to INEE's Education Minimum Standards: Preparedness, Response, Recovery need to be clarified and recognized. They

should also link to other global frameworks such as the post-2015 development agenda to ensure relevance in the current global context.

While there is high enthusiasm for a set of principles, there is also strong consensus that accountability through enforcement is critical. Principles in themselves are not a strong enough incentive to create better programs, research, accountability and transparency. In order to make a tangible difference, such principles should be signed on to at the highest levels, incorporated into the humanitarian and development policies of governments, donors, multilateral agencies and other education actors, and the underlying intentions of the principles should be sufficiently funded. A monitoring and evaluation framework should be developed to monitor and report on progress from the start, including an indication as to what kind of progress is expected, what kind of change in behavior. It was suggested that civil society should be supported to strengthen monitoring and advocacy skills to hold actors to account and that INEE could also have some role in such a monitoring process.

2.4 Summary of Global Consultation consensus on a fund/platform

- *Consultation Question 4: What will it take to guarantee that additional funds are in place to support education in crisis? Is a global fund or financing mechanism for education and crises a good idea? If so, how should it be organized and used?*

Consultation participants unanimously agreed that more and better funding is needed, and the vast majority support a new platform/fund embedded within the existing architecture. There were a minority voices on either end: a minority recommend creating a new platform/fund *outside* of the current architecture, given the humanitarian/development divide embedded within the current architecture, and a (vocal) minority feel that reforming the current architecture to make existing mechanisms better coordinated and more efficient is more important than creating a new platform/fund. The latter voiced concern that another platform/fund means another layer of bureaucracy, which could lead to greater fragmentation of existing funds and even to funds being diverted rather than drawing in new funds. There is also concern about the high transaction costs of setting up a new platform/fund and the risk of dis-incentivizing humanitarian donors to continue allocating or increasing funding to education in emergencies.

However, the vast majority of respondents recommended both improving the existing architecture *and* establishing a new platform/fund for education in emergencies that is embedded into the existing system. Such a platform offers an opportunity for a renewed commitment to not only funding, but also research, dialogue, and better coordinated donor input around education in emergencies. Moreover, there was strong consensus that a platform/fund should deliver not only more funding but additional, timely, predictable, flexible, and multi-year funding. Almost all respondents stressed the importance of additional funds: a new EiE platform/fund must not drain the limited resources of donors from effective education programs. There was also overwhelming consensus that funding should be accessible for the acute phase through the critical and oft unfunded transition phase between the humanitarian and development phases. An EiE platform/ fund should support preparedness and prevention activities, which would allow stakeholders to successfully make the transition from humanitarian to development programming in a way that builds resilience. Moreover, support from a new platform/fund should be based on need, used to support quality educational outcomes and used to incentivize contributions from other sources.

The following recommendations around the characteristics of a well-resourced and well-coordinated platform/fund were cited by a majority of consultation participants. Such a platform and fund should:

- Have the flexibility to quickly deliver funds at a short notice without bureaucratic delay

- and be responsive to the changing nature of emergencies
- Fund emergency response while also supporting transition plans, thus contributing to new policy, practice and systems that bridge the development/humanitarian divide and create more alignment with wider education aid
- Provide technical support for proactive planning, preparation and resilience initiatives by increasing funding and technical support for education plans to integrate preparedness, risk reduction (disaster and conflict mitigation) and resilience measures.
- Strengthen the preparedness and response capacity of existing systems, structures and organizations, especially national governments (Ministry of Education), the Education Cluster, UNHCR, responding agencies and local partners
- Strengthen system capacity to quantify return on short-and long-term investments through enhancing data collection and reporting on results through robust EMIS systems, research, impact evaluations and what works at scale and what it costs
- Target the full range of learners, from ECD through to post-primary and/or tertiary education
- Have an explicit focus on quality education for the most marginalized (see section on pages 5-6); this commitment should be reflected in all financial and technical support provided by the platform/fund

Participants recommend that any new platform or fund have a set of common key principles and a common approach for management and coordination, developed through an inclusive process. Moreover, such a platform could provide technical support to donors to include education within their humanitarian funding streams better and to include education in emergencies in the education development and other education funding streams better.

Platform/Fund: In what types of crises? There is broad agreement that a fund should contribute immediate financing to a first-phase response to a crisis, whether disaster or conflict-related. This would therefore qualify as increased humanitarian funding for education, focused on protection, psychosocial support and life skills. There was also broad agreement that a new platform/fund should support humanitarian responses to incorporate transition and early recovery measures from the outset and allow for an accelerated and sustained follow-on process that bridges the humanitarian and development divide. The majority of consultation participants also called for the new platform/fund to support underfunded, protracted crises, which can require significant financial support and technical expertise.

One suggestion is for a global fund to be a “top-up fund” within OCHA, but where OCHA ensures a minimum support to education through their mechanisms (CHF, CERF, ERF). Such a fund could be used to ensure longer-term support to education, including more focus on quality and learning, education for youth etc. Part of the fund could be spent on strengthening the education cluster in order to make the cluster the key coordination mechanism which provide technical guidance, builds capacity of government (where relevant), develops and ensure the use of standardized tools for data collection etc. In addition, a component on prevention and preparedness within education systems could be supported by this fund since prevention and preparedness seem to receive limited funding.

Platform/Fund: Over what timeframe?

The time frame for funding should be, at a minimum, six months and up to three years, given the challenges faced when humanitarian funding windows end and development windows begin. Continuity across humanitarian, transition and early recovery stages is critical and will allow Ministries of Education and partner organizations to plan from the acute emergency phase through into early recovery.

Platform/Fund: Who leads request and who is eligible to receive funds?

Ideally, the recipient Ministry of Education would lead the request for support, coordination and funding as well as planning/preparedness work, with the support of the education sector/cluster coordination group in the country. If government capacity is not sufficient or in the case of a non-state structure, there could be a local Managing Entity, which would include a partnership of the Ministries of Education and the education sector/cluster coordination group in the country.

In terms of receiving support and funds, in principle, both governments and non-state providers should be eligible and the onus should be on the basis of stabilizing an emergency, not providing means of entrenching an organization or approach. The danger is that this may lead to capture by those organizations most able to apply to respond to the call, which would likely favor the large UN and international non-governmental organizations. Explicit efforts must be made to support smaller and local organizations. Moreover, multiple respondents from implementing agencies recommended a regional funding allocation for regional responses: agencies working together in the same region would consolidate response strategies beyond their specific mandates, allowing for a harmonized response plan bridging the humanitarian/development divide.

Platform/Fund: Who should be involved in (i) in-country and (ii) global governance?

In-country Governance:

- The recipient Ministry of Education would be responsible for in-country governance, with the support of the education sector/cluster coordination group in the country. In addition, it is important to include local partners in coordination and governance of the fund.
- In cases of conflict in which the government is a party, care needs to be taken so that local governments are not able to discriminate against a subpopulation through funding, support or lack thereof.

Global Governance:

- At the level of global governance, a global level a governing body is needed and could be adapted from the GPE architecture. There will likely need to be a Secretariat for technical support as well as day-to-day responsibility for administration. Such a Secretariat could have designated technical focal points to offer a more responsive, seamless interface between humanitarian and development needs.

An independent review panel or body should monitor performance and impact of any such platform/ fund, building an evidence-base of lessons learned from which recommendations around how to modify the fund/platform to be more efficient could be drawn. Moreover, transparent allocation around how funds are used and accountability for the results they are delivering for learners are both essential.

Platform/Fund: How would a new fund interact with existing architecture?

The new fund absolutely has to interact with existing architecture. While there wasn't unanimous consensus, the majority of responses on this question suggested embedding platform/fund within the GPE architecture, with a close link to the Global Education Cluster. It was noted that if a new platform/fund is channeled through an existing entity, like GPE, then careful scrutiny needs to mitigate against high transaction costs and the predomination of GPE's program approaches and priorities. Thus, a strong link to the Global Education Cluster is ever more important, as the Global Education Cluster holds greater technical expertise on the field of education in emergencies than does GPE.

Those respondents recommending embedding the platform/fund within the GPE architecture stated that GPE is an appropriate mechanism for disbursement of emergency funds due to its

existing global funding distribution mechanisms and partners that already collaborate with GPE. And it is this mechanism and these partners that should distribute emergency funds. Moreover, GPE was also cited as a suitable fund manager because the deployment of emergency funds should activate an accelerated follow-on process to access coordinated development funding and support, which GPE is uniquely placed to do. Additionally it was suggested that GPE could assist in scaling-up the global effort to develop robust education sector plans that include an EiE component and budget, linking development with humanitarian arenas.

Additional Funding: Participants unanimously voiced the need to ensure that new funds for the EiE platform/ funds displace as little as possible existing funds from donors. Some ideas on how to do this include:

- An automatic trigger of between 5-10% of all donor pledges for education (whether to GPE, UNICEF, EU or other multilateral institutions) are diverted into an emergency fund for rapid response deployment. Similarly, the World Bank and regional development banks (including the BRICS development bank) should be required to siphon a percentage of education support grants and loans into an EiE fund.
- Analyze funding and interest in a particular emergency to identify and document which donors and actors are able to make short-, medium- and longer-term commitments. Ask donors and service providers to commit to ensuring support throughout the various phases of the emergency, and link this to, when possible, host country government commitments and investments.
- The business community, via Global Business Coalition for Education, has joined the call for a platform/fund for education in emergencies, noting that such a fund should be able to accept financial contributions from business, as under the current architecture it is unclear how the business community can engage and manage how their contributions are utilized and measured. As such, the business community seeks a financing framework which 1) maps how businesses can engage in the mechanism and 2) accounts for the business case to engage in education in emergencies in order to accelerate participation of companies of diverse sizes, industries and regions of operation. It was also noted that businesses could consider investment in education as part of its business continuity plans, using the financing mechanism as a vehicle to address workforce needs, improve customer loyalty and maintain long-term investment in the local community where it operates.
- Corporate and family foundations could be approached, under the umbrella International Education Funders Group, with the idea of contributing to the EiE platform/fund.
- A global tax system (such as VAT); for example, establishing a tax on all football tickets, music festival tickets, flight tickets, oil and gas, etc. Such a system could change the funding situation drastically, hence, bridging the funding gap and supporting education in time of crisis.

3. Next Steps

This report was shared with ODI at the beginning of June for inclusion into the Oslo Summit education in emergencies issues paper and other background documents. It is also being shared with policy makers and practitioners who will be attending the July 2015 Oslo Summit and other upcoming conferences. INEE's role as a network is to amplify the voices of its membership, and the more than 130 contributions to this global consultation, representing multiple languages, perspectives and geographical contexts, have brought greater depth and insight to the discussions. INEE will continue to build upon these important voices and experiences in the months and years to come while striving to ensure the right to education for all regardless of crisis or conflict, along a spectrum of preparedness, prevention, response and recovery.

Annex I. List of Consultation Participants and Acknowledgements

INEE is grateful to the over 130 practitioners and policy-makers who submitted inputs into the Global Consultation. This includes posts via the [INEE Global Consultation discussion forum](#), responses sent directly to the consultation facilitator via email and consultations held in person or over the internet and phone. Face-to-face consultations were held at the World Education Forum in Incheon, Korea (hosted by INEE and Save the Children), at UNICEF's offices in Toronto, Canada and during INEE Meet Ups in Dakar and Paris. In addition, the Global Business Coalition for Education (GBC-Education) hosted a virtual consultation and the global Education Cluster held a phone consultation, among others.

Tangwe Abraham, University of Bamberg; Friedrich Affolter, UNICEF; Anita Anastacio, ChildFund; Jesper Andersen, GPE; Allison Anderson, Center for Universal Education, Brookings Institution; Marina Anselme, RET; Benoit d'Ansembourg, UNICEF Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office; Atifa Abdalla Mohamed Badri, Ministry of Education Sudan; Thomas Ball, Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs; Lisa Bender, UNICEF; Charlotte Beyer, SC DK; Lyndsay Bird, IIEP-UNESCO; Rocco Blume, Plan; Dejan Bojanic, Save the Children; Francesca Bonomo, UNICEF; Jo Bourne, UNICEF; Helge Brochmann, Norad; Dean Brooks, INEE; Dana Burde, New York University; Francesco Calcagno, UNICEF MENARO; Clementine Cholat, AVSI; Ma-Lucha Colindres, Save the Children; Vigdis Cristofoli, Norad; Cheikh Amadou Bamba Diaw, ChildFund Senegal; Heather Donald, Refugee Research Network, York University; Kadidia V. Doumbia, International Society for Language Studies; S.B. Ekanayake, Global Vision; Gabriel El Khili, UNRWA; Ann Frost, Grandmothers Advocacy Network; Ram Gaire, National Campaign for Education- Nepal; Professor Galy (unknown affiliation); Sonia Gomez, UNHCR; Randi Gramshaug, NORAD; Helle Gudmandsen, IBIS; Jose Roberto Guevara, Asia South Pacific Association for Basic and Adult Education; Brenda Haiplik, UNICEF; Eleanor Hevey, UNICEF Canada; Ronja Hoelzer, GIZ; Kerstin Holst, UNESCO; Vanessa Humphries, UNICEF Canada; Risto Ihalainen, FCA, Education Cluster RRT; Naoko Imoto, UNICEF; Dr. Ghassan Issa, Arab Resource Collective and Arab Program for Early Childhood Care and Development; Roz Johns, Grandmothers Advocacy Network; Ashley Jonson, Plan International; Joshua Josa, Gallaudet University; Caroline Keenan, Independent Consultant; Sonya Khoury, Lebanon Ministry of Education; Kadja Charlotte Kirobo, UNHCR; Paulina Lasota, Tefl teacher; Charlotte Lebas, Plan International; Julia Lerch, Stanford University; Dominique Levasseur, Canadian Delegation to UNESCO; Sigbjorn Ljung, Global Education Cluster; Ian Macpherson, OSF; Emeline Marchois, INEE French Language Community; Michelle Mesen, Global Partnership for Education; Fiona McKenzie, Child to Child; Rachel McKinney, Save the Children; Christa McMillin, World University Service of Canada; Bope Médard, University for Peace; Dominic Mishio, Global Poverty Project / Global Citizen; Takafumi Miyake, Japan NGO Network for Education; Athisia Muir, GIZ; Vernor Munoz, Plan International; Dieudonne Amisi Mutambala, Artists for Humanity, Congo; Yona Nestel, Plan Canada; Joseph Nhan O'Reilly, Save the Children; Sharon Njobo; Christian Children's Fund of Canada; Liv Marte Nordhaug, Norad; Jessica Oliver, DFATD; Nina Papadopoulos, USAID; Arianna Pacifico, INEE; Gustavo Payan, EDC; Cris Revaz, Creative Associates; Joel Reyes, The World Bank; Ciara Rivera, UNICEF; Tatiana Romero, Save the Children Canada; Sarah Rowse, Children in Crisis; Bente Sandal-Aasen, Save the Children; Sweta Shah, Plan International; Pete Simms, Children in Crisis; Margaret Sinclair, Protect Education in Insecurity and Conflict; Nor Sirin MD Mokhtar, UNICEF; Silje Skeie, Norwegian Refugee Council; Jennifer Sklar, International Rescue Committee; Wendy Smith, World Vision International; Alan Smith, University of Ulster; Andreia Soares, INEE Portuguese Language Community; Marc Sommers, EDC; Emilia Sorrentino, Plan Ireland; James Sparkes, global Education Cluster; Eileen St. George, Creative Associates; Abraham Tangwe; Lena Thiam, Plan; Peter Transburg, INEE; Megan T Tucker, UNICEF; Rosangela Berman Bieler, UNICEF; Gopal Mitra, UNICEF; Anna Azaryeva Valente, UNICEF; Teija

Vallandingham, UNICEF East Asia & Pacific Regional Office; Justin Van Fleet, Office of the UN Special Envoy for Global Education; Ellen Van Kalmthout, global Education Cluster; Emmanuel Walla, USAID; Nikki Whaites, War Child Canada; Wendy Wheaton, Creative Associates; Howard Williams, American Institutes for Research; Valerie Wright, Grandmothers Advocacy Network; Pr Inamoud Ibny YATTARA, InfaPlus Mali; Barbara Zeus (UNHCR); Stephanie (affiliation unknown); Members of the Global Business Coalition for Education (16, representing 9 companies); Representatives from NORCAP (4).

This Global Consultation process was managed by Allison Anderson, in coordination with the INEE Secretariat. Allison Anderson also authored this report, analyzing and consolidating the inputs provided by INEE members and other partners. The Global Consultation was made possible due to the generous financial support provided by UNICEF and the Global Partnership for Education.

Annex II. Global Consultation Questions

The Challenge - There are a large number of 'challenges', involving different issues depending on type, phase and scale of a crisis, as well as impacts ranging from children out of school long-term, shorter-term but extended disruption, poor quality of teaching-learning, harm to the teaching force, and damage to school infrastructure. Moreover, there are significant gaps in funding available and economic impacts of failing to support education in crisis contexts.

Question 1: What challenge, or aspect thereof, needs the most attention by high level political actors at the Oslo Summit and beyond?

Architecture - The aid and response architecture for education in emergencies is not fit for purpose. There are issues surround the humanitarian and development divide, unclear implementation of mandates in cross-border crises, at times a lack of capable partners for delivery, gaps in terms of assessment and planning, limited data collection and analysis, and often, a shortage of funds to fully address education needs.

Question 2: What are the top 2-3 issues in terms of response architecture that should be addressed in order to better ensure quality education is available to all children and youth in crises?

Solutions - A number of solutions are being discussed to bridge some of the gaps in terms of humanitarian and development architecture.

Question 3: Would a set of principles agreed at a high political level make a difference? How could they be used to hold governments, UN agencies and other partners to account?

Question 4: What will it take to guarantee that additional funds are in place to support education and crisis? Is a global fund or financing mechanism for education and crises a good idea? If so, how should it be organized and used?

- In what types of crises?
- Over what kind of timeframe?
- Who leads request (organization, coordination group, etc.)?
- Who is eligible to receive funds?
- Who should be involved in (i) in-country and (ii) global governance?
- How would a new fund interact with existing architecture?
- Other suggestions

Question 5: How might we better improve the functioning and capacity of current architecture, as described above, in other ways? What key changes could:

- Link humanitarian and development coordination
- Lead to better response in regional crises, in particular for refugees
- Increase number of capable partners for delivery
- Improve needs assessment
- Advance recovery and transition planning and costing
- Strengthen information management / monitoring and reporting
- Further address the issues you raised in question 2 or 3 above