THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION
FALK AUDITORIUM

REACHING THE MARGINALIZED:
IS A QUALITY EDUCATION POSSIBLE FOR ALL?
Washington, D.C.
Wednesday, January 20, 2010

PARTICIPANTS:

Introduction and Moderator:

JACQUES van der GAAG
Senior Fellow and Co-Director
Center for Universal Education
The Brookings Institution

Featured Speaker:

KEVIN WATKINS
Director, EFA Global Monitoring Report
UNESCO

Discussants:

ELIZABETH KING
Director, Education, Human Development Network
World Bank

BARBARA REYNOLDS
Senior Advisor, Education
UNICEF

REBECCA WINTHROP
Fellow and Co-Director
Center for Universal Education
The Brookings Institution

MOHAMED IBRAHIM ELMI
Minister of State for the Development of
Northern Kenya and other Arid Lands

* * * *

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. van der GAAG: Well, good afternoon. My name is Jacques van der Gaag. I'm one of the co-directors of the Center for Universal Education. And on behalf of the Center, I'm very happy to welcome you, such large numbers, to this event.

Two weeks ago, we had a much smaller event organized by the Center here at Brookings to develop recommendations for reforming the global education architecture and search for new, innovative, and better international financing mechanisms.

Today, we host the lunch of the EFA Global Monitoring Report. Education will be on the agenda of the World Economic Forum. It's likely to be high priority on the G-20 agenda. It will compete with the World Cup for world attention in South Africa. Wonder who's going to win that one? With the One Goal campaign, one goal is not enough to get a lot of attention there, I guess.

And some people actually are starting to think about the year 2010 as the year of education. The needs are great. The report that we will discuss today makes that abundantly clear. But there are also new opportunities. The mid-term evaluation of the Fast Track Initiative plus the new leadership provide a chance to expand and improve global efforts. There's increase understanding that we need to shift emphasis from enrollment to quality education and learning. And the world in general is increasing its focus on education.

Let me just give you one quote. "Above all, we must do our part to see that all children have the basic right to learn. Every child, every boy, every girl, should have the ability to go to school." To ensure that our nation does its part to meet that goal, we need to establish a $2 billion global fund for education, according to candidate Obama.

So, though he may have some other priorities right today, I think we should keep him to that particular promise and keep moving on the opportunities.

In the meeting today, we'll discuss the challenges and opportunities. Our starting point is the Global Monitoring Report. The report will be introduced by Kevin Watkins, the director and author of the report.

We will then have comments from a panel of four internationally well-known education experts. Each of them will comment on specific aspects of the report. And I will introduce the panel members later to you.

During the second hour of this meeting, it's your turn. We will open the floor and, please, be active, aggressive, inquisitive, and start the discussion. I do expect a very lively debate. After that, there is -- you -- everybody's invited to a reception, which I believe is right next door.

But first, there's a bit of work to be done. Kevin Watkins is director of the Global Monitoring Report. As main author, has a long career in international education, having served, among other things, as the drafting committee of the Dakar framework, on the formulation of the education NEGs . And he was also the author of the Oxfam Report -- the printed Oxfam report on education, which, I believe, is celebrating its 10th anniversary by now.

Kevin, the floor is yours.

One important request: Please turn off your phones. It will disturb other people. And even if it's on the -- even if it's half off, it may interfere with the taping of this event. So, please turn off your phones.

Kevin, the floor is yours.

MR. WATKINS: Jacques, thank you very much for the introduction.

It's a great pleasure to be here. Not just for myself, but on behalf of the

whole Global Monitoring Report team and our colleagues in the UNESCO Institute for Statistics. We really welcome this opportunity to present the report here and to participate in the discussion after.

Bertram Russell once said that education is the greatest enemy of intelligence and freedom of thought. I think what unites us all in this room is that we don't believe that and we believe that education is, as Jacques set out, is something that is profoundly important at many levels.

And I do think sometimes, you know, when you've worked for so long on such a long report and you've processed so much data, it's very easy to lose sight of the human face, of what we're all interested in this room, I think, which is the entitlement of highly vulnerable, highly disadvantaged people to get a decent quality education.

And I was very lucky last week, actually, to visit the constituency of one of our guests today, Mohamed Elmi, the Minister for Northern Kenya, and spoke to parents and kids who were attending a nomadic school. And these are schools in desperately poor areas, where families have got together to somehow find the resources to hire a teacher. The kids sit on the floor under an acacia tree with a blackboard hanging from there -- from the branches. And you actually really realize when you speak to people like that just how powerful the drive is to get an education that can help to transform your life and change your life. And I think that's what we're interested in in the Global Monitoring Report, and it's what we're all concerned with here today.

As some of you will have noticed, somewhat critically in some cases, it is a pretty long report. And because this is a pretty short presentation, I'm going to skim over a lot of things.

I want to just take you really through three core parts of the report, which is some of the headline messages that come out of the monitoring section, the monitoring of

the six Education for All goals; the thematic section of the report, which is on reaching the marginalized; and then to say a few words at the end about financing.

Before I start, I do want to reflect just very briefly on a point that Jacques made about the importance of this year. We're one primary school generation from the target date for the 2015 goals. As I'll show during my presentation, we're not currently on track. If we want to get back on track, the time to do it is now. This is the window of opportunity. There's no point waiting until 2012 or 2013 to put in place investments that you need to deliver the results by 2015. So, we need to act now.

There are real opportunities, including the World Cup. Although I hate to say it, but in a straight competition between the World Cup and education, I think education may lose out, at least for some of the -- but there is a big campaign developing around the World Cup for education, and I think we should seize that opportunity. But on the other side, they're a real threat.

And we are, I think, already beginning to see the after-effects of the financial crisis in some of the poorest countries. And there are two primary transmission mechanisms that are very dangerous, I think, in terms of progress towards the goals. One of them is rising poverty and threats to nutritional status. And we're already starting to see some very worrying numbers come in in both of those areas. But as growth effect starts seeping through into government revenues and budgets, there are clearly potentially damaging finance implications for Sub-Saharan Africa in particular, but also other regions.

We have a back-of-the-envelope calculation in the report, which is that other things being equal, if you factor in the growth and revenue effects of the financial downturn for Sub-Saharan Africa, it roughly translates into a 10 percent per capita loss of financing per child in primary education. That is a very big hit in a country that has still got a long way to go to achieve the goals. And I think it demands of us a significantly scaled-up

concessional aid response.

I'm not sure who's controlling the PowerPoint, actually. Is somebody -- oh, I am. Oh, excellent. (Laughter)

MR. WATKINS: That's what --

SPEAKER: (inaudible)

MR. WATKINS: That's what too much education does for you. I hadn't worked that out.

So, let's start briefly with progress towards the goals. Just to touch on some of the key messages, one of the themes that we -- one of the concerns that we identified in last year's report was the state of children entering primarily education systems. I think we're all pretty good at monitoring enrollment rates and throughput through basic education systems, but we sometimes don't attach enough weight to the health status of kids who are going into schools.

There is something like 175 million children aged between 0 and 5 who have experienced severe malnutrition at some stage during those critical preschool years. And we've got Beth King with us today from the World Bank who knows an awful lot more about this than I do. But I think the jury is in on this, you know, that once you've gone through that experience of severe malnutrition, there's usually no way back. The costs are irreversible. And unless we tackle that problem, I think no amount of progress in enrollment in primary education is going to get us towards where we need to be.

There are examples that we give in the report. There's new research that we cite from Peru, but also from Nicaragua, where conditional cash transfer programs have made a real difference in terms -- both in terms of malnutrition and in terms of the registered cognitive development effects.

The UPE story -- Universal Primary Education story -- and the out-of-school

numbers I'm going to come back to in a moment. There's actually quite a bit of good news since Dakar: 33 million fewer children out of school; some of the world's poorest countries making pretty extraordinary progress actually. And we cite cases like Benin, Mozambique Tanzania, Senegal, countries like Bangladesh that have made a real breakthrough in gender parity. I mean, these are gains that are -- at the time of the Dakar conference, I think all of us, if we were honest, would probably have said were not likely to happen. So, there's a lot of very positive news out there.

There's also a lot of negative news and not all of it applies to the poorest countries. We identified Turkey and the Philippines as countries that are doing far worse in basic education than one would anticipate on the basis of their income. This is linked to what I'm going to talk about in the second part of the presentation, which is the scale of marginalization in both of those countries.

Thanks to the, I have to say, very professional lobbying and advocacy efforts of people who work on technical and vocational education, we were really pushed this year into looking in more depth at that issue. I'm not going to try and summarize this section, but it's clearly an absolutely critical area, especially, I think, in a domain of second chance opportunities and strengthening employment opportunities for young people entering the employment market.

The evidence, however, is pretty worrying because I think a lot of TIVET systems are -- appear not to be delivering the employment outcomes that one would have hoped for. And there's quite a big discrepancy between the type of skills that are being accumulated in those systems and the type of skills that are being demanded in employment markets. Maybe this is one of the things that we can come back to in discussion.

Another area of concern is adult literacy, where this is really become something of a forgotten Education for All goal. The progress report is pretty shocking. And

I think there is a tendency on the part of many governments to think that this is just very difficult to do. And if you're going to do it, it's going to be very high cost.

Well, I think there's some research coming out of Brazil now, in the national literacy programs there, that breakthroughs are possible, but it clearly needs to be pushed much farther up the political agenda than is currently the case.

Just to come back to the out-of-school story, this is what the picture looked like at the time of the Dakar conference, for those of you who are old enough to remember back to those heady days. There were 105 million kids out of school, just under half of them in Sub-Saharan Africa, a slightly smaller number out of school in South and West Asia.

If you look at the progress report since then, there has been a very big drop. And it -- there's been a drop in the context of a rising child population in many countries. And again, that is an extraordinary achievement, particularly in many low-income countries.

The worrying sub-picture in this trend is that if you look at that decline, most of it happens between 2002 and 2004, and most of it happens in South and West Asia. And within that, actually, the big bulk of that takes place in India. So, the progress has been uneven both across time and across regions. And it's slowing down. And I think, going back to Jacques' initial point, this demands, I think, a greater sense of urgency on the part of all of us to change that trend.

If we don't change the trend, this is broadly where we're heading for the 2015 target date. And, of course, at that date, we should have almost no children out of school. We're on a trajectory now which will leave us with around 56 million out of school. That is a very big number in the midst of an increasingly knowledge-based global economy. It has implications for the economic growth prospects of countries, for employment generation, for health, for governance, for democracy, and in many other areas.

And I think it's important for all of us who work in education to communicate those wider consequences of failing to meet the target. Education is a basic human right, and it matters in and of itself. But the ramifications for missing the target are very serious indeed.

One of the issues that we pay a lot more attention to this year is quality learning achievement. And it is a concern that many countries are moving much further and much faster on the headcount indicators of progress than they are on the learning achievement indicators for progress. And if you just take one example here, this is a spread of learning achievement data from, on the left-hand side, the OECD countries. And you can see all of those countries are above this red line. The red line is a low learning achievement level under the TIM scoring system.

You can see in a country like Ghana, 90 percent of students in the 8th grade score below that minimum line. That, of course, understates the problem because it's only capturing the test scores of children who are in school. But it gives you some idea of the learning achievement, of the qualitative gaps in education that lie behind the quantitative gaps that I set out a little bit earlier.

And to move on to the second area -- and I really apologize I'm going to have to skim through some of this pretty quickly -- there's a good reason for focusing on the marginalized in education, and it's not just a theoretical reason. If we don't do it, we're not going to reach the target. I mean, that, I think, goes without saying.

But I think there is a political problem. The closer you get to the target, the more difficult it becomes to take the next step. It's harder to reach kids who are in acute poverty or the most remote regions of a country or are facing the most significant stigmatization in society than it is to reach the average child. We could have a long debate about what we mean about marginalization, and there's several libraries full of sociological

literature on this.

We treat it in a pretty simple way, as a form of persistent and acute disadvantage in education. I'll come back to what I mean by that in a second.

But I think the point of looking at marginalization is to do something about it. There's a very nice sentence in a Martin Sens book on justice, which I've put up here, where he talks of clearly remediable injustices around us which we want to eliminate. I think marginalization in education is a very good example of a clearly remediable injustice in most countries.

In the report, we have three areas that -- three thematic areas for marginalization. One is the issue of measurement, the second looking analytically at what are the drivers of marginalization in different countries, and third, exploring some of the remedies.

We've developed, for the purposes of the report, a new tool. It's called the Deprivation and Marginalization in Education Indicator, which sounds like a little bit of a mouthful, but it actually does something very simple. We've reconfigured national census and household survey data to basically try and identify who in societies across the world have less than four years in school and less than two years in school. And we take the four-year threshold as a sort of education poverty threshold; that if you get less than that, your prospects of having accumulated the literacy and numeracy skills that you need to realize your potential in life are pretty close to zero.

If you run the numbers that we've done for a country like Nigeria, this just ranks a group of countries on average number of years in school by the age 17 to 22, and for Nigeria, on average, it's around 6.7. If you start looking at who's hovering around the education poverty line, what have -- you know, as you would expect, the poorest 20 percent of Nigerian society figure down there -- the poor -- the rural poor are in a much worse

position than the urban poor. But there are specific groups, and in this case the one we've picked out is poor, rural, Hausa girls, who at the age of 17 to 22, on average, have accumulated 3 months of education.

Now, that tells you something, I think, about the depth of the problem and about some of the issues that are involved. There are cultural issues, there are poverty related issues, there are regional issues, none of which are easy to resolve, but are important to identify.

I'm going to skip the next one, actually.

We explore in the report a whole range of drivers of marginalization, from income poverty to stigmatization to health-related issues. I'm not going to go through the country evidence that we look at, but I think what comes out of it is that if you want to tackle the problem, you can't do it in a partial manner. That is to say, just as marginalization in education is driven by many factors, some of which happen in the school, some of which happen in the home, some of which are rooted in wider structures of inequality in society, you have to tackle them on all three fronts. You have to tackle them in the learning environment, you have to tackle them with respect to the accessibility of schools and the affordability of schools, and you have to expand opportunities and entitlements.

We look at some of the redistributor strategies that work in these areas, ranging from the type of -- if you take the case of Brazil, of putting in place conditional cash transfer programs, which tackle the accessibility and affordability issue; putting in place redistributive education financing policies, transfers from rich states to poor states aimed at equalizing the learning environment as well as a range of additional policies for reaching out to groups like child laborers.

I want to conclude by saying a few words about aid. I think we're all aware that addressing the type of problems that we set out in the report and getting back on track

for the targets requires above all that governments bite the bullet and get serious about equalizing opportunity for all of their citizens. But it's also going to require a scaled-up aid effort, and a scaled-up aid effort is what we're not getting.

If you look at commitments to education, which is what the -- for basic education, which is the shaded bottom part of the graph here, you can see a 20 percent decline in 2007 by comparison with 2006. There's a wide spectrum of performance among different donors on education, but if you take the effort collectively, the story is one of failure that donors are not living up to the pledges that were made at Dakar.

We've tried to estimate in the report what we see as a ballpark figure for the financing gap. I'm getting signals that I've only got two minutes left, so I'm going to rush this a little bit. But for the 47 low-income countries that we look at, the -- we estimate the average -- roughly the resource envelope that's required for achieving the basic education goals is in the order of $36 billion U.S. Current expenditure in those countries is around the $12 billion mark. If you factor in additional growth between now and 2015, it would add another $3 billion. The scope for redistribution, as we all know, within budgets, greater equity and the direction of resources into basic education, a scaled-up revenue effort, and so on, which could generate another $4 billion, but that still leaves you with a financing gap of around $16 billion.

Now, if you run that gap against current aid for the same group of countries, the current provision is around $3 billion. If you were to factor in the increment that would arrive were donors to deliver on the commitments they made in 2005 under the Gleneagles Agreement to double aid, it would actually translate into something like an additional $2 billion for education.

In other words, we're looking roughly at an 11 billion U.S. dollar shortfall. Of course, a lot of that is going to have to come out of a scaled-up aid effort, and I think this

brings us back to Jacques' point of how do we mobilize to achieve that. But I also think we need to face up to the fact that it's not all going to come out of concession aid and we are going to need to look far more seriously at innovative financing.

The very last point I wanted to make was on the Fast Track Initiative, which has our treatment of the Fast Track Initiative has attracted a certain amount of controversy. What -- our critique of the initiative is really that it's not delivering on he scale that's required. The level of ambition is too low, the throughput of financing is too low, and the disbursement is too slow. None of this is a question of blaming institutions or individuals within institutions, and I would argue that many of the failings that we're seeing in the Fast Track Initiative today go back to basic design flaws in the original project. It was never particularly clear, was this supposed to really fill the financing gap or was it supposed to help the wider donor community mobilize additional resources.

If we're facing a financing gap on the scale that we've set out here, we need a multilateral mechanism that is capable of moving resources more quickly and on the scale required. The current framework is not fit for purpose. I think the reform debate over fast track is the time and the opportunity to do that. But to seize that opportunity, we really need the one critical ingredient that's been missing so far, and that is political leadership. And just speaking bluntly here, I think the level of political leadership -- and I'm talking about leadership on the donor side here -- that we've seen in education has really not matched up to what we've seen in other sectors, like health. And, you know, that's one of the things that we really need to change.

So, Jacques, I'd like to leave it there. Thank you very much. (Applause)

MR. van der GAAG: Thank you, Kevin, for this great presentation on what is actually -- and I should have said it earlier -- an excellent report. But I assumed that you all have read it already, so you knew that.

Can I invite the panel members to take their seats? And I'd like to introduce the first member of the panel, Minister Mohamed Ibrahim Elmi. Mohamed is Minister of State for the development of Northern Kenya. And under his leadership, the new ministry is helping to develop a nomadic education policy, laying down innovative strategies to expand learning opportunities among vulnerable and marginalized community in Northern Kenya.

So, our next presentation will give us a glimpse of what it takes on the ground to deal with the main topic of this report, marginalized kids who have very little chance to enjoy a decent education.

Mohamed, may I invite you?

MR. ELMI: Mine will not be as colorful and informative as what Kevin has done.

I would like to just say it's a pleasure to be with you here today to discuss this important publication. I welcome the leadership of UNESCO in highlighting this critical issue of my generalization in education and, in doing so, setting example for all of us to follow.

I come from a family of nomadic pastoralists. I know that too many families like mine have to balance between the demands of their life roots with their desire for their children to learn, simply because our education systems is normally built upon a fixed school system. As a result, around 400,000 pastoralist children in Kenya are currently out of school, close to 1/3 of our total out of school population -- close to 2/3. Many of these are girls. In my constituency fewer than one in five girls are enrolled in school.

But another reason for this low achievement in education is the historical marginalization of the area where most pastoralists live. The arid lands of Northern Kenya are poorly served with infrastructure and resources. There are nearly 3,000 worker in our primary schools.

As a Minister for Northern Kenya, my job is to tackle the chronic and the development of this region. Lack of access to quality education is a critical part of this. We will not overcome the deep challenges of poverty and inequality without a skilled and educated population. So, for me, my generalization is not an abstract concept. It is the heart of what I do.

This report by UNESCO shows that my generalization is truly a global problem. It touches on street children in Honduras and child laborers in India as well as children herding livestock in Kenya. International publications such as this one send a strong message, and a solid one at that, to governments around the world. And in this case, that inequality matters.

As political leaders, we must do far more to forecast on the children that are being left behind. I welcome the stand which UNESCO is taking on inequality and the message this report gives. It is the high time that we target the marginalized.

National data on progress achieved by each country hides a lot. We must target specific groups and regions within each country, which are falling behind against the Education for All goals.

These are often also the places where poverty is deepest, where the risk of conflict and instability is highest, and where inequality and education translate into other forms of deprivation. Kenya introduced free primary education in 2003, and we've really achieved a lot in terms of increasing the number. But we find that mobile pastoralists and slum dwellers face a unique challenge which require unique interventions before they can benefit from the national initiative.

The concept of education for all is built on the principle that education is a universal right. No child should be denied that right because of their livery system of their parent or other circumstances of their parents.

The scale of the problem is such that we would easily turn to despair. But despair is a luxury that these children can ill afford and rarely resort to themselves. We have a responsibility to keep hope alive. In Kenya, I'm working with my counterpart in Ministry of Education to find practical solutions to the challenge of marrying mobility and learning.

For example, we are exploring the contribution that distant learning could play through radio and/or Internet. We are establishing a national commission for nomadic education to lead the fight against this inequality. We are looking for new ways of attracting and retaining teachers in a difficult working environment through innovative and sustainable initiatives -- incentives. And we are creating an independent trust fund to finance tertiary education for girls from poor families, who, in time, we hope will become powerful role models to inspire future generations of female students.

We need to invest massive resources in marginalized areas if we are to remove these glaring regional disparities. Facilities such as Fast Track Initiative have an important role to play. Kenya has already benefited significantly from this. By September 2009, we had received U.S. $121 million. I'm aware that a debate on its reform is underway.

If my ministry could mobilize additional resources from this kind of facility specially targeted to the most disadvantaged children, we could be able to act on many of the recommendations of the report we are discussing here today. We need innovative and enhancing financing mechanism which target a fixed portion of these funds to marginalized areas and groups, and manage through a strong and accountable institutions, for this is much more than education. This is about the kind of world we want to live in, a world in which large sections of our populations are no longer left behind, a world in which all our children realize their hopes and dreams through the education they deserve. I congratulate and thank the team behind the UNESCO's Global Monitoring Report for showing us with such a clear term conviction what we must do to start bringing that world about.

Thank you. (Applause)

MR. van der GAAG: Thank you, Mohamed. It's always great to hear from initiatives on the ground and one thing to, you know, imagine the problem and bring it to a forum. But it's almost unimaginable to imagine the thousands of problems you encounter when you try to deal with such a difficult issue on the ground. So, your perspective is very welcome in this meeting.

The second panel member is Elizabeth King. By the way, I see that you already have clipped on your microphone. If you want to talk from there, it's fine. If you prefer here, it's also fine.

Beth is director of education in the Human Development Network of the World Bank. As such, she's the World Bank's main spokesperson for education policies. She has published very widely -- and I think many of you will know that -- on topics such as household investment in human capital; the linkages between education, poverty, and economic development; gender issues in education; and educational finance and the impact of decentralization reforms.

She will now talk about -- if I got that correctly, but you can change the topic any time you want to -- on the sources of and dimensions of marginalization. And looking forward to the next decade, how do we deal with what gradually will become the obvious consequences of the current financial crisis.

Beth?

MS. KING: Thank you very much, Jacques.

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. And thank you for coming to this lunch.

This is a wonderful report to read about this topic. It -- I think you got some flavor of what the report does from Kevin's presentation.

One of the -- I'd like to focus on three things. One is the source of marginalization, and Kevin has already mentioned some of this. I think it's very important to recognize that marginalization is not due to just one factor. Sometimes we just focus on gender or sometimes we just focus on urban rural differences or sometimes we just focus on ethnicity.

I think what Kevin's wonderful graph about Nigeria shows is that when you actually look at the intersection of the different sources of marginalization, you see this huge -- what we really mean by marginalized populations. And you saw this huge gap between the years of schooling achieved by the Hausa girls in rural areas, and who are poor and those who are not.

In my own country, in the Philippines, if I also do something similar, the poorest would look like the poor in Africa. And those who are richer or non-Muslim in urban areas are going to look more like -- in terms of education, are going to look more like Canada. You see this huge difference.

And all of our countries actually do have marginalized populations, and that's something to remember about this topic. It's not a topic only about poor countries. It's a topic about middle-income countries and also about rich countries. And I think what this report does give us is some framework for understanding marginalization in many different settings in many different countries.

Another point about the source of marginalization is that it's not -- or of the nature of marginalization is that although we're focusing today on education, it's not just education. Marginalized populations are marginalized not only in education. They are also marginalized in health care, they're going to be marginalized in the labor market. And, in fact, it's trying to -- it's understanding that marginalization appears in many different aspects of life that we begin to understand the immensity and the severity of this problem. And I will

get back to that in a little while.

Another wonderful point about this report, which it really brings across in a very strong and clear way, is that marginalization starts from birth. Very, very important, especially when we want to look at where are the correct entry points? Where are the effective entry points for policy? If it starts from birth, it means to say cognitive development, physical development of a child is already affected. And so when a child enters the school system, that child enters with a lot of disadvantage.

As Kevin was saying, stunting means to say a child does not enter school when that child is supposed to enter school. And even when that child enters school, that child basically is not going to be able to learn what he or she has to learn. In this case, usually "she," as you saw from the case of Nigeria.

Even all things constant -- that means, even if you correct the supply conditions -- you're still going to -- that child is still going to face disadvantage. And so when we think about the MDGs -- the Millennium Development Goals -- and the goals for education and that, we cannot really achieve this unless we respond to this various sources of disadvantage for the poorest.

When we think about the MDGs, we think about average numbers. And what this report shows is that when we focus on averages by countries, we miss a lot. We miss the disadvantage, because it's really in the inequalities and who are in the bottom of the distribution where we need to make the biggest impact.

I did say that a very important point for the policymakers is to identify the entry points. And so, thinking about the life cycle of a child is -- of a person is very important, of a child is very important. And the entry points there -- the book says early childhood development is a very important entry point. When the child leaves school -- and that could be quite early -- is another entry point because we need to think about second chances. We

need to think about remedial ways for actually achieving education and the skills needed for life and for work in the labor market.

We need to be able to identify, in particular, what to do with respect to demand. As policymakers, we tend to think about the supply side: build a school, build appropriate classrooms, put teachers in those, address the scarcity of textbooks, and other school supplies. But marginalized populations are in a way different from just -- if you're marginalized, it's different from just being poor. Because the marginalization, since it also is seen in the labor market, let's say, means to say that we have something special, a special problem on the demand side.

What do I mean by that? It means to say that if you think parents and children, or youth, are rational beings, it means to say that how what they see as their potential -- is the potential benefit to education in society and the economy are going to drive the decisions that they make about education. If they are marginalized, then what they see as the benefits to them of education as citizens or as workers in the labor market are going to be different. And so simply putting a school in the village is not going to solve that problem of wanting to do -- want to achieve more education.

Now, I don't mean -- this is not to say there are no exceptions. But I'm just saying that the demand side of marginalization is very important.

Kevin did mention conditional cash transfers, conditional cash transfer programs. Try to do something about the demand side of this issue.

Finally, he had also mentioned the financial crisis and the danger that puts on the progress we've gained in education. How robust is the educational progress we've seen in many countries? And there has been progress. If you just look at averages and years of schooling and even in learning indicators, we do see progress since 1990.

All right. How robust is this progress with respect to marginalized

populations? If, in fact, marginalized populations are more disadvantaged with respect to the quality of schooling and, therefore -- and the quality of classroom instruction, if they also have much more fragile demand for education, then the financial crisis is going to have a larger impact on them; those who have looked, for example, at the responsiveness of poor people versus non-poor people with respect to prices.

All right. We see that poor people, on average, are more responsive. In economist terms, it's more elastic. The demand for education is more elastic to price. So, when you change the price of schooling, as in if the financial crisis is going to force, for example, schools to start charging some fees -- and they may not call it fees, they might just call this contributions, voluntary contributions. But if the financial crisis actually forces schools to do that in order to stay -- in order to survive, then we know who are going to be hit more. And these are going to be the poor and the marginalized populations.

And I think that the quality of education -- probably much more than the quantity of education, much more than the years of schooling or enrollment rates -- it's going to be hit harder. So, we need to watch out for this effect on the quality of instruction, the quality of schools, because this is what's going to be hit hardest by this financial crisis.

The projections for growth in the poorer countries after this recovery are quite modest, and that's actually optimistic. And so we need to think about what the next 10 years is going to look like for many of our poor countries. Many poor countries, because their financial system is less connected to the global financial system, probably did not feel as much the cost, the consequences, of the financial crisis.

However, that financial crisis has an effect on their export competitiveness, on their ability to export, and, therefore, on their growth. And that's going to translate into lower revenues for government and, therefore, a lower ability of government to provide the kinds of services that they've been able to provide. So, I think here we need to really watch

what's happening to marginalized populations for the different reasons that the report gives us.

So, on that note, thank you very much. (Applause)

MR. van der GAAG: Thank you, Beth.

I have a question for the audience. How many of you are or have been schoolteachers?

So, then the next speaker will be in very good company. She currently is senior education advisor at UNICEF in New York. For the past 20 years, she has worked on education issues in countries as diverse as Nigeria and China, Botswana, and Ghana, Liberia, Zambia, and I probably forget a few. And she has been a secondary school teacher.

Barbara, the floor is yours.

MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you very much.

You know, if you looked at those of us who are seated here as individuals, it pretty much reflects the aggregate of data in the report. Think about it.

However, the paths that each of us took to get here this afternoon are different. I think that's what underscores the second theme in the report that Kevin brought out.

And thank you very much, Kevin. It's an excellent report. I was delighted to see the Education Deprivation Indicator. It's a tool that we can use. And again, this report will be our go-to report for data and statistics.

I took a look at the EFA (inaudible) declaration and the goals therein, and the Dakar declaration and the targets that were set. And I'd invite you to do your own audit from your perspective. We'll arrive at the same conclusions: much progress has been made; there is much to be done.

From the three themes that Kevin focused on, I'd like to talk a little bit first about marginalization, and I endorse everything that he said and everything that Beth said. And I wanted to add that it's not just the interaction in the individual indicators that affect each of us, but the intersection. And if we think about the intersection between, for example, genealogy, just look at CNN and generation and gender, we begin to understand how important it is that the solutions that we devise have to be focused on individuals as well as the aggregate.

And this is a bit of a challenge because as policymakers and as practitioners we tend to think in terms of the aggregate. But in order to reach the marginalized we'll have to focus a little bit more on individuals, where they are. And gender interacting with all the social markers that were mentioned is absolutely important.

What is of concern to me is that I -- as I look at some of what we call the emerging issues, and they've actually emerged pretty much -- transients, in all its splendid glory; migration; urbanization; mobility; voluntary; involuntary -- think about Haiti today, what's going to happen there? That's a wonderful, horrific laboratory for what we profess as education policymakers and practitioners. Climate change and its interaction with transients, the explosion of information technologies, all of these, ladies and gentlemen, are going to exacerbate social location.

And if you look at the report, one of the things that it brings out so remarkably well is that in this global village where we all find ourselves, the center globally and the center in each nation are coming together, and the gap between the center and the periphery within nations, within groups, and the center and the periphery globally is expanding.

My nieces and nephews look a lot more like you do than most of the population of my home country Ghana. Agreed? There's a reason for that. It's around

gender, genealogy, generation, socioeconomic status, the level of education that our parents had, and we can go on and on.

I met a 15-year-old girl 2 years ago, a lovely young woman. She is so fast on the technology. She interferes with my phone and she tells me what I can do with it. And she asked me so what is an encyclopedia? And I went, duh? And she was genuine. That's the gap right there.

So, since all of us who are in here are practitioners, then what's more important for me this afternoon it's not what's going on in your heads, because I know what's going on in your heads. It's what do you do when you leave here. What's the agency of each of us in the room to change two things?

I think we need to overhaul what we do as education practitioners. How do we spend our time? How do we spend our money? What do we do with reports and analyses that we produce? How do we translate them into information that decision makers can use? How do we prepare this and make decision makers for the decisions that they have to make, and how do we hold them accountable? Are we morally prepared to hold them accountable? Have we got to the point where from a human rights perspective is the claim to good quality education justiciable, and have we explored that sufficiently well?

By overhauling what we do as practitioners, I think that's where the difference is going to come. You know, when I look at sometimes how we allocate funds to education, we keep throwing good money after bad. And one of the things we don't do very well as practitioners is try to figure out what are the bad practices in which we have engaged over the last 30 years, where are the failures? So, we talk a lot about good practices and lessons learned, and I love that.

We need to explore bad practices, not because they are morally bad, but because they didn't work. And we need to juxtapose those with good practices. We need to

understand why they worked, where they worked, where they didn't work, and make the difference from that.

And that's what all of us need to do as policymakers and practitioners. And the report underscores the fact that that's the only way we'll actually get to the marginalized.

The report and Kevin spoke about increasing aid flows. I do not like aid, I'm sorry. I work in a development organization, I don't like aid. And so I've begun to talk about increasing the investment in education. We're talking about greater volumes of financing, a different type of financing and education, and greater efficiency and effectiveness of financing.

And when we talk about financing, we're talking about returns on the financing, which brings us to public-private partnerships and what can hardcore, hardheaded business men and women get out of investing in education, either because people are going to buy their goods and services because they're better prepared to do that or they're going to fund their factories better or something. But it really is a hardcore investment argument that we have to make. No longer can we stand as moral beings and say that education is a right. We know that, ladies and gentlemen. The people who have the money are there -- haven't bought into that yet.

And so, when we talk about expanding partnerships, yes, we need aid, we need people to deliver on aid commitments. I'm not knocking that. We absolutely do. We've got to bring other sources of financing into the mix. We've got to look at demand and supply and get that going.

And finally, coming back to who we are as a group. And I say this advisedly and with all humility because I'm part of the Education for All movement, I think we need to change our rhetoric. I know that it's good to have free education, but when governments have to make hard choices and Economics 101 tells us that money is limited,

finite, when we think about the money that goes into educating the richest -- the top 20 percent of our populations in poor countries with the scholarships from birth to university grad school, post-grad, et cetera -- and the returns that devolve to those countries like mine, it does not make any absolute economic sense. I'm talking from a personal perspective, I'm talking about a national perspective, and I'm talking from a perspective of a practitioner, to go back on our rhetoric will take a lot of courage. We were not wrong in 1990. We were absolutely right.

Times have changed, the situation has changed. And so what I would push for would be those three things, that we actually overhaul what we do as practitioners, how we spend our time, our money, our intellect, our resources so that the systemic and systematic approach that we take to building education systems from the bottom up to address the issue of marginalization responds to the averages, but also to the individuals; that we bring different people into public and private partnerships. Civil society organizations are not enough. We love them, but they cannot finance education in and of their own.

And then in order to get this through, to change what we do, how we do it, to bring more people, how do we change the rhetoric.

Thank you very much. (Applause)

MR. van der GAAG: Thank you very much. And I think you put a very strong set of challenges in front of each and every one of us. I hope we can get back to that.

The final panel member is Rebecca Winthrop. She is my colleague at the Center for Universal Education. Before that, she worked -- before she worked at the Center she was head of education for the International Rescue Committee, which is a humanitarian aid NGO. And she will talk about conflict-affected countries and the potential role of donors in education in those countries.

MS. WINTHROP: I think my leg fell asleep. (Laughter)

I'm going to sit here. Can you all hear me? Yes, I'm fine? I'm going to jiggle it gently, so.

So, anyways, thank you very much, Kevin. It's a really interesting report and I congratulate you and your whole team. And I would encourage you who -- all of you who got a copy to read it. I've already, you know, quickly marked mine up. And if anybody is tempted to just skim through it very briefly, I would encourage you to pause especially on the depravation and marginalization of education index, which I think is really very, very cool and a great contribution.

So, what I'm going to talk about today is general comments and feedback on one of the themes of the report that came out around the impact of conflict, political violence, and armed conflict. And communities who are affected by those things are much more likely to be marginalized in terms of access to quality education.

And I really have four very, very simple points. The first one is very simple, which is if you weren't convinced -- in the report, it comes out very strongly that inclusive education and reaching quality -- access to quality education for these very marginalized populations is really important not only for economic growth, but, you know, for human rights and social justice.

And if you weren't convinced by that, which I certainly am, but maybe more people need more convincing. I think a really good argument to make is that, you know, reaching the most marginalizing and inclusive education is also really important for global stability. And in a world where we are really concerned about insecurity and global stability, I think it is very relevant.

Just a few quick facts for those of you who think, well, what is she talking about? An increase by 10 percent in secondary school enrollment reduces the risk of countries being affected by conflict by 3 percent. Additionally, there's been a lot of research

around equitable distribution of education, and here we're really talking about what Kevin and his team are talking about on the report in terms of reaching those most marginalized sub-national populations. So, equitable distribution of education is an effective predictor of democratic governance. So, that's the first point. Let's -- you know, we can also use this data that's presented here to think about it in terms of the importance for global stability.

My second point, which comes out very strongly in the report, is that communities affected by armed conflict and political violence, it's not just a few communities and a few countries around the world. Unfortunately, this is a really, really big problem. If we want to reach those EFA targets, those Education for All targets in the Millennium Development Goals, like Kevin talked about, we have got to tackle how to work and how to reach these kids and adults and youth in these countries.

A third of all the primary age school kids who are out of school reside in these countries, and that's about 25 million children. So, it's a really large number and it's a significant percentage. Of all, there's about 14 million children and youth who've been forcibly displaced from their homes as a result of conflict. And education itself, whether that's schools, teachers, whatever, is often under attack in these particular countries.

There's a really interesting report coming out that's being updated by UNESCO around sort of the attacks on education in these context. So, schools are, you know, they -- their data says that around 32 countries there's been thousands and thousands of incidents of schools being blown up, teachers and students and other academics and education officials being harassed and kidnapped and imprisoned and beaten and shot and raped -- all, you know, horrible, horrible things -- while at school or going to and from school. So, this is depressing and awful and mostly for the people who are living this on a daily basis around the world. But it gives you a sense of what is at stake and how very, very difficult it is to try to work in these contexts. So, it is a really large

problem.

And my third point is that we're not -- not only are we not doing enough to address it as donors or as the sort of global aid community, we're not doing the right things. You know, Kevin showed a great -- that graph of, you know, here's the financing gap; here's the little bit that countries themselves can do; and there's still $11 billion missing. Within that $11 billion, we have to do things really differently. The donor aid architecture -- and I thought that was very provocative. Don't call it aid. I like it donor investment architecture; that means something else to a lot of us, but is not set up well at all to try to address this particular problem. And specifically, how do they engage in countries affected by conflict?

And so I have come up with colleagues here at the Center for Universal Education and at CFPT Education Trust, which is in the U.K., we've come up with -- we're starting a research project on sort of how exactly can we do this work. And specifically, what are the things that donors can do?

We have seven ideas that we're going to start exploring. So, you know, what are the seven things that donors need to do? First of all, one is an obvious one: We need to make sure that more money gets to these particular countries. Right now, even though a third of the kids who are out of school globally reside in these countries, only one-fifth of all the education aid goes to these particular contacts. So it's not even proportionate.

Secondly, and this is something that the donors have been very bad at -- which you can understand from their perspective, but it doesn't matter, we need to address it -- is we need to start supporting recurrent costs, which is largely teacher salaries, frankly. There's other recurrent costs. Any sort of given education budget at country level is probably 80 to 90 percent teacher salaries. And there's absolutely no way to support education for these kids in conflict without supporting ongoing teacher salaries.

A third way -- a third thing that needs to happen which the report talks quite

a bit about is to really reform the multilateral donor aid architecture, which is largely the EFA Fast Track Initiative. For a long time, you know, countries affected by conflict were not at all included in this multilateral aid architecture. And it's beginning to be an issue that they're trying to address more seriously, although they haven't exactly worked out how to do it. But it's really important that, you know, bilateral donors who perhaps don't have a presence in a conflict-affected country or can't be all over the place in some of these dangerous situations can have a way to channel their funds through a multilateral aid system that can get to these countries. So reforming FTI to ensure that countries affected by conflict can be easily included is really important.

The fourth thing is that there needs to be very consistent funding and policies across humanitarian aid and development aid and the transitions in between so that education can continue throughout these difficult circumstances. And right now that's not happening at all. There's sort of pockets of sort of ebbs and flows of aid depending on if you're in a humanitarian crisis or if you're deemed, you know, good enough for development. So humanitarian aid right now, globally only 2 percent is dedicated -- of all the global humanitarian aid 2 percent is dedicated to education. So it makes it very difficult to have any sort of continuity across these very difficult contexts.

The fifth thing is that donors need to do a better job -- and this is certainly in partnership with lots of other folks -- but trying to develop national scale interventions and programs. And this is really hard where there might not be a government through which you can work. So, you know, really what a lot of times happens in these contexts is perhaps really good, high-quality programs, but they're only in, you know, a small region of a country; or they do, you know, that region gets a great NGO program and another region gets nothing. So it's very sort of spotty and quite difficult. And that's something that needs to be thought about. How do you even do that in these contexts?

The sixth thing is multiyear funding. Long-term commitments are really important. It's really, you know, this is for probably any development work, but it's really impossible with aid volatility, sort of fits and spurts, money flowing in really rapidly for a couple years and then stopping and then, oh, if the situation gets worse money will flow in again. You know, that really hampers any type of ability to support quality continuous education across these really difficult and volatile contexts.

And the last thing that can make a big difference -- and I don't think is too horrifically hard in concept, it just needs some thinking through -- is donors. We need to work with our civil society partners or their civil society partners to scale up all the good projects that happened in the humanitarian context and the real emergency context and bring them to scale in a way that doesn't undermine the authority of any emerging government. And so that is very tricky, but certainly could be feasible to do, but is really quite important.

So those, I think, are big challenges, but I have no concern that they can't be met. These are all things that are, you know, within our purview if we really want to put some political muscle behind it and do it.

My last point, fourthly, just very shortly, is that throughout all of those seven things, one thing that is really important is a commitment to quality education. And for a long time I think those of us who work in global education and talk a lot about access and then we say, oh, and also there should be quality. And I think, you know, the time is past when we need to do that. We need to talk about access to quality education hand-in-hand. There's absolutely no point in scaling up things or going with national scale if what you're scaling up you're not learning anything or if, you know, you're actually putting yourself in danger by attending schools, which often could be a case if you don't have high-quality education in conflict context.

And it's especially important for -- if you think about conflict countries, they want -- education is crucial. Critical thinking, literacy, numeracy, these are all really crucial skill sets to rebuild a country and the later sort of higher order skill sets that you develop in secondary education are crucial to rebuild a country. And you need quality education to gain those.

So those are my four things. And with that I'll close. (Applause)

MR. van der GAAG: Four things?

SPEAKER: Four. Four. There are four. There were seven in between.

MR. van der GAAG: I counted seven. Well, thanks very much members of the panel. You put up a lot of important topics and I'm sure each and every one of you have many important topics to add to that.

Let me just mention a few before I start the discussion. The first one that's in the title of the report is really the question how to address the marginalized in education, how to put the issue of marginalization higher on the global policy agenda, and how to learn from underground experiences such as those presented by Minister Elmi.

The second one is about the Global Financial Architecture for Education. I mean, I think nobody said it so bluntly, but apparently we're not up to the task at the moment and we fall short -- fall short in dollars, but also in contents.

Should there be a Global Fund? I think it's only Barbara who mentioned the private sector or public-private partnerships. I don't even think it's in the report. I may have overlooked that. But is there a role for the private sector? And if so, what would it be? Are there other more innovative ways of getting stable resources for education? Should we use the health sector as a potential example?

The third issue would be the learning issue. It starts at birth or maybe even in utero. How can we bring the lessons that are abundant from the early child development

literature into this discussion of learning and education at a global scale?

Fourth I would say is a very urgent matter. Kevin has already said, you know, this is the last year that we can get kids in school if we want them to graduate in 2015. If we don't get them in school this year then, you know, then this window of opportunity has been lost. Is there a way to give this year an extra push to get the kids that are currently not in school and should be there in school in 2010?

And I'm sure you all have many more issues that you want to ask questions about because the vast majority of you are actually teachers. I was surprised to see that -- or have been teachers.

So the floor is wide open. Simple rules are microphones -- where are the microphones? In the back. Raise your hand and a microphone will come to you. Please stand up and say your name and your affiliation and perhaps, if you want, the person that you would like to answer the question.

The floor is open. I have one here. I have two here.

MR. YOSHI: I'm Sudhamsu Yoshi and representing (inaudible) International Center on Child Labor and Education and also the Global March Against Child Labor.

MR. van der GAAG: No, no. Go ahead. I'm just directing microphones. Ask your question, please.

MR. YOSHI: Kevin, congratulations to you and to your entire team. It's a brilliant report.

My question is particularly on the point that you made that the biggest gains that have been made is in South Asia. And India and Bangladesh actually happen to be like, you know, really emerging forward with the numbers of children that are in schools. But also I think India and Bangladesh if you look back, where the Ministries of Education have

shown sort of real robustness in terms of managing complex institutional relationships between the Ministries of Education, Labor, Women and Child Development, and that entire put together, has really shown results.

So I was thinking is the tool that you have invented -- it's very, very interesting -- if it was in any way possible to kind of see how good governance in education and kind of a robust sort of management of institutional relationships between the various ministries has shown sort of results in some countries. So it would be an interesting tool to see where the governments are really doing good in delivery of education and how so much more matters where Education Ministries remain tied to (inaudible) compartments. And also an analogy of that would be also to see that how within the relationship between the World Bank, ILO, UNESCO itself and UNICEF, where you see that various sort of support mechanisms are there on poverty, on elimination of child labor, on education. But how do they relate with one another in supporting sort of national efforts?

Thank you.

MR. van der GAAG: Kevin, do you want to respond?

MR. WATKINS: Well, it's a very good question and there are a lot of different parts of it.

You know, we hope that that's all the deprivation and marginalization indicator will be used for: for governments and researchers who are trying to identify particularly disadvantaged and marginalized groups. At the moment, quite a lot of governments have expressed their displeasure at it all being made public. But one hopes that over time the displeasure will give way to happiness and interest.

SPEAKER: Or action.

MR. WATKINS: And even better that it will give way to action.

I mean, I actually think that the point that Beth made in her introduction is a

really important one -- that when you look at marginalization in education it's always very context-specific and it's always very complicated. You know, there are nutritional elements; there are job-related elements; there are parental education problems and so on. And I think unless you tackle it on multiple fronts, you're not going to get to where you need to be. And the examples that you give, I think, are very telling because that's precisely what specific countries have tried to do. If you look at Brazil, for example, you know, you've had a very strong strategy on nutrition; you've had a very strong strategy reaching black Brazilians in education; you've had very strong targeting policies in specific regions; you've had very strong policies on child labor. And it's been coordinated through a national strategy under the auspices of the President's office.

And I think too often what you see -- and I would say this is what I saw in Kenya -- I'm not sure if Mohamed would agree with me. Given that he's a cabinet minister, he may not be allowed to agree with me even if he does. But, you know, you have a lot of good things going on in the Education Ministry, but it's not clear they're being backed in other areas -- in the Health Ministry and other areas. So, you know, I think the question is not really a question. I mean, it's more a statement of what are the tolls and the approaches that one needs to make a difference. And I think it has to be joined up and integrated.

MR. BOLEG: My name is Burton Boleg . I'm a freelance reporter covering this issue for America.gov.

I was intrigued by the indication that Turkey and the Philippines are doing particularly badly, and I was wondering if we could get some more details on what the issues are in that country. And I remember last year, I guess from the monitoring report of last year, that in sub-Saharan African, I believe that Nigeria was the worst or one of the worst countries. I was wondering if we can get any kind of an update on if Nigeria has improved or what their situation is.

Thank you.

MR. van der GAAG: Thank you. Who would you like to give words of wisdom on that one? Anyone? Anyone has knowledge on this?

MR. WATKINS: I think Beth should answer the Philippines part.

MS. KING: Are you going to answer Turkey?

Well, I think, if I'm not mistaken, that statement comes from a relating income -- GDP per capita to education, and the Philippines falls below. And I think in terms of -- I actually mentioned it earlier that if you look at, for example, the Muslim provinces, there are 5 of them in a particular region, it's number 16. Just the bottom of all the regions. And if you look at that in terms of various indicators of social development or human development, it falls way below. And it's been so for years, for decades, and is, in fact, very related to what Rebecca was saying is -- I think underpins the conflict that's going on there, why this Mindanao conflict has been going on for decades.

And I actually tried to look at this because all the writing I have seen about this is about religion and politics. But when you look at the services available and indicators of human development, it's also at the very bottom. So a big question is, you know, which -- what is the cause and what is the consequence? It's very hard to disentangle those. But it is very helpful to see that, in fact, for all the regions it's at the very bottom with respect to education, with respect to health, et cetera.

That's why I said earlier if you look at those five provinces in the southern-most island, they have human development indicators that are comparable to averages in Africa, whereas the top region, which is the national capital region, has the average for Canada. That is really -- that's an incredible story right there. An incredible inequality. And I'm sure Brazil has the same because it's one of the most unequal countries in Latin America.

MR. WATKINS: Well, I mean, just very briefly, the answer to the Turkey question -- and I'm not an expert on Turkey -- but if you look at the data -- and we have a figure on this in the report -- the part of Turkey that's falling dramatically behind is the east. The group in the east that are falling dramatically behind our non-Turkey-speaking goals. And, in fact, if you take -- if you use our indicator and you look and you compile it for poor Kurdish-speaking goals in Eastern Turkey, the average accumulation of years in school at age 17 to 22 is equivalent to the level in Chad. And if you go to the other end of the scale it's best that it would presumably be somewhere up there with Canada. And I think what this tells you -- I mean, clearly there are a lot of language-related issues. There are poverty-related questions of critical cultural issues, but if Turkey wants to go the final mile toward that goal of UPE, these are the sorts of problems that have to be addressed.

MR. van der GAAG: Thank you. I think I have two questions there. Anybody? Something on Nigeria?

SPEAKER: Let me just say that you'd have to really -- without referencing political ramifications -- look at Nigeria's three regions: the North and the Southeast and the Southwest. And the statement about the center and periphery within each state is truest in Nigeria than any other country about which I could think. So you've got fabulous performance among the top 10 percent of the population, and then you've got another 40 percent of the population, and you've got another 40 percent of the population, and you've got a 10 percent who happen to be just what you saw in the report -- poor, rural, house of speaking girls. And the intersection of religion, politics, location, and genealogy, and generation are obvious.

MR. van der GAAG: Okay. Two there. Go ahead, please.

MR. WOLFE: Larry Wolfe . I'm currently unaffiliated. This is a question for Elizabeth King and others.

You mentioned in passing that there was progress in learning indicators. Now, I know there's progress in terms of more learning indicators, but have you perceived any progress and improvement in learning in specific countries? And if you have, what are some of the factors that you would attribute it to?

MS. KING: I have to quickly go through my head the various graphs that I've done.

First, progress in just measuring learning. This is huge. This is one of the biggest progresses in our sector in education and something we should really be doing if we want to look at marginalized populations.

For example, PISA , which OECD in Paris does. PISA International tests in 2000, I believe, there were -- it had only 43 countries or 44 countries. And in 2007, 67 countries had participated. So -- and more developing countries than ever before.

Now, is there progress? Well, in a way it's hard to see because of -- other countries are also progressing. But you do see a few countries which have moved up from the bottom relative to others. Again, because the number of countries participating is different so you don't necessarily see just how much -- so, for example, Indonesia has increased its standing relative to what it was before. But partly that's because more countries -- more developing countries have participated.

But in terms of other -- let's say we forget these international tests. I think there are some indicators from other evidence that say there is some progress in learning in terms of quality. Let's say indicators would be inputs available. So we sort of go back. I mean, this is something that I think is the shortcoming of our field. We sort of -- because we don't have necessarily comparable measures across countries, we go back to in a way more vulgar or crude measures which is, let's say, inputs per pupil. And there we do see some progress.

MR. van der GAAG: Okay. Thank you. Go ahead.

MR. SCOTT: I'm over-affiliated so I'll give you all of them. Michael Scott, Johns Hopkins School of Education and also Equity Matters.

And to your point, Barbara, what you're really talking about is a conversation around equity. And as you are looking at reframing language and rhetoric and action, have you -- what innovative ways have you thought to do that? And have you looked at other heretofore competing policy interests like health, so people that are doing social determinants of health and how that relates? Because education, we know, is a primary social determinant. Have you looked at other parallel policy pieces that might have converged and how are you getting that buy-in from the business community, as a capitalist slime ball pig myself, in reform? How are you making those business case arguments that are paired with the moral ones since some just don't care once you make the moral argument?

SPEAKER: Thanks. I think the biggest gains we can make right now are in two domains -- human rights, and that's around just the stability of the claim to education. I don't think we've exploited it enough. I think that many governments as representatives of the state have not been called into account for their unwillingness to provide education for children in all locations. And I'm talking about relatively well-off governments who systematically exclude minorities: linguistic minorities, ethnic minorities. But there is sufficient resource -- there's a sufficient resource base for those children to be included. And the gap that we see is not a gap in rhetoric around human rights because we've been talking about this, but a gap around holding governments to account for that. So that's one area where we can make some more gains.

The second one is around partnerships. One of the fragilities we have as education practitioners is that we don't have enough education economists to go around. If

you ask the average education practitioner how much more would it cost to get the 2,000 children in a particular location into school here, she will not know. And he or she will not know how to get from point A to point B. So that's something that we have to address so that better informs the whole discussion about what it would cost to finance education, whether it's a question of bottlenecks or systems or efficiency or effectiveness. And if we know where the shortfall is in time -- because it will change over time and by location -- then we can better look at improving financial flows.

Now, I'm not saying it's going to be easy, but obviously the money is out there. Health has done a better job, but then health is more -- we were talking about whether it is attractive or urgent. I don't know what it is. But you talk about a child surviving and everybody tunes in. You talk about education and people's eyes glaze over because it's an 18-year activity. So how do you convince Procter & Gamble, Hewlett-Packard -- name any one of them -- to consistently invest in education because the returns will be there 25 years down the line.

And I've just called those names. Please, I'm not talking about those particular companies; I'm talking about garden variety, hardheaded business people.

MR. van der GAAG: Thank you. I have two additional men who want to ask questions. All the other questions will be asked by women because we want to be gender neutral here. And I have one woman right there already and a second one. We're getting better. Go ahead, please.

MR. JENNINGS: Thank you. My name is Wynn Jennings. I'm from the National Science Foundation. And I would like to -- and I thank you for all your presentations.

I would like to ask about another aspect of education. And that is, is there a role -- and if there is a role, has there been any progress in the area of what we might

commonly call informal science education? Let me say informal being out of school sort of learning that's gathering more strength, et cetera. And the obvious answer is there's not enough museums to go around, but might I focus your attention on cyber learning, which is falling into this area of informal science education.

Thank you.

MR. van der GAAG: Well, who wants to tackle this interesting question?

MS. WINTHROP: Well, I have one comment, but others will pitch in.

I mean, I think your point about -- you call it informal and I would probably talk about non-formal education interventions. Yeah. You know, that's a lot of times where kids learn the most -- sometimes outside of the classroom, unfortunately. But if you talk -- link it to the theme of the report around marginalization and reaching the most marginalized, I think there's a huge room for alternative education services. You know, governments need to be a lot more innovative on how they reach these folks. And I think, you know, cyber learning might work really well in certain countries where there is relevant technology and access to all that and can do a big leapfrog for accessing some of those marginalized populations. But non-formal education, especially if you think about youth, you know, most of the youth in sub-Saharan Africa are out of school. I think some statistic I read recently, like 85 percent of them are not really enrolled in formal schooling. Did I just make that up?

SPEAKER: Possibly.

MS. WINTHROP: Erase that statistic. (Laughter) Anyways, a lot. But the point is there isn't -- you know, if you think about what do you do for youth in terms of education, a lot of it is not going to be through the formal system. A lot of it is going to be linking to livelihoods and a lot of it can be around agriculture. And science is a huge component of that. So I think it's very important from that aspect.

I'm sure other people have other thoughts.

SPEAKER: Well, I wasn't going to answer the question specifically on science, but I think what Rebecca said is absolutely right. If you look at the adolescent population in low-income countries, you have as many out of school, again, as you have primary school aged population. And actually, I think one of the areas where there's been a lot of success is in reaching those groups.

And there are some examples that we use in the reports, some of which are just fantastic innovative examples, such as the Schools for Life project as it's called in Northern Ghana, which is one of the world's most disadvantaged education regions. And it targets people aged -- kids aged between 10 and 14. And it provides around a year or a year and a half of intensive education and literacy and numeracy with a view to getting them back into the formal system. Or in Bangladesh where you've got really disadvantaged kids living on riverbanks, many of them working as child laborers, and NGOs who have set up school boats to provide intensive teaching pairs to get these kids back into school.

And the best example -- and this goes back to the earlier question -- the best cases are where these are integrated into national strategies and then scaled up. And I think there are many successful examples of that.

I just want, if I may, to respond to the private -- role of the private sector in all of this. I think there are a lot of examples of really interesting private sector innovations. There's a whole group of companies that are working around this 21st century learning approach where they're developing innovative tools for measuring the quality of education, the relevance of education, and so on. Hewlett-Packard or another country are doing great things.

To me what's missing in education -- if you compare it with the health sector, like the Global Funds for HIV, AIDS, malaria, and tuberculosis, or the Garvey Alliance for immunization, there in those cases you have a multilateral framework which

facilitates the entry of those countries into already well-established programs or the expansion of programs. In education, you don't have that. So every country -- every company is doing this on sort of an initial start-up basis with really high transaction costs, very little sort of direction in terms of targeting resources and expertise in areas of the biggest disadvantage.

And I think if we had a reformed Fast Track Initiative that opened a window for those sorts of partnerships it would harness both the finance and the energy and innovation of the private sector in support of public sector -- public education programs. And that's really what's missing.

MR. van der GAAG: Thank you. I think, Beth, you --

MS. KING: Yes, just on the cyber learning. Governments are very interested in bringing computers to schools. A couple of problems -- three problems I see. One is that teachers don't know how to use them and there's no space during the day when they actually allow students to go to the computer labs, which are sitting empty because the curriculum hasn't actually adapted -- adopted -- adapted to the having computers as part of the student learning. And teachers don't necessarily welcome this.

Secondly, again, with respect to this topic of marginalization, households in marginalized populations are not going to have computers. And in many cases their languages may not actually be -- have -- they may not be written languages. Think about 80 languages in Laos, many of them without a script. So that's going to be -- that's a problem with respect to this topic.

Third, girls use computers differently than boys. So there are several things to think about with respect to possibly enlarging differences that already exist until we are able to really mainstream and for Ministries of Education to understand better how to use computers in their formal education.

MR. van der GAAG: Thank you. I have the last man asking and then --

MR. IANSU: My name is Franklin Iansu . I am a freelance writer and editor. I'm from Ghana and I'm based in Washington, D.C.

And this is a question to the panel in general about the relative efficiency in terms of dollars spent between primary and secondary school.

I went to a good secondary school in Ghana. Ghana's primary enrollment has burgeoned. And at least in terms of anecdotal evidence, not measured data, there's a strong consensus on various fora that I belong to that the quality of learning, certainly in the secondary level, never having toured northern Ghana, but in urban Accra has seriously plummeted.

So, for example, when I worked at Ashanti Gold Fields as investment manager -- investment relations manager, there was a lot of talk about why we are paying ex-patriots six times what a Ghanaian would earn because there's Ghanaian trained to take that person's place. So you have to bring someone from abroad and pay them a lot of money.

And in my own secondary school, for example, this is Achimoto School, where Rawlings and various -- it's one of the -- it used to be one of the lead schools, basically, what is happening there now is teachers don't show up in the classroom. They wait at home for parents to contact them to say since you aren't teaching them in the classroom, so can I pay you more to give my child private tutoring?

So on the various discussion forums that I belong to, Africa-centric, there's just a lot of bemoaning of the quality plummet in secondary education at a very time when UNESCO and others are saying there isn't even enough money going into primary education. So the general question is what's the thinking around the comparable benefits? To put it in Barbara's terms, investment -- return on investment in the two sectors. And is

there a way of packaging investment and primary education, education for all -- in terms that don't -- that appeal beyond moral -- because as she said, everybody here is agreed on the moral commitment, but the people with the money aren't buying it.

Thank you.

MR. van der GAAG: Thank you. Beth, for you, right?

SPEAKER: Both of them.

SPEAKER: In the hot seat.

MR. van der GAAG: He didn't say so, but the question was for you.

MS. KING: Let me respond to this without necessarily thinking about the World Bank policy, okay, which there isn't really in terms of -- right now in terms of whether primary or secondary.

When countries expand their secondary education very much, that expansion alone is going to drive sort of any measurable amount of quality -- type of quality down. Right? Partly because your -- if you test more students who are not just from the elite families who have computers and books and educated parents, you're going to bring the average performance in those stats down. That's just simple common sense. Right? So that's one.

The second one is that increase in enrollment also stresses the amount of resources. And we do have countries that are not able to increase their resources by the amount that they should in order to keep their resources up -- the level of the quality of instruction at the same level. So that's partly what I think you're seeing.

You're asking the question should -- how can this discussion about primary education not take away money from the secondary education? Is that what you're sort of saying? How do you measure --

SPEAKER: How you shift the money.

MS. KING: Yeah, right. Exactly. Exactly.

The study is out -- the studies out there that have measured the returns to the labor market of primary versus secondary have tended to see primary -- the primary education as having a higher return. But I don't think -- that's a very static view of it. As economies start moving towards production that requires higher skills, we're going to see the return to secondary education is really rising. And so if, in fact, people and governments are responding to that change, there will be a push towards that. And you see that everywhere. I mean, that's why, you know, graphs from this report will show you an increase over time in secondary, as well as tertiary.

And even teenagers, there's a study in the Dominican Republic which showed how teenagers were responding to information about the returns to them if they completed their high school. And those teenagers who did not receive the information that in fact they would get this much more if they finished their high school versus those who did receive the information, okay, actually were less likely. So giving teenagers even just the information that they would get a higher return on their education actually improved.

So this is not -- in a way it's also a -- which is, again, I go back to this topic of marginalized populations and why I said earlier the demand is very important because populations are marginalized not only in education; they're marginalized also in the labor market. So if they don't see a return to them in the labor market, they're less likely to actually finish their education.

And education is a two party -- at least a two party activity. It's not just the student. It's also the providers. I mean, it's not only the school, rather -- sorry. It's also the household and the students. And so bringing the information about the labor market, about this desire of countries to be much more competitive globally and that there are returns to education in a much more globally competitive economy, is going to come back and improve

the demand for education. More details on a one-on-one basis.

SPEAKER: I just want to make a comment about when these groups are marginalized, you actually want to then go beyond secondary because education is probably one of the tools that can get a group out of marginalization. I was just looking at government. Looking at the 78 percent of Kenya, you know, northern Kenya, and looking at those people in government, you know, and the secretaries, you know, civil service, and they're not there. And if you then don't have people who even understand those areas, it (inaudible) itself. So that's why we think of, you know, really we want those areas -- really take it even higher. But if you look at, again, very specific groups like (inaudible), if you took somebody to class eight, they have lost out on looking at the animals, the camels, the goats, and they will not enter the job market. So you really have to take them up to a place where then they can enter the job market. So I think you have to look at every specific case.

MR. van der GAAG: Thank you. Kevin, do you want to answer that?

MR. WATKINS: Well, just really briefly.

I mean, there are many things that I really enjoy about the job that I do, but there's one area that I regard as a sort of occupational hazard, and that's having to read literature on the rate of return at different levels.

SPEAKER: You could learn something. (Laughter)

MR. WATKINS: There are different variations on this. The standard story is the one, as Beth said, or at least it used to be, that returns are supposed to be highest to primary education. And so the arguments to governments was always, you know, you should be investing resources in that area.

And more recently, we've had another current of literature, especially from Latin America, actually, which says this turns out to be wrong. The rate of return is higher in secondary education than it is in primary education. And you sort of think, well, what's the

political relevance of that? You can't get a secondary education unless you had a primary education. You know, it is a detail. (Laughter)

But it's sort of also arithmetic that, of course, once you've got universal primary education if you hold everything else constant you've got a bigger supply of kids coming through the primary school system. So fewer labor shortages for those types of skills and greater labor shortages on the secondary side, which is going to push up the rate of return there.

So, you know, I think a lot of the theoretical discussion on this is really unhelpful and irrelevant in public policy terms. But there are very important practical questions. For one thing, I think there's a lot of evidence coming out now that parents won't put children through a full primary cycle unless they feel there's a real prospect of them getting into secondary education because secondary education is becoming more important. And there's a big equity issue here because the per pupil cost in secondary are much higher than in primary.

Just to give you one example from Kenya, actually, if you look at private provision in Kenya, the typical patent is the higher income parents invest really heavily in private primary schools. And entry to the national schools in Kenya, which are very high performing schools, is completely dominated by the graduates of these private primary schools. And these national secondary schools get very high levels of investment per pupil financed by taxpayers from the kids who are excluded from those schools, including the parents of the kids who are excluded from those schools because they didn't go to private primary schools or they live in the wrong region and so on.

So if you're going to go down the road of supporting increased public investment in secondary education and you're interested in equity, you'd better make sure the whole population is getting access to those opportunities. And that's not really what's

happening now in many countries.

MR. van der GAAG: And if you're really serious about all of that you should start much younger than primary school. Right, Kevin?

MR. WATKINS: Mm-hmm.

MR. van der GAAG: I have two women with microphones in their hand. Go ahead. And then I saw a third one there. And then we may be running out of time so keep it short, please.

SPEAKER: Yes. Thank you. I'm glad gender was not excluded and marginalized here.

I'm delighted that conflict was taken into consideration. Thank you, Rebecca.

Marginalization is a driver of conflict. Conflict is a driver of marginalization and it is hard not to look at it.

I have a couple of questions. One is for Mr. Minister of State. How do you monitor the reduction of marginalization in your state without just looking at access?

And my second question is related to it. How do you -- in your data, have you looked at post-conflict countries? And if so, have you seen reversal of trends of marginalization in post-conflict countries?

Thank you.

SPEAKER: I mean, our ministry is new. This is our second year. But if you looked at what are the things we intend to monitor, at the moment we really want to even increase access. We're talking of certain districts that have less than 25 percent enrollment in schools. So our big drive is going to be one in which we are saying more children should actually have access. And then, of course, quality will come in and a whole range of other indicators that we will be looking at. But at the moment, what we are looking

at is to see which children are out of school, why are they out of school or (inaudible) school, why not getting education, because we're looking more at alternative approaches to providing education rather than the fiscal location of schools.

MS. GROMBOW : (inaudible) I'm with the United -- I forgot to say who I was.

MR. van der GAAG: Okay, let's start over.

MS. GROMBOW: USAID. I won't. USAID Office of Education in Washington. I'm Yolan (inaudible) Grombow.

MR. van der GAAG: Thank you. Kevin, do you have --

MR. WATKINS: Well, I'm going to, if you don't mind, pass on the question because we are doing next year's report on conflict. There is quite a bit in this year's report on post-conflict states. We look at Liberia. We look at the Sierra Leone. We also look at conflict states. But I don't have a systematic answer to the question. We haven't really run the data for say what's happening in Liberia or Sierra Leone relative to other countries. But we will have done by this time next year when I hope I'll be invited back.

SPEAKER: Just one plug for your report next year, which I think Yolan's point is really important, that actually in terms of marginalization conflict is -- might present some small windows of opportunity amidst crisis because social networks and social fabrics are broken down, which is really bad for most everything, but often you can get core groups of people who never did have access because sort of societies are very rigid to all of a sudden be participating in different ways. And it would be a really interesting thing to look at whether it's -- we know it's true for gender. That often girls can have much more access to education in these contexts than they would have normally. But I wonder if it's true for other things. It would be interest.

MR. van der GAAG: Okay. We have one more question then. I saw a

hand there.

MS. KEEFER: Thank you. My name is Patricia Keefer. I'm with the American Federation of Teachers, and I wanted to know about the cost of bad practices.

When you look at your projections, the commitments that donors make, the things that donors need to do, is there a cost associated with core governance, corruption? What have we learned in terms of a dollar value of the early years of this investment that is going to give us a better -- an increase -- a dollar increase in the investment in future years? Because everything doesn't remain constant.

And as part of that, as you list the seven points of what donors need to do, Barbara, what do recipients need to do to demonstrate confidence to the donors that they have a commitment to reach these goals? I think I'm right about this. I noticed that the U.S. Government increased its aid for education to Pakistan by a significant amount, maybe $300 million. And whatever the dollar figure, it increased our overall commitment to education for all and the U.S. Government is counting that by some significant amount.

But the Pakistan government reaction to this increase, this aid, was don't attach any strings to it. Let us spend the money the way we think. Now, I think there's a great deal of value in recipients having an education plan just like the health education recipients or the health recipients needed to have a national plan for HIV-AIDS eradication. But there's a different element to the no strings attached that we're dealing with here.

So that's my question.

MS. REYNOLDS: A lot of questions.

MR. van der GAAG: That's an easy one. Any panel member can answer this one, I guess. Barbara.

MS. REYNOLDS: Just really, really briefly. I think you had like four questions.

But I think one of the questions was the quantification question and I'm not going to precisely answer that. But in terms of aid effectiveness, you know, we do know that there's a lot of bad donor practices. Whether it's, you know, stopping and starting of aid -- aid volatility it's often called. And we have a colleague here at Brookings, Jacques and I, named Homi Karas , who has quantified that -- done some good number crunching. And he has -- there's one sort of study he did which showed that the volatility of aid in certain countries, especially fragile states -- so in other words, rushing in of funds, you know, post-conflict and then taking them all away, you know, when a new emergency happens, creates, you know, what we -- economic aid shocks. So the equivalent of our financial crisis to a huge magnitude. I think he -- and I can reference you the study afterwards -- but he said, you know, he had some examples where it would be the equivalent of the Great Depression and the First World War, you know, sort of impact on our economy, you know, times two or three for these, you know, developing country economies who are, you know, trying to deal with, you know, moving things forward. You know, aid volatility is a huge problem.

And there was a bunch of other questions in there and I'm -- I couldn't exactly --

MS. KEEFER: (inaudible)

MS. REYNOLDS: Oh, yeah. Yeah. Right.

MS. KEEFER: (inaudible) What are you doing to get the recipients to improve on that that will make the investment go further?

MR. van der GAAG: Brief answer from Minister Elmi.

MINISTER ELMI: I will just try.

I think what recipient countries should do is first, as you say, have a plan. But that plan should be one which minimizes -- puts the money where it's going to be used. So, for example, in Kenya, the money goes directly to schools and managed by committees.

It still hasn't completely stopped corruption because in a lot of places committees are still weak. They are -- the governments are not very strong. But it's much better, you know, because at least the committees are made of parents and that's where the money is going.

The other thing you might want to know is how much is the government itself putting in? So you put sufficiently in -- because governments who are donors change and they could easily pull the plug. So you should be having a sufficient amount of, you know, your own money going into it so that the whole thing doesn't really collapse if for some reason the donor doesn't put in, I think, and do it for the right reason. You know, because education is worth investing in.

So you look at countries where really you see the commitment to that. And therefore, any additional money you bring in is being brought in to fill a gap and for a period. So that there are times when those investments eventually will actually make those countries get out of it. So, for example, Kenya would say presently we had some problem and some parents wanted to (inaudible). And as a government, we actually put the equivalent so that our free primary education that was started in 2003 didn't collapse. So that kind of commitment, I think, is what you need in those governments.

MR. van der GAAG: We are approaching the end. I have one more person with a microphone in her hand. So, go ahead, please.

MS. MALOOF: Thank you. Hi, I'm Katie Maloof with Oxfam International. And thank you very much to the panelists for their excellent discussions.

The Global Monitoring Report this year has an excellent chapter on the international aid architecture and specifically on the reform of the Fast Track Initiative. And there's also a really excellent independent evaluation that's about to come out on the Fast Track Initiative. Oxfam has also released a report, and there's others in the advocacy community that are calling for reform of the Fast Track Initiative into a Global Fund for

Education.

And I'd like to ask the panelists what their view is on the priority areas for reform of the Fast Track Initiative -- we've already heard a bit about the private sector and about conflict and those are very important areas -- if you have other areas that you'd like to add to.

And then, finally, the GMR also mentions a really large $16 billion financing gap for global education. And this is perhaps a very difficult question, but in the view of the panel what is -- how is the U.S. doing in terms of our fair share of contribution to that gap?

MR. van der GAAG: For time reasons I'm going to give Kevin a chance to answer this.

He just refused to have the last word, but, hey, I am the boss. Go ahead.

MR. WATKINS: Well, I did think I was getting off a little lightly there.

It's a very good question with several different elements. As I said, I think the issue with the Fast Track Initiative is really about the fundamental design problems. What many of us who were arguing for a multilateral framework initially had in mind was an initiative that would do what it said on the (inaudible), which is close the finance -- measuring the financing gaps; mobilize the resources to close the financing gaps; and build the capacity of governments to deliver on the ground.

What we ended up with -- all sorts of quite complicated political and institutional reasons was something very different -- something that started off without any financing capacity at all, which then had a financing element bolted onto it, which is the catalytic fund. And the catalytic fund is responsive to demands. And the demands that are made on the catalytic fund actually bear no relationship at all to financing gaps in country. We've had this process now for many years where every G-8 meeting endorses the importance of replenishing the Fast Track Initiative -- actually, it's always the same number

interesting enough to the tune of $1.2 billion, without any clear indication what exactly does this relate to. I mean, it's clearly a tiny part of the financing gap. It's $1.2 billion over the 3-year cycle usually, as well.

And then we have all sorts of serious problems in disbursement. Now, if you ask where do these problems come from, some NGOs and some donors say, well, it's all the responsibility of the World Bank and IDA processes. And on the part of donors in particular, ignoring the fact that they sit on the board of the Bank that actually create these processes. So there's this sort of blame the Bank for things, which clearly go beyond the responsibility and the jurisdiction of the Bank in a lot of respects.

And as we say in the report, I think the finger pointing and the blame game doesn't really help anyone. We clearly need an initiative that does things differently than currently happen under the Fast Track Initiative. I think with substantive reforms, you know, it could become the sort of multilateral mechanism that we need to see. But getting those reforms is going to take very high-level political leadership. And the sort of stuff that we see going down at every G-8, I think, is really unhelpful in this area. And there are a lot of lessons, as we argue in the report, to be taken from the Global Fund for Health. And I don't think this is a direct replication that we're talking about. But if you just do the numbers on the comparison, I mean, the Global Fund for HIV-AIDS was created in 2002. It's now actually disbursed something like $7 billion U.S. The Catalytic Fund was created in 2003 and it's disbursed a total of, whatever it is, $450 million.

This is not commensurate with the scale of ambition and the problem that we face. And I think all of us here -- the U.N. system, the World Bank, and the donor community -- really need to sit down and urgently come up with something different. Because we've run out of time I'm not going to tell you what the something different ought to be. (Laughter)

SPEAKER: We have to read the report.

MR. WATKINS: You'll have to read next year's report on that one.

MR. van der GAAG: Thank you very much. I think this has to be the end.

Yes, applause for the speaker and the panel. (Applause)

The Center for Universal Education can promise that we will over the months to come organize additional meetings, workshops, get-togethers on some of those issues, including the global architecture. We'd now like to invite you to the reception, which is next door.

And we hope that Brookings will in just a short week put the proceedings of this meeting on its website. So if you want to re-read it, you know where to find it.

Thank you very much.

* * * * *

CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC

I, Carleton J. Anderson, III do hereby certify that the forgoing electronic file when originally transmitted was reduced to text at my direction; that said transcript is a true record of the proceedings therein referenced; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which these proceedings were taken; and, furthermore, that I am neither a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.

/s/Carleton J. Anderson, III

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Virginia

Commission No. 351998

Expires: November 30, 2012