FOREWORD

This study was commissioned by the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, to inform decision-making concerning participation in the Education for All Fast-Track Initiative (FTI) and future funding to basic education through multilateral and bilateral channels as part of Finland’s development cooperation. The Terms of reference also see the study as a contribution to the more general discussion on development cooperation and its modalities.

This report is primarily about the FTI as a whole. Particular attention is given to those five countries among Finland’s current, or recent, partners in bilateral development cooperation in the education sector which belong to the first-wave group of potential beneficiaries of FTI: Ethiopia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Tanzania and Zambia. Information on the FTI process at country level in Ethiopia, Mozambique, Tanzania and Zambia was received from the respective Finnish Embassies.
The report is primarily a result of a desk study, based mainly on material available from the FTI Technical Secretariat at the World Bank. Further insights into the FTI process were gained from interviews at UNESCO Headquarters: Mr. Abhimanyu Singh, Lead Manager of the Education for All Follow-Up Unit, and Dr. Lene Buchert, Senior Programme Specialist, Office of the Director of Basic Education, and with Ms. Ruth Kagia, Director of the Education Unit at the World Bank, and Ms. Hanke Koopman, Coordinator for Basic Education, the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs. This study has also benefited from written memorandums on the FTI, prepared by the education advisors of DfID and the Netherlands Ministry for Foreign Affairs, and from comments from the French Ministry for Foreign Affairs concerning the FTI process, which were distributed through the FTI email network.

The author of the report alone is responsible for the conclusions and recommendations presented below.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Education for All Fast-track Initiative (FTI) is a program for accelerating progress towards the goal that all the world’s children would complete at least primary schooling, which is one of the Millennium Development Goals for 2015. FTI is a response to the commitment, made by international agencies at the 2000 Dakar Education for All (EFA) conference, to provide funding for implementation of “credible” national EFA plans. It is also an operationalization of the concept of a development compact, introduced by the 2002 Monterrey Conference on Financing for Development.

FTI was primarily designed by the World Bank and subsequently discussed and amended with other multilateral and bilateral agencies. It was endorsed at the meeting of the Development Committee of the World Bank and IMF in April 2002. Members of the “FTI partnership” currently include EU, UNESCO, UNICEF, the multilateral development banks and 15 bilateral development agencies (Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Russia, Sweden, the U.K., the U.S.A.).
The first set of FTI countries were selected from among those that are deemed not able to achieve EFA 2015 without additional external funding, on the basis of two criteria: a Poverty Reduction Strategic Plan (PRSP) had to be in place by the end of August 2002, and an education sector program must be under implementation. All the invited countries accepted to join the FTI. At the time of preparing this report, 18 countries are participating in the FTI: Albania, Bolivia, Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, The Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Tanzania, Uganda, Vietnam, Yemen and Zambia.

The FTI approach is built on a strong analytical basis. Studies of the experience of developing countries, which have either attained EFA or made considerable progress towards this goal, demonstrate a virtuous combination of factors that contribute to these achievements (national financial commitment, moderate unit costs, and quality factors). These have been used to formulate a set of indicative benchmarks for guiding the preparation of national FTI plans and for the future education policies of the respective countries. The politically most sensitive issue is the level of teachers’ salaries relative to GDP per capita.

The benchmarks have been inbuilt into a simulation model, which has been applied to 47 low-income countries. The model also estimates the impact of the HIV/AIDS epidemic on the costs of providing primary education. Results of the simulation show the “financing gap” – i.e. the difference between the estimated total need for funding to achieve EFA by 2015 and the projected domestic financing available for primary education. The total size of the gap for low-income countries is estimated at 2.5 billion USD annually, of which 2.1 billion would be needed in Sub-Saharan Africa. Out of the total amount, 1/3 would consist of funding school construction and 2/3 would be for covering recurrent costs.

Eleven of the FTI countries had by December 2002 prepared their national plans for assessment by the funding agencies. At a Donors’ Consultative Conference a first group of seven countries were deemed to qualify for additional funding: Burkina Faso, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Mauritania, Nicaragua and Niger. Those FTI countries where Finland is currently supporting basic education are either in the process of revising their FTI plan on the basis of feedback provided by the assessment (Mozambique) or are still working on a plan to be submitted for assessment (Tanzania, Zambia).

Implementation of the national FTI plans will amplify the challenges for local institutional capacity that are already known from the experience of education sector programs in many countries. The donor agencies will also need to move further towards harmonized procedures and pooled funding/budget support, in order to finance recurrent costs.

The report presents recommendations for information-sharing on and further follow-up of the FTI process, and for Finland’s possible contributions to FTI.

1. Background of the Education for All Fast-track Initiative

The Education for All -conference held in Jomtien in 1990 adopted a program of action that envisaged that by the year 2000 all the world’s children would be enrolled in and would complete primary school. This objective became known as the Education for All (EFA) goal. A review conducted halfway through the decade showed that while from the 1990 onwards several countries had made considerable strides in increasing enrolment, others had stagnated in this respect and yet others had in fact moved further away from the EFA
goal. It became also clear that the goal would not be attained in the majority of developing countries by the end of the decade.

In 1996, OECD’s Development Assistance Committee shifted the goalpost: EFA was to be achieved globally by 2015. This change was endorsed at the worldwide EFA Forum held in Dakar in 2000. The Dakar meeting also made public a commitment to assist financially all countries that will prepare a credible plan for realizing EFA: “We affirm that no country seriously committed to education for all will be thwarted in its achievement by a lack of resources”. EFA, defined as universal primary school completion, by 2015 also became one of the Millenium Development Goals and there is a complementarity between them: if some countries remain seriously short of EFA, their prospects for reaching the other MDGs are also dim. Overall coordination responsibility for follow-up of the Dakar Framework of Action rests with UNESCO.

2. The FTI Process

Well ahead of the Dakar 2000 EFA conference, The World Bank had launched analysis of the progress/ lack of progress of individual countries towards EFA. Based on these analyses and in the context of the UN Special Initiative for Africa, the Bank’s policy became to promote increased priority to basic education on the agenda of developing countries and to make available, together with grant-giving agencies, increased funds particularly for the development of basic education in African countries with very low primary school enrolment.

After the Dakar conference, as it became obvious that the global momentum for EFA was not sufficient for significant actions, the World Bank has in consultation with other agencies and developing country governments prepared a plan for accelerating progress towards EFA and to fulfil the commitment made at Dakar. There is considerable political pressure in the donor countries, not least because of active campaigning by international NGOs, to “deliver on their promises” regarding financial support to EFA without further delay. High-level political backing to this effort has been given by meetings of the G8 Group and the Monterrey Conference on Financing for Development, held in 2002. The Monterrey Conference also introduced the concept of a development compact, characterized by commitment to reform on the part of developing countries and additional and better coordinated external funding from donors in support of developing country plans. In the case of basic education these principles are operationalized in the EFA Fast-Track Initiative, which was endorsed in April 2002 by the Development Committee of the World Bank and the IMF, which brings together Ministers of Development and Finance.

Members of the “EFA Fast-track partnership” currently are the EU, UNESCO, UNICEF, the multilateral development banks and 15 bilateral development agencies (Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Russia, Sweden, the U.K., the U.S.A.). The technical secretariat of FTI is located at the World Bank, and its capacity is strengthened by professionals seconded from several bilateral and multilateral agencies. A number of studies have been undertaken at and commissioned by the Bank, in order to improve understanding of the multifaceted issues that need to be tackled if progress towards EFA is to be accelerated.

The first set of FTI countries were selected from among those that are deemed not able to achieve EFA 2015 without additional external funding. In order to be invited to join, a country needed to fulfil two criteria. First, a full Poverty Reduction Strategy Plan had to be in place by the end of August 2002, so as to indicate that the country’s education
sector strategy is nested in its broader development strategy. Second, an education sector program must be under implementation. The letters of invitation stated the expectation that countries would commit themselves to pursuing EFA “within a framework for efficient use of resources and long-term sustainability”. All the countries invited to join the first wave of FTI accepted to do so. This is evidence of the strong mobilizing potential of the initiative.

At the time of preparing this report (December 2002), the list of countries participating in the FTI consists of the following 18 countries: Albania, Bolivia, Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, The Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Tanzania, Uganda, Vietnam, Yemen and Zambia. Of this group, the majority - eleven - are countries of Africa. Five FTI countries are principal partners in Finland’s bilateral development cooperation: Ethiopia, Mozambique, Tanzania, Zambia and Nicaragua. In addition to the group of eighteen, another five countries which are at present not meeting the criteria for eligibility but have a very large number of out-of-school children, have been invited to join the initiative (Bangladesh, Democratic Republic of Congo, India, Nigeria and Pakistan). The latter group will be provided with analytic and capacity-building support, which is expected to result in clearer articulation of their EFA strategies and possibly to funding under FTI. By December 2002, India had not responded to this invitation, whereas the other four countries in this group had reacted positively.

The process of preparing and assessing the FTI plans of individual countries is described in more detail later in this report. A Donors’ Consultative Group meeting was held in Brussels in November 2002 to review the by then existing country plans.

3. Studies on policy preconditions of achieving EFA

The FTI approach is grounded in findings of studies, which have aimed at identifying the factors that have contributed to achievement of/ significant progress towards EFA, defined as universal primary school enrolment and completion. A striking overall finding of these analyses is the enormous variance of national fiscal commitment to primary education and of the unit costs of primary schooling across low-income countries. However, amidst this variance a pattern common to the relatively successful countries could be identified. This group of countries:

- Devote a higher than average share of GDP to public primary education
- Have per pupil -costs that fall in the middle of the range (not too high and not too low)
- Have moderate costs of classroom construction
- Pay teachers a moderate wage (average of about 3.6 times per capita GDP per teacher)
- Have an average pupil-teacher ratio of 40:1
- Have higher than average spending on non-salary inputs (such as textbooks), and
- Have rates of grade repetition at below 10 per cent.

By contrast, the countries that are not on track of achieving EFA by 2015, exhibit combinations of the opposites of the factors listed above: e.g. they allocate a relatively small amount of total resources to primary education, pay relatively high salaries to teachers and have repetition rates reaching up to over 30 per cent.

The findings of the studies regarding “success factors” can then be used to formulate benchmarks for a policy of accelerated progress towards EFA through increased resources, better efficiency in their use and without sacrificing the quality of education. It is
worth emphasizing that these benchmarks are based on the observed reality of countries which have been successful in their EFA efforts – not on arbitrary assumptions as have been used in previous simulation exercises. Within the overall framework of benchmarks, the path to EFA will of course be quite different for individual countries, depending on how they score at present on the different parameters. Overall, the main conclusion from this analysis is that “attainment of universal primary completion depends even more crucially on education system reform than on incremental financing” (Achieving EFA by 2015, Executive summary, p. 4).

The list of benchmarks is as follows:

- Government revenues as proportion of GDP: 14-18 per cent (varies according to country income level)
- Share of education spending of the Government recurrent budget: 20 per cent
- Share of primary education of total recurrent spending on education: 50 per cent (graded further according to the duration of primary schooling)
- Average teacher salary: 3.5 times per capita GDP
- Pupil-teacher ratio: 40:1
- Non-teacher salary share of total recurrent spending on education (for learning materials, in-service training of teachers, supervision, etc.): 33 per cent
- Average cost of classroom construction, with furniture and equipment: 8000 USD (implying large-scale reliance on community-based construction methods)
- Average repetition rate: below 10 per cent.

4. The simulation model

The notorious unreliability of data on primary school enrolment in many developing countries is not given much attention in the FTI documents as a whole. According to an expert assessment from the mid-1990s, around half of UNESCO’s member countries had serious problems in providing reliable data on enrolments (Puryear 1995). These are also countries which are furthest away from achieving EFA. The UNESCO Institute of Statistics has been working towards improvement in this area, but it is clear that reliability of statistical data continues to be a major problem. For example, in a data-set recently published by UIS (http://unescostat.unesco.org) it is notable that the enrolment figures from quite many countries are evidently too suspect to be published as such – instead UIS estimates are given. And, according to most recent figures reported by Cape Verde and Zimbabwe, these countries have implausible primary school completion rates of 117 and 113 per cent, respectively. Preparation of the global EFA monitoring report, to be published annually, will expectedly lead to further improvement in the reliability of national data.

The impact of the unreliability of statistical data is globally, and in most individual countries, to bias the picture upwards from the actual level of enrolment. As a consequence, the resource requirements that result from an estimate based on existing data, are smaller than they would turn out to be if more accurate data were available. In exceptional individual countries the situation could conceivably be the reverse.

As part of FTI, a simulation has been carried out for a sample of 47 countries, all of which belong to the category of low-income countries and of which 33 are countries of Africa. In this exercise, country-level data were collected in an ad hoc manner from several
kinds of sources and checked for internal consistency. Results from national household surveys have also been used, where available. The reliability of the data was thus substantially improved.

The FTI simulation model is different from earlier similar studies in that the former focuses on primary school completion, rather than the conventionally used enrolment ratio figures. The completion rate is defined as the total number of students successfully completing primary education in a given year, divided by the total number of children who are in the official primary school graduation age. As the duration of the primary school cycle varies among developing countries, the model used a duration of five grade levels for countries where this is the norm and six grade level for countries where the primary cycle is six years or more. Special attention has been paid to estimating the impact of the HIV/AIDS epidemic on variables included in the model, through declining growth of the school-age population, increasing morbidity and mortality of teachers, and growing number of orphans in need of special financial support to their schooling.

The simulation model is, first, based on extrapolation of enrolment trends observed at country level since 1990 (more detailed descriptions of the model are found in annexes 3 and 4). From here onwards the model differs significantly from earlier similar exercises. The implicit assumptions in earlier studies have been perverse: these have in effect implied that additional external funding to primary education would be insensitive to the countries’ own financial effort and to the existing inefficiencies in their primary school systems. Hence they have also been insensitive to the issue of sustainability. By contrast, the FTI model also makes the following assumptions:

- abolition of student fees in public primary schools, where these exist at present
- proportion of enrolment in private primary schools at 10 per cent of total primary enrolment
- increased domestic budget allocations to primary education, and
- implementation of policy reforms, aimed at improved cost-efficiency and better quality of education (depending of the direction in which the present situation deviates from the benchmarks, reforms can be considered as either efficiency-improving – e.g. increase of the pupil:teacher ratio where currently under 40, downwards adjustment of teacher salaries if currently over 3.5 times GDP per capita – or quality-enhancing – e.g. decrease of the pupil:teacher ratio where over 40, increase of teachers’ salary level if under 3.5 times GDP per capita).

5. Overall results of the simulation

On the basis of global projections, developing countries as a whole are grouped into four main categories:

1) Countries that have already achieved EFA (universal completion of primary schooling),
2) Countries that are “on track” of achieving EFA by 2015, i.e. likely to reach the goal given the continuation of the trend observed in them in the 1990s
3) Countries that are “not on track”, i.e. at risk of not achieving the goal either because of present very low primary school completion rates or a declining trend despite a higher completion rate, and
4) Countries that are “seriously off track”, with low current completion rates and a stagnating or declining trend.

The division of the total number of 155 countries into the four categories is as follows:

- Group 1: 36 countries
- Group 2: 30 countries
- Group 3: 60 countries
- Group 4: 29 countries

The countries of group 3 and 4 together, 89 in number, are of concern to international efforts to support progress towards EFA.

As a result of the increased budget allocation requirement and of efficiency-improving measures, which are to some extent offset by cost increases resulting from measures of quality improvement, the FTI simulation leads to substantially lower estimates of external funding needs than the earlier studies (and a subsequent simulation, published in UNESCO’s EFA Monitoring Report of 2002). The “financing gap” estimated by the FTI simulation model for the group of low-income countries consists of the difference between the estimated total need for funding to achieve EFA by 2015 and the projected domestic financing available for primary education under the above-mentioned assumptions. One should note that the size of the financing gap for individual countries does not indicate the volume of additional external funding needed – the latter depends on how much external funding to primary education countries are at present receiving. Indeed, it is possible that in some cases the size of the annual gap, as projected by the simulation, turns out to be smaller than the amount of external support which is currently provided for primary education.

The total estimate for the financing gap for low-income countries is 2.5 billion USD annually. The bulk of this sum – 2.1 billion – would be needed in Sub-Saharan Africa. A further breakdown is that more than half of the total sum for Sub-Saharan Africa would be targeted at a group of only seven countries, each one of which has a financing gap of at least 100 MUSD per annum (Nigeria, Ethiopia, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda, Sudan).

Outside Africa it is notable that, according to this simulation, India could achieve EFA without additional external resources, as in its case following the benchmark parameters would lead to a substantial increase in the domestic budget allocated to primary education. A second analysis will be carried out later, including those countries that have not yet reached EFA but do not belong to the category of low-income countries. While the outcome of such analysis will add to the estimated financing gap, it is also clear that the bulk of the need for incremental external funding is in the low-income countries.

Out of the total estimated need for external financing for low-income countries, 1/3 would be needed for school construction and the remaining 2/3 would cover recurrent costs. In countries outside Africa, the latter component represents the need for funding the provision of education, whereas in Sub-Saharan Africa some 25% of the recurrent cost component would consist of expenditure targeted at supporting the schooling of AIDS-orphans and replacing teachers afflicted with HIV/AIDS.

6. Results for Finland’s principal partner countries
Five of Finland’s current, or recent, partners in bilateral development cooperation in the education sector are among the first-wave group of potential beneficiaries of FTI: Ethiopia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Tanzania and Zambia. Of these, Finland is currently providing bilateral support to basic education in Mozambique, Tanzania and Zambia, whereas such support to Ethiopia was recently terminated and the ongoing support to the education sector in Nicaragua is only indirectly influencing the basic education sub-sector.

The estimated primary school completion rates for the five countries vary across a wide range: this figure is highest for Zambia (80%), followed by Nicaragua at 65%, Tanzania 59%, Mozambique 39%, and Ethiopia 24%. It is noteworthy that at least the four African countries in this group may at some point during the last three decades have been closer to the EFA goal than they are at present. This was a result of strong political commitment, in the broader atmosphere of a national version of socialist ideology. Subsequently, the levels of enrolment have fluctuated – in spite of substantial amounts of external assistance to primary education - as a result of different combinations of war conditions, economic crisis and the HIV/AIDS-epidemic. Of these five countries, at least in Zambia the primary school enrolment rate has during recent years been on the decline.

Comparing the present situation in this group of countries with the indicative benchmarks, the most significant discrepancies and, hence, the main policy changes expected of the FTI plans prepared by these countries are in the following (for more details, see Annex 2):

- Government funding to primary education is below the benchmark level in Ethiopia, Mozambique, Tanzania and Zambia
- Teachers’ salaries relative to GDP per capita are outstandingly high in Ethiopia, and exceptionally low in Nicaragua and Zambia
- Class sizes are high in Ethiopia, Mozambique and Zambia
- Repetition rates are high in Mozambique
- Spending on non-salary inputs is low in all five countries, particularly so in Tanzania.

The size of the projected annual financing gap (A + B + C2 in the simulation model, see annex 5) in the five countries varies considerably. It is highest in Ethiopia at 245 million USD, followed by Tanzania at 123 million, both Mozambique and Zambia at 54 million, and lowest in Nicaragua (the exact figure was not available for this study from the FTI Secretariat). The share of construction costs of these total sums is more than half in Ethiopia (reflecting its present extremely low enrolment level) and in the region of 20-25 per cent in Mozambique, Tanzania and Zambia.

7. Concerns related to the quality of education

In the already existing education sector programs of the FTI countries, one of the principal components is improvement of the quality of education. The question here is, what ramifications may accelerated expansion of primary schooling have on the quality dimension?
It is possible to argue that defining the EFA goal in terms of primary school completion will resolve the quantity/quality dilemma, as only a system with reasonably good quality will be able to eliminate dropout from primary school. This argument could be backed up with evidence, but there are also counterexamples. For instance, the state of Kerala in India is renowned for having achieved near 100 per cent enrolment throughout primary school (and that without any significant external assistance). What is less known is that the level of measured learning achievement in Kerala’s primary schools is below the respective figure for several other Indian states which are far from EFA (Varghese 1999). If progress towards EFA is to be measured by improvement in the primary school completion rate, and if additional external financing is made conditional on progress on this indicator, there is a risk that countries will be tempted to lower their repetition rates simply through administrative measures. An extreme variant of such measures is a policy of automatic promotion from grade to grade within the primary school cycle. This measure has been implemented i.a. in Kerala; another example of automatic promotion accompanied by apparently declining levels of learning is Ghana during the past 15 years (N’tchougan-Sonou 2001). Such a policy of course is contrary to quality improvement and is likely to backfire by leading to higher rates of failure in the end-of-primary-school examinations. A prudent way of reducing repetition and eventually move to automatic promotion would be to proceed in tandem with actual improvements in learning achievement.

Some of the FTI benchmark parameters have a direct bearing on the quality of education. Increased spending on non-salary inputs and a lower pupil:teacher ratio will expectedly contribute towards improving quality, whereas a gradual decline of teachers’ salary level may have the opposite effect (through influencing recruitment into the profession, as well as the motivation of serving teachers). The set of indicative benchmarks is a result of considering the difficult tradeoffs involved: where the relative salaries of teachers are very high, movement towards a lower level would release resources to raise enrolments and/or increase spending on non-salary inputs and/or bring down the pupil:teacher ratio.

A very real risk to quality is demonstrated by the experience of many countries (e.g. Malawi, Uganda, Bangladesh, Indonesia and Brazil in the 1990s): under conditions of rapid enrolment growth, the quality of education can be severely compromised by resorting to recruitment of a large number of untrained and poorly trained teachers, as appropriately trained teachers are not available in sufficient numbers. Such recruitment would also make it easier for countries to comply with the indicative benchmark given for teachers’ salary level. If individual countries opt for a crash program to increase primary school enrollment, with high political visibility, the external funding agencies involved in a program of accelerated progress towards EFA have rather limited means to influence the process in the interest of safeguarding the quality of education.

Yet another factor complicating the quantitative expansion/quality of education issue is the fact that a substantial increase in the coverage of primary schooling in the child population also requires the system to cope with a wider range of learning ability than is the case with a more selective system with a high dropout rate. In other words, in a rapidly growing primary school system, even maintaining the previously existing level of quality may be a notable achievement, requiring as it does provision of special support to children who are slower learners e.g. due to physical disabilities or psychological problems. In countries where achieving EFA by 2015 requires a high rate of enrolment growth, a difficult question, then, is: should the quality of education be monitored against an ideal of improvement even under these conditions, or against some more modest target that might be considered a realistic one. There is thus a considerable degree of arbitrariness in setting targets for the quality of primary education.
For ex post facto monitoring of quality, primary school completion rates are one indicator, and – if reliable data are available – easy to use. However, as this indicator can be manipulated by administrative decisions, it is not sufficient as such. Other measures of quality are provided by national level data on learning achievement of primary school pupils in reading and writing skills, mathematics and science. From many developing countries such information is already available as a baseline for future comparisons (the UNESCO-UNICEF Minimum Learning Achievement Project, with 27 countries participating; the SACMEQ project in countries of Southern and Eastern Africa, and the PASEC project in Francophone Africa).

8. Preparation of country plans

A basic principle of FTI is to build on existing education sector programs and Poverty Reduction Strategic Plans, which the countries eligible to join the initiative already have in place. The PRSPs have been or are being prepared as one requirement for becoming eligible for debt reduction under the HIPC arrangement. These plans contain a broader set of complementary actions needed, alongside raising the educational level of the population, to reduce poverty: macroeconomic prudence, good governance, and actions to improve health and nutrition, water and sanitation, rural infrastructure. The PRSP preparation processes have also provided a forum for broad-based political discussion on prioritisation across the different sectors, recognizing the requirements of a sound macroeconomic framework and the projected ceilings for public expenditure as a whole.

In cases where the national “education sector program” is truly sectorwide (e.g. Ethiopia, Uganda), it provides a comprehensive framework for consideration of the EFA issues in their interlinkages with the other sub-sectors (e.g. supply of secondary education opportunities in relation the the number of primary school completers; effect of teacher training requirements on the tertiary level of the education system). However, many of the existing so-called education sector programs only cover the basic education sub-sector (e.g. in Tanzania and Zambia – but in these cases, a sectorwide program is under preparation). The analytical approach developed under FTI and the set of indicative benchmarks necessitates a discussion on policy options and prioritisation within the education sector. This will then lead to adjustments in the current sectorwide programs and will inform the preparation of such programs where currently basic education sub-sector programs exist, thus contributing to improved efficiency and sustainability and to better quality of education.

UNESCO has in August 2000 issued guidelines for the preparation of national EFA plans, which should have been completed by the end of 2002. This document reiterates the principle of the Dakar (and Jomtien) conference that governments should increase their budgetary allocations to basic education, but beyond this statement it refrains from prescription. The UNESCO Guidelines place much emphasis on the participatory nature of the planning process, in order to build up political commitment among stakeholder groups, which again may be difficult to reconcile with sufficient attention to issues of efficiency and economic sustainability. A different kind of a document is the detailed EFA Planning Guide prepared by UNESCO’s Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific, primarily to serve the
Southeast and East Asian countries in the preparation of their national plans and also to be used in training activities of the International Institute for Educational Planning. This guide contains very practical advice on how to estimate resource requirements under different cost assumptions and to assess the financial feasibility of alternative plans. Moreover, it deals with the above-mentioned difficult question of how to mediate between the technical-economic and the political-participatory aspects of the planning process.

The framework prepared at the World Bank for national EFA Fast-track plans is more prescriptive than the above-mentioned UNESCO guidelines in that the former also gives indicative benchmarks for a number of key parameters. These have been listed above in the section “Study on policy preconditions”. The Bank presented the benchmarks to the agencies that participate in FTI as a “normative” framework, but after discussion the term “indicative” was agreed upon. This framework reflects the overall principle that “countries cannot hope to achieve EFA unless their education systems are within reasonable norms of efficiency and their national efforts to invest in education are on par with those of other countries at similar income levels” (Education for Dynamic Economies, p. 13).

The benchmarks are not initial conditionalities in the strict sense, but one of the tasks of the FTI missions sent by the World Bank during July-September 2002 to discuss the preparation of country plans was to ensure a reasonable degree of consistency of these plans with the indicative benchmarks. Countries also were provided with versions of the simulation model adjusted to the local conditions and with guidance in the use of the model. In their submitted plans, countries were expected to justify deviations from the benchmarks, as these will have an effect on the size of the estimated financing gap. In other words, the question here is, what constitutes a “credible” national EFA plan, deemed worthy of additional external funding. It is of course unfortunate that this message has been communicated to countries only two years after the Dakar meeting, at a stage when they were already expected to have advanced far in the preparation of their national EFA plans. In reality, however, many countries had by that time been unable to make much progress in this respect.

While the reference to basic norms of national financial commitment and of efficiency may be regarded as self-evident, the benefit from the studies carried out under the FTI process is that they have brought this kind of implications out in more tangible terms than is customary in documents prepared for the EFA coordination process and in the consensus-seeking statements of political meetings. Considerations of national ownership of educational policies should also bear in mind the constraints imposed by economic realities. As regards the size of the domestic budget allocation to primary education, the HIPC arrangements already have led to significant adjustments: the African countries eligible for HIPC have agreed to increase this budgetary contribution by 40 per cent on average.

Where the present situation significantly deviates from the indicative benchmarks, making the required political decisions and implementing the respective reforms will in many necessitate a radical change of prevailing conceptions and attitudes regarding what constitutes “proper” primary education (relative salary level of teachers, construction standards, extent of grade repetition). This may also require a long period of political discussion within the existing institutional set-up before decisions can be taken. In order not to further undermine national ownership of education policies, it is important that these decisions be not rushed (in this respect, the choice of the term “Fast track” may be somewhat unfortunate). The FTI simulation framework takes this into account in the case of teachers’ salaries, assuming that a downward change cannot be effected on already serving teachers (the indicative benchmark value is an average teacher’s salary at 3.5 times GDP per capita, whereas the respective figure for the Sahel countries is as high as
6.4 and for Ethiopia it is 7.8). Instead, alternative salary schemes can be introduced over time, as new teachers are recruited. To facilitate such changes, the World Bank has for example sponsored a forum for stakeholders from five Francophone African countries to exchange perspectives and to build the political support necessary for developing such alternative schemes. The forum is reported to have had an impact throughout the region.

9. Assessment of country plans

Before the consultative conference of donors, 27 November 2002, the following countries had produced an EFA Fast-track plan that had been subjected to assessment: Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, The Gambia, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger and Yemen. Most of the remaining first-wave countries (Albania, Bolivia, Ghana, Tanzania, Uganda, Vietnam and Zambia) are expected to submit their plans during the first quarter of 2003.

The country plans have been assessed using common guidelines (these are reproduced as annex 6). The basic question asked is, whether the proposed strategy constitutes a sound basis for funding by the FTI. The assessment also checks, whether the FTI plan is consistent with targets presented in the existing PRSP and the education sector program, and whether it has been prepared in consultation with key stakeholders. The more specific questions reflect the content of the indicative framework given for the preparation of the country plans, and also those questions from countries and funding agencies that have sought better clarity about how the proposals will be assessed.

The assessments have been conducted both by the FTI secretariat and by the funding agencies that participate in the FTI and are active in the education sector of a given country, where possible under the leadership of the locally designated lead agency for the sector. The task of the in-country donors was disconnected from the issue of funding pledges by the same, i.e. a favourable assessment of a given plan only becomes a recommendation for the agencies collectively to provide additional funding. The role of the FTI secretariat is to ensure a cross-country comparative perspective, while the advantages of in-country assessment are familiarity with the local context and better coordination with relevant ongoing planning and negotiation processes.

An overview of the country plans clearly shows that many of these have not been able to address the required issues very thoroughly. In the overall judgement, there is inevitably a considerable amount of discretion. There are also indications that agencies involved in the in-country assessments have had varying interpretations of the role of the indicative benchmarks, with some of them giving stronger emphasis on flexibility in this regard than was intended by the World Bank and some of the other agencies. In these assessments the local donor groups have arrived at opinions that can be announced as representing a consensus among the agencies (which already have gained similar experience from the coordination forums that have been established for the sector programs). It is not unlikely that the conclusions have also been influenced by the views of those agencies which are the most significant prospective sources of additional funding in a given country.

A discrepancy between the in-country and the cross-country perspectives may in individual cases arise from the fact that agencies with established presence in the education sector of a given country (including the World Bank) have already discussed and eventually endorsed the policy framework on which the existing sector/sub-sector development plan is based. This may have happened without sufficient attention to those
issues of cost-efficiency and sustainability which have more recently been made more explicit within FTI. If such is the case, the agencies are likely to find it intellectually and politically difficult to distance themselves from the previous positions. From the perspective of the individual developing countries, this kind of a situation obviously carries the risk that the “rules of the game” are perceived as changing and the collective position of the education sector donors as moving towards stronger conditionality. On the other hand, the first group of countries deemed to qualify for FTI funding will become an example to the rest, and the credibility of the initiative depends on applying the assessment criteria in a transparent manner across countries. In the implementation of the country plans, the advantage of clear benchmarks is that they provide a basis for transparent monitoring of performance and for decisions on external funding.

10. Planning situation in Finland’s principal partner countries

The FTI plan prepared by Nicaragua is based on the existing sectorwide National Education Plan for 2001-2015. The FTI plan was endorsed by the in-country donors’ group and FTI funding was recommended. The amount of external funding requested by the Government for the period 2003-5 is 75 MUSD.

The FTI plan of Mozambique is in large part built on the national Education Sector Strategic Plan, which has been implemented from 1999. As a result of the FTI planning task, and of experience gained during the ESSP implementation, the ESSP document is also being revised.

Ethiopia’s FTI plan is closely based on the country’s Education Sector Development Program II, which was endorsed in broad terms by the education sector donor group already in early 2002. The Mid-term Review of the ESDP is to take place in January-February 2003. Ethiopia is currently involved in more detailed costing of its FTI plan as part of ESDP II.

The draft FTI plans from both Ethiopia and Mozambique stood out among the country plans for being excessively costly, mainly due to their high level of projected teachers’ salaries and classroom construction costs. This causes doubts as to the sustainability of the policies on which the draft plans are based. The respective Governments are reluctant to revise their teacher recruitment and remuneration policies, in order to contain the cost increase resulting from expansion of the system, whereas they express the intention of working towards lowering construction costs. This situation is a clear – and not unexpected – example of the above-mentioned potential tension between stakeholder positions and the technical-economic rationality expressed in the FTI indicative benchmarks. The in-country donor groups have signalled their general endorsement of the Ethiopian and Mozambican draft plans, but have also given feedback for the further development of these.

Tanzania’s FTI plan under preparation is linked with the Primary Education Development Program, and in the future is will also become embedded in a sectorwide ESDP. There is preliminary information suggesting that Tanzania is not likely to have difficulty in complying with the indicative benchmarks, as in many respects this does not require major changes to the status quo of its education system.

For Zambia, preparation of an FTI plan for November 2002 would have disrupted the ongoing planning process, where the Basic Education Sub-Sector Investment Programme
(BESSIP) will be replaced by a more comprehensive Education Sector Strategic Plan for 2003-7. Zambia’s FTI plan is expected to be submitted for assessment in March 2002. It is noteworthy that the current volume of external funding to BESSIP is 81 MUSD (in 2002), which is more than the financing gap in the results of the simulation (54 MUSD annually).

11. Funding pledges and further planning

The results of the simulation for low-income countries give a total financing gap of 2.5 billion annually up to 2015, of which 2.1 billion would be needed in Sub-Saharan Africa. These figures represent the difference between the estimated total need for funding to achieve EFA by 2015 and the projected domestic financing available for primary education under the above-mentioned assumptions. In relation to the existing level of external assistance to primary education, provision of the additional funding is estimated to represent a 300 % increase globally, and a 700 % increase in the respective sum for Sub-Saharan Africa.

In the process of scrutinizing the FTI plans from individual countries as a basis of funding pledges from donor agencies, information on already existing financial commitments of agencies was gathered in a late stage and the resulting picture was far from complete. Nevertheless, it is clear that all the FTI countries already receive substantial amounts of external support to their primary education systems – in some cases only from a few funding agencies (The Gambia, Guyana), in others from as many as 10-12 bilateral/multilateral agencies (Mozambique, Uganda, Zambia). As mentioned above in section 4, the FTI simulation model differs from earlier estimates of external funding needs for achieving EFA in that the former assumes a given minimum level of domestic budgetary allocation to primary education. The corollary of this assumption is that in the provision of external assistance countries would no more be rewarded for low levels of public funding on primary education (as has arguably been the case in e.g. Mozambique, Tanzania and Zambia). To what extent the existing pattern of allocating donors’ contributions among countries will change to reflect this principle, is an open question.

At the Donors’ consultative conference of 27.11.02 the plans of seven countries were deemed to qualify for FTI funding at this stage: Burkina Faso, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Mauritania, Nicaragua and Niger. The plans submitted by these countries demonstrate a high degree of compliance with the indicative benchmarks, and the in-country donors are relatively confident with implementation capacity, although there is agreement that a more thorough assessment of the latter is still needed. These countries have also been given feedback for further consideration. After the country plans have been deemed favourably as a basis for additional funding, implementation plans with more detailed costing will need to be prepared.

Due to incomplete information on the present level of external funding to primary education, it is not yet possible to announce the total amount of the needed additional funding in the group of seven countries. The FTI donors collectively have pledged to make the requisite funding available for these countries during 2003-5. The relevant funding decisions by individual agencies can consist of: a) decisions to continue at present annual level the support that they already provide to primary education in a given country (which they might well have decided to do even if FTI did not exist), and b) incremental funding over the present annual level, in response to an identified deficit.
The countries whose submitted plans were not yet deemed sufficient as a basis for a funding decision have been informed as to how the plan should be improved and will continue to receive support in this work. These countries have also been informed that FTI is not a time-bound process, but that additional country plans will be considered as they become available. The next meeting of the FTI agencies is scheduled for March 2003, and thereafter the agencies have agreed to meet at least annually.

12. Capacity constraints and requirements in the FTI countries

By virtue of meeting the criteria for joining the FTI, the respective countries have already demonstrated capacity to prepare and implement an education sector program and to prepare a PRSP. In many cases, this has entailed substantial use of technical assistance. The processes of preparing the FTI plans, which in the majority of cases was carried out within a period of a few months, was also facilitated by TA from several of the FTI donors and by guidance from the FTI secretariat. Countries participating in the FTI also have the possibility of regional exchange of perspectives and experiences. Furthermore, using the existence of an education sector program as an eligibility criterion for FTI funding also provides an incentive for countries not yet following the sector program approach to adopt it.

It is obvious that even when a national FTI plan has broad political support and is technically sound, it can be implemented only on condition that a satisfactory level of local institutional capacity exists to operationalize the plan and to channel the resources to where they are to be used. Issues related to this requirement are already well-known in countries where an education sector/basic education sub-sector program exists – what is new is that under FTI progress at a faster pace is expected. As noted above, most of the need for incremental external funding is in the form of recurrent budget support. In the case of Sub-Saharan Africa in particular, the projected 8-fold increase in the amount of external funding for primary education certainly poses a formidable challenge to existing management capacities of Ministries of Finance and of Education at central and lower levels of the administration. Experience to date clearly shows that increased availability of external funding through a pool fund arrangement has in some cases (e.g. Tanzania, Zambia) not led to commensurate increases in actual expenditure, due to insufficient management capacity. There are also cases (e.g. Zambia), where a substantial share of the funds released through HIPC and allocated to the education sector have remained unspent. Yet capacity building at Ministries of Education and lower levels of administration has been an important component in the already existing sector development programs. In its dispatches that are critical of the FTI, the Global Campaign for Education –coalition of NGOs conspicuously downplays the importance of capacity constraints.

The plans prepared by the FTI countries were expected to include proposals for the mechanism of channelling additional funds into the education sector, and further down to schools and target communities and families. An instructive experience from the 1990s in this area is that Uganda’s extraordinary achievements in increasing primary school enrolment have been made possible i.a. by a dramatic growth in the proportion of education sector budget funds that actually reach the schools, achieved through measures which increased the accountability of Government bodies vis-à-vis citizenry (Ablo & Reinikka 1998). The assessment of the FTI plans is also focusing on the implementation
capacity issue and possible risks entailed. For instance, the plan prepared by Ethiopia expresses the preference that additional funds be provided in the form of budget support and does not regard capacity as a constraint, although funding agencies have not agreed to establish even a system of pooled funding in the education sector in Ethiopia. More generally, doubts about implementation capacity have been a major concern expressed by in-country donors in the assessment of several countries’ FTI proposals. At the same time, it was not clear, by whom and how this capacity should be more systematically judged. The in-country donors of course have concrete experience of capacity constraints and capacity building efforts in the context of sector/sub-sector programs.

The implementation plans can build on the respective plans that already exist for the national education sector/basic education sub-sector programs, but in many cases the latter will need to be thoroughly revised. This planning task was perhaps not foreseen very clearly and/or was not communicated to the countries that embarked on preparing their FTI plans. An unintended consequence might then be that the additional planning requirements are seen by the FTI countries as “moving the goalpost” in the midst of the process (in the earlier preparation of education sector programs there are examples of the same kind of oversight, with resulting unrealistic expectations in the first stage and subsequent feeling of disappointment – see Martin & Oksanen & Takala 2000; Takala & Marope 2003). If such situations are encountered, FTI must find ways to overcome them.

13. Conclusions for funding agencies

Under their present management procedures the funding agencies can relatively conveniently cover construction costs (including provision of furniture), which represent 1/3 of the estimated total need for external financing primary education in low-income countries. This will require scaling up of existing school construction projects and/or involvement of more donors in this area. Given the assumption of large-scale reliance on community-based construction, in order to contain costs, the main specific constraints here are related to the availability of skills for supervision of construction and for subsequent maintenance of the school buildings (the FTI plan from Mozambique and its in-country assessment give particular attention to these issues).

In this context, it is notable that Japan, which is one of the FTI partners, has already launched a basic education support initiative of its own, for which 2 billion USD will be available over a period of five years. These funds can be used for supporting the FTI, but only under the existing funding modalities, which in the case of Japan exclude budget support and pooled funding. In the past, school construction has accounted for almost half of Japan’s total assistance to education, and these activities typically have not been low-cost nor have they encouraged community participation.

External funding to cover increased recurrent costs (2/3 of the estimated total need for external funding) is expected to be increasingly channelled through extra-budgetary pool fund arrangements, although part the recurrent support can also consist of conventional-type of projects to produce and distribute learning materials. The pool fund systems represent an intermediate mode between agency-specific projects and sectoral budget support, relying on rules for procurement, financial management and reporting, and auditing, which are common to all agencies that contribute funds into the pool. Related to the process of preparing PRSPs, a major drive towards harmonization of the funding agencies’ management procedures is underway as a joint effort of OECD-DAC member
countries and the multilateral development banks. This effort also covers areas such as pre-planning analytical work, risk assessment and evaluation. Pilot activities are ongoing in several countries (e.g. Ethiopia, Vietnam). At the FTI donors’ meeting in April 2002, the need to proceed on this issue was also agreed upon. Among the bilateral agencies that have joined the FTI, there are several major ones that have hitherto been reluctant to participate in the move towards harmonized procedures. There are, however, indications that at least some of these agencies are reviewing their policies in this respect.

Among those agencies that have actively sought change towards harmonization and have been able to establish systems for the pooling of funds, the share of their total funding to the education sector channelled via pooling arrangements is at present relatively minor, while the bulk of assistance continues to be managed as disparate projects and according to agency-specific procedures (e.g. in Mozambique, Zambia). For devising and negotiating the pool fund systems a period of several years has typically been needed, and in many of the first-wave FTI countries these systems are not yet in place (e.g. in Nicaragua, which in its FTI plan proposes establishment of an EFA-FTI Trust Fund). In light of these experiences, further progress towards increased reliance on pool fund arrangements, as well as transition into sectoral budget support, will typically be a lengthy and complicated process. Also the needed dovetailing of financing and monitoring procedures under FTI with those already used in the sector/sub-sector programs of individual countries – instead of complicating the set-up – will require further negotiation and planning. The key task for the FTI donors now is to devise a system for the future decision-making concerning funding and for monitoring of progress.

A new lending instrument of the World Bank is Poverty Reduction Support Credits, which is an operationalization of the idea of a development compact. PRSCs are designed to provide general budget support against demonstrable progress towards goals defined in the PRPSs, such as EFA. Grant-giving agencies have the option of joining PRSCs as co-financiers. The Netherlands Government, which during recent years has multiplied the volume of its support to basic education, has already made available 130 MUSD for FTI through a co-financing arrangement with the World Bank. There has also been discussion on setting up trust fund systems to enable bilateral agencies to jointly contribute to FTI in countries where they are not currently involved in basic education. Decisions to significantly increase the volume of funding in support of basic education have already been made in Canada, Norway and the USA. Of these the first two have in recent years demonstrated willingness to join pool fund arrangements.

A particular challenge in future support to FTI countries is the question, how to manage the payments of bursaries that are intended to support the schooling of AIDS-orphans. This issue is neglected in the plans of even those countries where the problem is most severe (e.g. Ethiopia and Mozambique). The order of magnitude of this task is immense in comparison with existing bursary schemes for disadvantaged groups that have been supported by external funding agencies.

Technical assistance for capacity building in the FTI countries will continue to be necessary for the finalization of the outstanding FTI country plans, for the preparation of implementation plans, and for those additional countries that in the future will join the FTI. Such TA is not included in the estimate for needed external funding, nor are the more global costs of monitoring, research and information dissemination. It is quite possible that there are divergent views among funding agencies and developing country governments on the amount and kind of TA needed.

A substantial amount of TA (approximately 20 MUSD) has during 1998-2002 been provided by the Norwegian Education Trust Fund (NETF) for analytical and planning work in the preparation of education sector programs and PRSPs, for related capacity building
activities, and for facilitating consensus-building in key issues of educational policy. Managed by the World Bank, NETF has supported such activities in more than 20 African countries. During 2002, part of this support has been directly geared to the preparation of national FTI plans, and this arrangement is expected to continue in 2003. One of the operational principles of NETF is that activities which are conducted by the countries themselves and which use African professionals/institutions, should be prioritised (NETF 2002 Report, p. 7). The needed additional expertise from outside Africa has been recruited internationally.

For future TA in support of the operationalization and implementation of national FTI plans a wider pool of international experts than that existing under NETF would be the preferable option. Under such an arrangement, TA could be provided on a demand-driven basis and in a flexible manner. Agency-specific provision of TA risks remaining uncoordinated and could even become counterproductive in the FTI process.

14. Recommendations for the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland (MFAF)

The FTI process has been to a very large extent designed and steered by the World Bank. In this respect it is another example, within a short period, of a significant change in the strategy and modalities of development cooperation – other recent examples have been the introduction of the concept of sector program support and the preparation of PRSPs. For small bilateral agencies in particular, these changes pose a challenge in terms of being reasonably well informed of and possibly influencing the content and pace of such changes together with other bilateral agencies. In the early stage of preparing the FTI there was apparently too little information-sharing from the Bank towards the other agencies involved, but this has improved substantially during the second half of 2002.

The recommendations that follow from this consideration and from the preceding analysis, are:

1) Information on FTI should be disseminated within MFAF, and also to the Consultative Committee on Relations with Developing Countries (KESU) and the Service Center for Development Cooperation (KEPA), in order to inform the more general discussion on evolving new modes of development cooperation.

2) Further follow-up of the FTI process will need to cover the future documents disseminated by the FTI Secretariat. This should be coordinated with the ongoing follow-up of sector development program processes in Mozambique, Tanzania and Zambia.

3) Two-way information-sharing on the FTI process between MFAF Headquarters and Embassies in the five principal partner countries should be ensured (agendas and outcomes of high-level FTI meetings on the one hand, and discussions and decisions of in-country education sector donor meetings related to FTI issues on the other).

4) The context of implementing Finland’s ongoing bilateral support to the education sector programs in Mozambique, Tanzania and Zambia will be affected, if these countries become beneficiaries of FTI support. The implementation of the national FTI plans will be monitored and future plans will be discussed at the annual review meetings of the
education sector programs. The meetings of the bilateral Supervision Boards, as well as the preparation of the bilateral annual work plans, will need to be informed of the relevant discussions and decisions.

5) Possible TA inputs from Finland into the FTI process would preferably be channelled through the above-mentioned option of a TA pool as part of the FTI set-up. The main areas of expertise, which are relevant for the FTI countries and where internationally competitive expertise is available from Finland are: special education and integration of children with special needs into mainstream classrooms, and production and distribution of learning materials. In addition, some potentially useful expertise also exists in community-based school construction and in assessment of learning achievement in primary schools. As regards the geographical distribution of country-specific experience among professionals in Finland, most of this has naturally been gained in Finland’s principal bilateral program countries, five of which are currently among the FTI countries.

6) Provision of additional funding from Finland to support implementation of the national FTI plans in some of the five countries will be a precondition for having a voice in the general FTI process. This would be possible through increased contributions to existing education sector pool funds. Finland’s contribution to basic education in Mozambique currently amounts to approximately 3 MUSD per annum, and an expectedly increasing amount of support will be channelled through the joint Education Sector Support Fund. The respective sum for Tanzania is also at 3 MUSD per annum, and after mid-2003 the total amount of this support is to be channelled through the pool fund arrangement. Finland’s support to basic education in Zambia currently amounts to 2.4 MUSD, of which 1 million is channelled through the pool fund. As has been noted above in section 10, it is not clear that in the forthcoming FTI assessment Zambia will be judged to need additional external funding above the level that the agencies collectively are already providing. In Nicaragua, Finland is not directly involved in the basic education sub-sector, and there is as yet no pool fund arrangement for the sector. In Ethiopia, Finland’s long-lasting support to basic education has recently been terminated, but when Ethiopia is deemed to qualify for FTI funding, MFAF may wish to reconsider its position in this context.

An alternative to sectoral support through existing pool fund systems is general budget support parallel to PRSCs. General budget support is already given by Finland to Nicaragua and Tanzania, and it will also become operational in Mozambique.

7) Flexible, quick-disbursement funding will be needed also in other countries than the above-mentioned five. As such needs will in some cases be relatively minor, even small contributions to meeting them could play a role. This option would entail a co-financing arrangement with a donor already operating in the country in question, or Finland’s contribution could be channelled through a future FTI trust fund system. Apart from the first-wave group of 18 countries, additional countries will expectedly become eligible for FTI support in the future.
ANNEX 1

LIST OF DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

Material produced as part of the FTI process:
(published/distributed by the World Bank during 2002)

EFA: the Lessons of Experience – the Impact of Policies in 20 Case Studies

Education for Dynamic Economies: Accelerating Progress towards EFA

Achieving Education for All by 2015: Simulation Results for 47 Low-Income Countries

Financing EFA by 2015: Simulation Results for 33 African Countries

Achieving EFA in Uganda: the Big Bang Approach

Mingat, A.: Teacher Salary Issues in African Countries

EFA FTI – Suggested outline for plans of African countries

Guidelines for the assessment of EFA FTI proposals

Fast-Track Initiative – Design and Operational Issues

EFA FTI – Framework for Monitoring and Evaluation

Reports of donors’ FTI meetings in Amsterdam 10-11.4.02, Washington D.C. 17.7.2002 and 24.10.02, Brussels 27.11.02

Country plans (in English/ French): Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, The Gambia, Guinea, Guyana, Mozambique, Nicaragua

Assessments of country plans by in-country donors (in English/ French): Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, The Gambia, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Mauritania, Mozambique, Niger, Yemen

Assessments of country plans by the FTI Secretariat: Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Guyana, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger
Other material:


Education for All – An international strategy to operationalize the Dakar Framework for Action on EFA, UNESCO April 2002

Education for All Global Monitoring Report, UNESCO 2002

EFA Planning Guide for Southeast and East Asia, UNESCO Principal Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific, 2001

Enhancing Human Development in the HIPC/PRSP Context. The World Bank


Global Campaign for Education: November 27th consortium – the future of 16 million children is at stake

Harmonization of operational policies, procedures and practices – Information note 16.9.2002. Development Committee of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund


Moving towards Budget Support. DAC Task Force on Donor Practices, December 2001

Norwegian Education Trust Fund, Annual Report 2002

