

THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION  
FALK AUDITORIUM

FINANCING EDUCATION FOR THE DEVELOPING WORLD  
THROUGH 2030 AND BEYOND

Washington, D.C.  
Tuesday, September 8, 2015

**PARTICIPANTS:**

**Introduction and Moderator:**

REBECCA WINTHROP  
Senior Fellow and Director, Center for Universal Education  
The Brookings Institution

**Keynote Remarks:**

AMBASSADOR KÅRE R. AAS  
Ambassador to the United States  
Kingdom of Norway

**Panelists:**

ALICE ALBRIGHT  
Chief Executive Officer  
Global Partnership for Education

DONAL BROWN  
Director, Global Funds Department  
Senior Representative, U.K. Department for International Development

LIESBET STEER  
Fellow, Center for Universal Education  
The Brookings Institution

\* \* \* \* \*

## P R O C E E D I N G S

MS. WINTHROP: Good afternoon, everyone. I am Rebecca Winthrop, the director of the Center for Universal Education here at the Brookings Institution. It's a real pleasure to spend the afternoon with you. Thank you for coming. In Washington, D.C., it's the back-to-school day, post-Labor Day. Congress is back in session. Everyone's back. It's also International Literacy Day. So Happy International Literacy Day for everybody.

And what a more fitting thing to do on International Literacy Day than to talk about education around the world. And we thought it would be a great way to welcome the wrap-up of summer and bringing people back together to talk about global education, and particularly something that's incredibly important, to deliver global education, which is money. Money and financing for global education.

We've had a very big summer in the global education community, specifically talking about financing for global education. In July, there were two really large meetings, one hosted by the Norwegian government, the Oslo Summit for Financing for Education for Development, which talked a lot about these questions, and then a broader summit that a lot of you who follow the sustainable development goals process might have heard about, taking place in Addis, the Financing for Development Conference, of which education was a piece of a larger question around financing the forthcoming sustainable development goals.

So there's been a lot of action amongst the policymakers over the summer around financing for education and other sectors. And as we are gearing up for the Sustainable Development Goals Summit during the U.N. General Assembly Week in a couple of weeks in New York, we thought it would be a great opportunity to talk about education and to talk about financing, and to take stock and raise some questions and think about where we need to go.

We are really very pleased to welcome our distinguished guests. You have their full biographies in your programs, but I just -- so I won't go into it in details, but the order of the program I will hand over first to Ambassador Aas, who is the ambassador to the United States from the Kingdom of Norway, and a wonderful friend and partner to Brookings for a very long time and to the center, and cares quite a bit about education. So we're very honored to have you, Ambassador Aas.

I will then hand over to my colleague Liesbet Steer, who is a scholar with us at the Center for Universal Education and has authored -- you know, I'm not totally objective, but an excellent report. And if I had it in my hand I would wave it, but you saw it coming in -- an excellent report on education financing. And she will -- it came out this summer in July, and was an input into the Oslo Summit conference. And she will do her best to condense -- I don't know, how long is this thing? A hundred pages into 10 really scintillating minutes, giving you the overview of the key findings that she and her team, Katie Smith and Lindsay found in this research.

And then we will have a discussion with a great panel. Donal Brown is in town from the U.K., the director of Global Funds Department and the senior representative of DFID. And Alice Albright, who is always -- she's not always in town. She's always out of town traveling around the world, but she happens to be based here and in town at the moment, which is great, CEO of the Global Partnership for Education.

We'll have a discussion amongst the panelists and then, of course, open up to questions from all of you.

So again, welcome, and join me in welcoming to the stage Ambassador Aas.

(Applause)

MR. AAS: Thank you, Rebecca. And good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. It's great to be here today and to take part in the important discussion on how we can improve funding for education in developing countries.

I think that the reason why I'm here is because education is really a high priority for my government, and it has been there for many, many years, but with the present prime minister, she has really devoted her energy and resources on this issue, and she really wants to make a difference.

My government firmly believes that everyone has the right to education. We know from history that education is key to social and economic development. Today, as Rebecca said, is the internationally recognized World Literacy Day. And I'd like to thank Rebecca and her team here at Brookings for hosting this event, as well as for strategically electing today to do so.

Literacy and education go hand in hand. Over the last 12 years, substantial progress has been made on decreasing the number of out-of-school children from around 106 million to 58 million. But

EDUCATION-2015/09/08

we still have a long way to go before we can say we have reached our goals. More than 120 million children and youth are still without education worldwide. Thirty-seven million children are out of school due to crisis and conflict and the numbers keep rising.

When you break it down, the differences in the quality of education given to girls and boys are also unacceptable. We cannot accept that girls and boys are treated unequally. We need gender sensitive education policies and safer learning environments. We need to continue to advocate for the mobilization of resources, especially for the education of girls. Norway has doubled its financial contribution to education in its development assistance programs since 2013. Norway has also entered into a new partnership with the World Bank on innovative financing. We are focusing our resources on strengthening girls' education, the quality of learning, vocational and technical training, as well as education in conflict zones.

I was the Norwegian ambassador to Afghanistan from 2008 to 2010 and I stayed there for two and a half years. I must say that I saw firsthand the importance of education in conflict areas. When I was there, Norway contributed to the construction of around 100 schools based on Afghan priorities, many of which were built specifically for the inclusion of girls, and this continues to be a prioritized issue for Norway and Afghanistan.

However, what I learned in Afghanistan was that they cannot focus on just building primary schools. We also need to provide secondary schools and universities in order to give youth access to higher education. Another thing I learned is that it is not just about the number of buildings we build, but also the quality of education being provided. I saw firsthand the challenge to recruit experienced and qualified teachers.

Just as important as building schools is the need to strengthen the weight on national cooperation and exchanges on teacher issues and intensify our efforts to secure teachers and appropriate learning materials. When I arrived to Afghanistan, I thought that we should build as many schools as possible and count the numbers, and that I will say was also what many of my colleagues and many other countries had that idea. So we say that we are improving the quality of education in Afghanistan by the numbers -- the figuring of the number.

But of course, we also after a while realized that we need the teachers and we need the

EDUCATION-2015/09/08

safe environment for children to go to school. And we also saw that and we thought that let's prioritize on primary education. But really, what is important is also to help and assist and support the children to go from primary school and to secondary school and to university studies. The issue is, of course, much more complex than just that, but I will say that focusing on quality and focusing on what the children are learning is really, really important.

From experience, we know that education has the ability to lift societies, contribute to making countries grow stronger economically, and promote gender equality. And I would say, believe it or not, that Norway is a prime example of this. Why do I want to focus on Norway and to give that as an example? Yes, because in the 1960s, Norway was probably one of the poorest -- among one of the poorest countries in Europe. That was just 50 years ago. But what happened in my country was really that the government -- and there was a national consensus -- that we should provide free education and free education to universities to everyone. And that I would say, that has worked.

By doing this in Norway, we have transformed the country, raised the level of education, and strengthened the overall skillset of our people. And I'm not taking away from how oil and gas has contributed, but I really want to underline that without a doubt, that education has contributed to where we are as a nation today, and that's an important learning. And I think that if we are able, taking into account the sort of differences between many countries and, of course, you can't compare a developing country with what Norway was in the 1960s, but the idea and the issue of free public schooling is what I really want to convey to you.

Another critical element that I would like to mention is that educating youth in general, as well as educating them about human rights and values, can significantly contribute to our fight against violent extremism. In-housing skills, such as logic, problem solving, and critical thinking is an important measure in counter violence and extremism. This is why free access to quality public education is so important in developing countries, but also all over the world. Norway consistently encourages the international community to increase their support for global education.

And just one word on the extremism. Rebecca, she referred to the summit in Oslo last summer, but at the same time just some weeks before or after the Education Summit, we also hosted one of the regional conferences on counter violence extremism. And it is part of the same sort of problem,

and I think that by, as I said, strengthening the education also on human rights and the sort of basic values is important. It's really important also in countering international terrorism.

Okay. Rebeca referred to the Global Summit in Oslo in July, and what we hope is that the summit will boost international efforts and awareness on the need for funding, quality of education and learning, as well as girls' education and education in crisis and conflict zones as I have referred to.

I would like to thank Alice Albright, Julia Gillard, and Rebecca for working so closely with Norway on the summit and contributing to its success. And it was a great success attended by leaders from over 40 different countries, international organizations, civil society, and advocacy groups focusing on the right to education. The summit, and I think Liesbet also referred to this, but what we sort of want to say and to conclude and convey to you on the Oslo Summit was that the summit underlined the need to review political priorities on education, increase public and private investment of education, use existing funds more effectively, and implement evidence-based, inclusive, and effective education policies.

The consensus was that we must reverse the negative trend on international support for education. We must continue to advocate for a greater share of the global development budgets to be allocated to the education sector, and we must make funding education the core funding education, the core of our efforts in achieving sustainable development. To accomplish this, a high-level commission on the financing of global education was established as you probably know, supported by the U.N. secretary general, and facilitated by Norway together with Indonesia, Malawi, Chile, and UNESCO. The commission will be headed by Mr. Gordon Brown, the secretary general, Special Envoy for Global Education.

The commission's first meeting will be held in New York approximately two weeks from now, with the purpose to discuss its priorities and work plan. And that is also why I think that this meeting and this seminar is really an important event leading up to New York. And the final report is set to be delivered during next year's U.N. General Assembly.

I think that the Oslo Summit brought attention to one of the most central foreign priorities, or to say it in other words, the summit really brought attention to one of my government's most central and key foreign policy issues, and I can guarantee you that Norway will be very committed to education in the next coming years. It was an important step in the (inaudible) the level of cooperation and commitment

by key actors to assure that all children in developing countries have access to education.

We have already seen increased awareness on the need for education thanks to campaigns from the First Lady Michelle Obama and the Norwegian Prime Minister, Mrs. Erna Solberg, but we need to do more. Moving forward, Norway will continue its commitment to the strong partnership it has with the United States and with organizations such as Brookings and the Global Partnership for Education.

I look forward to today's discussion and believe that together we can make sure that every child and youth has access to public, quality education. No matter where our sons and daughters live, no matter if they are poor or rich, living in peaceful Scandinavia or in war and conflict zones, every girl and child has the right to education. It is, ladies and gentlemen, our common responsibility to make this right a reality. Together, I think we will succeed.

Thank you very much for your attention.

(Applause)

MS. STEER: Thank you so much, Mr. Ambassador. I felt it was a very inspiring speech to get us all ready for this year. As Rebecca said, it's a big year for all of us.

I wanted to thank you all to come out today, for coming out and coming to listen to the results of our work as well. I wanted to thank Rebecca and the team at the Center for Universal Education for being such wonderful colleagues and helping to make this report and this research happen.

So let me just get going quickly if I can figure out how to move these slides. Yes.

So I will talk about four things today. One is reminding us of the challenge we are facing. The ambassador already mentioned some of that. I will go through that quickly. Secondly, I would like to talk about why we need more and more effective finance, and I would also like to talk about why we need more and more effective finance. Slight sort of grammatical difference there, but I really feel, and I want to emphasize that we need both, and there's often discussion about whether we need one or the other. We need both. And I will end with some concluding thoughts.

The challenge. This will be familiar to you. What's a bit different is in that in the report we looked at the challenge or the problems in education by splitting countries in different groups. The groups were a little different from what one normally sees in terms of low income, middle income, which

EDUCATION-2015/09/08

are the categorizations that are normally used. We tried to make it slightly more sophisticated to allow also for different financing needs. So we had fragile, low, least developed countries; non-fragile least developed countries; fragile low to middle income countries; nonfragile low to middle income countries; mainly upper middle income countries; and then the small island developing states. And what this allowed us to do is to have a slightly more nuanced look at these different country groups and see what is going on, both in terms of the education needs and the financing needs.

So first of all, we all know that we've made huge progress in terms of increasing access, but as you can see from this graph which shows you how that has happened over the last decade, some country groups have made a lot more progress than others, and interestingly, the country groups that are more on the higher end, like middle income, upper middle income countries are actually having a bit of a hard time to continue making progress and getting that last mile done. Fragile least developed and nonfragile least developed have done a fantastic job as you can see but are still far from where they need to be.

We see progress across the board also on secondary access, which is wonderful. But then we come, of course, to our other problem which is as access has expanded, the quality has dropped and children have started to drop out. Again, when you look at the different country groups, you see that in those two groups the least developed fragile and nonfragile, that there the dropout rates or the survival rates are actually declining. So we are getting into a worse situation there. We see some progress in the other groups which is, of course, great.

On the learning side, again, the big problems are situated in these least developed countries and the fragile lower middle income countries and also in the small island developing states where less than two-thirds of children are coming out of primary school with minimum basic skills. So this needs to be addressed and it needs to be addressed urgently.

Another big problem we have is inequities. We are seeing within countries we have gaps between countries as we could see earlier, but we also have huge gaps within countries. So when we look at the education attainment and years of schooling, we see huge differences between the poorest 20 percent of the population and the richest 20 percent of the population, something we need to address.

Finally, what all of this is resulting in is that we are getting young people with the wrong



EDUCATION-2015/09/08

skills for the demands of the economy. Economies are growing. They're asking for more skilled labor and countries are not able to supply it. We see that in 2020, estimates in 11 developing countries on shortages and surpluses of labor show that we'll have huge surpluses in terms of low-skilled labor and shortages in terms of medium-skilled labor.

Now, we want to go to universal completion of primary and secondary education. That's what we have set out in the sustainable development goals to achieve by 2030. Now, when you look at projections and you see, okay, we assume that what's happened in the past is going to be continuing in the future, we come to the conclusion that we are going to be way off. We will reach primary completion by 2100. We will reach secondary completion way into the next century, which means that if we do want to reach those sustainable development goals, we're going to have to do much, much better.

So that gets me to the more of the more and more effective. If we look at how much more is needed, UNESCO came up with these estimates which basically told us that if we want to achieve universal basic education by 2030, quality including pre-primary, primary, and lower secondary, we will have to double spending on education in the next 15 years, roughly equivalent to 5.5 of GDP, roughly equivalent to 20 percent of education budgets. That's the recommendation.

Now, if we look at these country groups again that I was referring to earlier, we see that the biggest effort is going to have to be made in those least developed countries. They will have to increase their spending per child by -- they will have to double it, basically. That's the lower two bars you see there. The white is where they are today; the yellow is where they need to be. Other countries will also need to increase but not by so much in relative terms.

The good news is that countries have been increasing their spending on education. As a percentage of GDP, they are doing much better than a decade ago in large part driven by increased resource mobilization at the domestic level. But compared to those targets that the UNESCO have set with respect to 5.5 percent of GDP and 20 percent of the budget, a lot of countries are no way there yet. There's a need to both increase the percentage in the budget and increase the percentage in terms of GDP. So that's what you see here. The blue lines are the targets and the dots are the countries falling below target at the moment.

The other issue we've seen in the research we did is that sadly, actually, even though we

EDUCATION-2015/09/08

see the increase in terms of percentage of GDP, we see a lot of countries deprioritizing education in their budgets. So they've been able to increase because they're mobilizing more resources but actually as a share of their budget, education is becoming less important, while if you look at health spending, that is becoming more important as a share of the budget. We also see that in some regions of the world, we are way, way off. South Asia, with huge needs, 12 percent of budget is spent on education, way too little.

Another issue is that countries are allocating their resources to bad purposes rather than good ones. So if you look at energy subsidies, for example, which are universally known to not be good for the economy, not be good for the environment, not be good for development, in many countries they are multiple times the expenditure on education. If we look at Pakistan, for example, energy subsidies are currently three times as much what is being spent on education. So that tells us something about allocation.

Now, the other sources. We know the story. The ambassador referred to it. Aid has been growing in the past decade. Education has been growing, but then in the last few years it's suddenly got this slump. We don't quite know why but it has been happening.

Another source of finance that we should be looking at is nonconcessional finance. We know that just aid and public spending is not the only thing out there. Nonconcessional finance are those loans that can be provided, for example, by the World Bank at typically higher interest rates. Countries have more and more access to this. Over the decade, that source of finance has more than doubled. But again we see that education on this slide, even though the total has doubled, education hasn't benefitted as much. It only increased from 1.1 to 1.4 billion. So in relative terms, it has actually declined in terms of its importance to this particular source of finance.

Another source of finance is private finance. Now, there's a lot of discussion about what the definition of this could be. It can be charitable giving. It can be investment. When we look at charitable giving, we know that over time that has been expanding a lot. We know today it's roughly about 25 percent of ODA. So the private development assistance from OECD countries roughly represents about 25 percent of ODA. We don't quite know where it is going or what it is really doing in terms of the sectoral allocation, but when we look, for example, at American philanthropists and we look at what they are doing in terms of supporting the MDG goals, we see that when you look at the universal primary

EDUCATION-2015/09/08

education goal, that 1 percent of total spending went to that particular purpose as opposed to other purposes which seem to be a little more successful in attracting that source of finance.

There is also the issue of nonstate provision. Now, you'll say this is not finance. No, it isn't, but the nonstate provision actually illustrates what is going on in terms of household spending. Again, this is an area of financing that we're not quite sure about what actually is going on with it, but we have observed that more and more households are spending on education and that actually is reflected in some of the trends in terms of private provision. Again, estimates roughly say that this amounts to about half of domestic public spending. So in 17 countries in Africa, we found that half of that, of total domestic public spending, is what households spend in addition. So it's an important source of finance to look at.

Now, one of the key points we make in the report is that we need to combine these different source of finance in order to really have a good overview of what is going on in these different countries. And here we start seeing some pretty interesting things. For example, I'll just highlight some things. There is a lot more in the report.

When you look at the fragile countries, LDCs and lower middle income countries with the sort of reds up on top there, we see that there is very little improvement in domestic resource mobilization, tax to GDP ratio going up only slightly. Education as a share of government expenditure is going down, deprioritization. In the meantime, however, aid to these countries has been increasing, responding to the huge needs there, which raises some interesting questions around how do we deal with this? We clearly need these domestic funds in those countries.

On the other hand, we see that in the right hand bottom corner here, that in the lower middle income countries and upper middle income countries, more and more financing from nonconcessional sources, loans, and loans from the private sector could be available for education. We need to look at how we could tap into that.

Looking forward, so what we did in the report is to say, okay, if we believe the costing estimates of the UNESCO, and those are the best ones out there, what would need to happen between now and 2020 for countries to be able to achieve those goals by 2030? We took the estimates of the IMF in terms of growth rates of countries. We took the estimates of the IMF in terms of what countries could mobilize in terms of domestic resources. The best estimates, the most optimistic scenarios. We

EDUCATION-2015/09/08

estimated that countries would all allocate 12 percent of their budget to basic education, which is the recommended amount. If we add all that up and countries spend the idea amount of money on education, they will still fall short. We still have a financing gap of about 30 billion in 2020 to finance all that. We could cover some of it by aid, if aid keeps on increasing following historical patterns, but we wouldn't be there by any long way. So we need to do more. And in particular, we're going to need to do a lot better.

And that's how I get to the next piece of my presentation about effectiveness. And one of the biggest issues that we have in education is this problem. It is that the relationship between spending and outcomes is unclear. We have a weak positive relationship, but in most countries we have countries spending a lot of money, achieving very little. We have countries spending very little money achieving a lot. And we don't really know very well how money relates to outcomes. And that needs to improve. There's a lot of work. I'm going to try to look at these issues, in particular around sort of systems, how system improvement could work -- make that work better.

Secondly, we need to address the inequalities in spending and the allocations of money within countries, which are highly inequitable. Often, for example, in low income countries, about 50 percent of the budget is spent on the 10 percent most educated children. In some countries like Malawi, that is 70 percent. So there are clearly things that could be done in terms of the allocation. And here I think we also have a lack of good data, in particular, around where would governments with limited domestic public resources, where would they best put those resources? There's been research that has shown we need to put it in the lower levels -- pre-primary, primary, and then go up like that. But more work is needed to really clarify what is the investment strategy for a government to invest in those different levels of education to make sure we can reach the goals.

Then the other resources. So we all know we have some issues with our aid effectiveness. We looked at this quite extensively in the report, and I will just highlight a couple of things. One is the fragmentation rate. We see this in terms of the number of donors that are active in education. We see this in terms of the number of relationships that are in each country and the kind of smallness of some of those relationships. But we also see it in the degree to which education is delivered -- education finance, education aid is delivered through multilateral channels. We found that in education, 35 percent

EDUCATION-2015/09/08

of aid is delivered through multilateral channels, which means all aid through multilateral, both core and noncore. So trust funds, everything. Thirty-five percent. If you compare that to health, it's 65 percent. So we are a much more bilateral sector than, for example, health, which affects the degree to which we can be coordinated.

Secondly, aid is not allocated to need. There are a lot of ways one can allocate aid and there's a whole literature out there around how that best could be done. Performance needs to be taken into account. Sure, we can't just look at needs, but it's pretty hard to justify that the share of aid to sub-Saharan African has fallen from 50 percent to 30 percent over the decade while the number of children that are out of school has increased significantly, and we know there are a lot of other problems. So what explains that and why are we doing this? We need to be much more rational. Same with this. Spending per child, \$60 per child in one country; \$10 in another country. There is an issue that we need to address here.

Finally, just coming back to the results-based finance, which the ambassador alluded to as well. If we want to get better results, these types of new financing mechanisms which build in results are really wonderful and should be pursued. Unfortunately, when you look at education again, this is the World Bank's PFR program, which is Performance for Results. And this is the breakdown of the sectors that are currently and in the future in the pipeline benefitting from this pot of money that's results-based. Education, as you see there in the red arrow, represents about 5 percent. Other sectors are doing a lot better in terms of really making a case for this type of funding. So how well is education really -- or how ready is it for this type of financing?

So let me conclude. We come up with a lot of things in the paper but just to summarize, I think we need to make a more compelling case for education investment, and I'm not only talking here about saying education is important. We all know that. But it's to be a little more sophisticated about, okay, how could we invest in the best way? What different sources of finance could we use to get the best outcomes? Looking at the social rates of return that are out there, making those better, because at the moment they're actually not really social rates of return. They don't really include externalities in the way we could. Making that much more sophisticated is something we need to do.

Secondly, we need to focus much more on the domestic issue. The domestic finance

issue, the mobilization and allocation of domestic financing with all its aspects.

Thirdly, we need to analyze options of finance, including all sources of finance -- not just aid, not just domestic public finance, but also these other sources that are out there that we're currently not really understanding and tapping into. And that needs to be tailored to these different countries. Middle income countries have more access to capital markets. They have access to different sources of finance. Least developed countries don't have that, so we need to think about what is the mix that is appropriate for each of these countries.

And then finally, the effectiveness question. We've been looking a lot at, okay, there's so much evidence out there, thousands of randomized control trials trying to say what is working in education, where should we put our money? And at the end of the day, we have learned very little. It's all contradictory, and the reason for this is that these intervention-based approaches haven't really accounted for the environment in which these interventions are either effective or ineffective, and that is why I think it's absolutely wonderful that DFID is leading the charge in getting more attention to the systems and how these systems are actually making particular interventions more or less effective. So really looking forward to that work.

I hope I didn't go on too long. Thanks very much.

(Applause)

MS. WINTHROP: Many, many things, Liesbet as we're getting mic'd up here. A lot of rich material, rich research. What we'll hope to do is have a conversation amongst our panelists on a couple of key questions, key topics, and then throw it out to you. One last mic. Thanks.

One of the things that, again, I've read many drafts, Liesbet, but that struck me again as you presented is how important it is to really think very -- in some ways differently but in a very nuanced way about context in terms of what are the country characteristics that make certain financing mechanisms successful or not. That came through again in your presentation.

And I think one of the first questions to our panelists should really be around fragile states. This is a topic that has gotten a lot of attention over the last several years. It's a topic that I've done a lot of work on personally in many ways before I came to Brookings, and I remember 10 years ago it was the Norwegian government, actually, who everybody in the global education community looked to

EDUCATION-2015/09/08

who was making the argument that education should be an integral part of humanitarian response. And Norway was the one lone voice at the time that even put out a white paper saying education is the fourth pillar of humanitarian response along with other crucial lifesaving interventions, such as clean water and health, et cetera. And certainly DFID has been a strong -- has come in to this space and been a strong leader in the last couple years on education and fragile states, and for a long time it was the Fast Track initiative prior to its rebranding as the Global Partnership for Education, but you know, 10 -- 8, 10 years ago, FTI was just beginning and certainly as early as maybe six years ago and five years ago, fragile states wasn't really on the agenda, and it wasn't really a mechanism for directing financing to those countries. And that has changed in the last couple years.

So you all have engaged with the topic of education in fragile states, and what I noted again, Liesbet, in your presentations, was that actually I wonder what to make of this issue that actually in fragile states today, now that it is actually on people's agenda, on large agencies' agenda, domestic -- governments who are fragile states are putting less money into the education sector while aid is putting more money into education, compared to -- in least developed countries who are fragile states, compared to least developed countries who have relatively strong governance and aren't fragile, where aid is going down as governments are putting more money domestically into education. So I'm not sure what to make of it, but I'm sure you guys will.

Ambassador, you've talked about your experience in Afghanistan. I know, you know, fragile states -- engaging in fragile states is a topic close to your heart. You've worked on a number of issues, including peacekeeping, an array of things. So, you know, what do you think the international community should be doing to engage fragile states in education, and should our interventions and response be very different -- differ from other country contexts?

MR. AAS: Thank you for that, Rebecca, and to Liesbet, really great material, which also I would say demonstrates the complexity of what we are discussing.

On fragile states and Norway, we are working with many fragile states also in sort of trying to facilitate the political processes in order for governments to reach political understanding and agreements with (inaudible) for example, and we are doing that in Afghanistan with the Afghan government and the Taliban. We have been doing that for a long time.

I really think talking about fragile states, some of them have huge problems and they have so many issues to solve, which means that I understand that for a government in a fragile state, it's really difficult to make the right priorities. Then I would also say that based on my experience from Afghanistan, also that the donor community is so strong also in influencing these governments. So in a way, without sort of prejudice, but sometimes they say yes to everything you recommend.

But I think that what is really needed in order to strengthen education and governments in fragile states is really to have the necessary emphasis on this issue, there needs to be, as I would say, a better cooperation and partnership between donor countries and these governments. So there has to be a sort of relationship between what the international community is allocating on, for example, education, and what these governments themselves are doing. And it can't be that if there is -- and we know that it is a priority for the international community to do more on education, then I also think that it should be reflected in what all these countries themselves are doing. And I really hope that also what you have been doing, the Oslo Summit, the London conference, and the meeting in New York in a couple of weeks really will lead to a stronger relationship and partnership between the receivers and the donors. I hope so.

MS. WINTHROP: Donal, do you agree with that from the sort of -- well, your personal perspective. You spent a lot of time yourself working in fragile states -- Sudan, Somalia, all places, but also from a different perspective, what would be your take?

MR. BROWN: I think we've got to be very careful about terminology because fragile states encompasses so many things. One minute people talk about fragile states and mix it up with countries in conflict. You know, what is behind there? A lot of times you hear conversation about fragile states but actually they're talking about emergencies. You know, so I'm a bit worried that we have this big tag saying "fragile states," and actually you can't see it as that. You have to really differentiate what you're talking about in there.

Saying that, just some things that occur to me both in terms of working in them but also looking at the main -- DFID is putting a lot of money into the fragile states. It is by far the biggest part of our budget now and will continue to be so particularly in sub-Saharan Africa.

Now, there are fragile states which are weak because of weak governance, because of



EDUCATION-2015/09/08

emerging from civil wars, et cetera, et cetera. That to me is a slightly different category to fragile states that are still in conflict. And in the fragile states debate at the moment, I think one of the things that's most important is -- and that needs more attention is actually fragile states or conflict states that actually are in some sort of a protracted crisis. And I think you look -- I think the education debate and the humanitarian debate is dominated by Syria. And the answers to an emergency in Syria are very different in education to an emergency in, say, Sierra Leona. And for me, one of the biggest failings is we don't have a way of bridging the humanitarian to the development continuum, including on funding and including on things like education. We kind of like things in neat buckets, and actually, you can't put short-term acute emergencies in one bucket and (inaudible) in another. And I think this really affects education. I think the statistics in Liesbet's report on funding in (inaudible) emergencies are quite stark.

And so to me it's not just about the total amount of funding. I think there is no doubt we need more funding for particularly dealing with education in countries in (inaudible) crisis. But actually, a lot of it is about getting that better move across between humanitarian and development. I think in many countries when you talk about being in crisis, actually crisis is now sort of a main part of the development and you have to see the development continuum within the context of the conflict of the crisis. Because actually, the outcomes you're trying to get are similar. You know, we want kids in school and we want them learning.

I think another problem is we sort of apply the same traditional mindset and solutions we use to education in a normal country to these sorts of countries and sort of just assume you can move over. And actually, you've got to look at them completely differently. Just things like school year and planning is completely different in those sort of contexts.

And then it comes to Liesbet's other point about systemic reforms. I think it is absolutely crucial, particularly in these countries, because often they are the countries with the weakest governance and the weakest systems. And, you know, if we go around dabbling in little interventions when you've got a very weak system, we often make it even worse. And so you've got to stand back and look fundamentally at the system. And not just education just more generally. So what do we need to get that basic capability in governance in a place like that? And I think that's key.

And then just last -- well, two last points. We haven't really said anything about

EDUCATION-2015/09/08

technology, and for me, particularly in fragile states, you have a real opportunity around technology. You know, we know that we're not doing very well in many of our learning outcomes there but we're not really tearing up our traditional approach and saying, well, how can technology really play a very, very different role here. And I think we have to really rise to the technology challenge, including in things like (inaudible) crisis. When I'm looking at the Syrian refugees in Turkey, and it's obviously very much on all our minds at the moment, but why are they going to Europe? There was some stuff in the UK at the weekend. They're going because they have no faith that actually anything will ever change in their own country so they might as well start a new life somewhere else. But secondly, it's being driven by education because they have no access to education. So what are we doing in technology there to really move apart from putting kids in school in refugee camps? So actually, you could really take technology to another level in providing education to this.

And then just my last point in the whole fragile states thing is I think we're also trapped within a conundrum of always tending, particularly as donors, to deal with the government. The government is key, but very often, the nonstate actors in education there are often more important and deliver more outcomes than the state. So I think we all again have to step back and say who can actually get these outcomes and how do we do it? And that probably goes back to your systems point again, is we like to think about systemic reforms but we get trapped in ideology and other things too quickly so we don't really step back and look objectively of what the system is.

MS. WINTHROP: Alice, before I turn to you, Liesbet, what was -- Donal started off by saying, well, it depends on what you're talking about. Like, fragile state is a very broad term, fragility is, you know, yet another constellation of characteristics of states. I remember meetings with -- I'm looking at some of the research assistants in the back who worked on this report where we -- God, they were endless. It was like which list of fragile states do we use? And you guys came up with a very different approach. Could you, you know, what did you put in the bucket of fragile states when you were doing your analysis?

MS. STEER: Well, we actually worked with the OECD list mainly, but then slightly tweaked it looking at the World Bank list. So it is true, it is extremely difficult to make that judgment because some lists are much, much longer than others. The reason why we also went for the OECD list

EDUCATION-2015/09/08

primarily was because we were using the methodology from the OECD to divide up the countries, which was lining up with some of their financing needs as well. So that was our interest. And so it's not so much actually -- it's more those that have been fragile for a very long time and those lists are being reviewed, so it's more the ones that are having --

MS. WINTHROP: More the protracted crisis and not the quick --

MS. STEER: -- systemic --

MS. WINTHROP: -- emergency-type?

MS. STEER: Yeah, exactly.

MS. WINTHROP: Right. Okay.

Alice, you know, what's your take on this? Particularly, I'd be interested to hear your response to Donal's last point about, you know, in fact, we probably need to do system reform in fragile states and need to think very differently about who our interlocutors are. You know, GPE, of course, is supporting governments and government plans, and recently, GPE has taken on fragile states, and you have a fragile states policy and that's great. In fact, the number of countries, I think it's doubled or something in the last couple years who have applied and gotten GPE funding in terms of the number of countries who are fragile states who are GPE partners. But, you know, what is your perspective on sort of the GPE model in fragile states, particularly vis-à-vis government support versus a range of other actors, whether it's civil society or others that, you know, could be involved in systems strengthening at that?

MS. ALBRIGHT: I think there's been some terrific points made, and before I get my comments I want to again thank every one of the institutions or governments that you all work for for all that you're doing with us and in education, because all of you have made remarkable contributions.

So I was just making a little list here in my notes about the number of fragile and conflict-affected countries that we've had conversations about within GPE in the last few weeks. Okay? So it's Nepal. Let's say going back to sort of early May. Nepal, Central African Republic, Yemen, South Sudan, Chad, and Sierra Leone, and there are others. And so it is by far the fastest growing part of GPE's work. And you're absolutely right. We do have a specific way where we can accelerate funding up to a certain percentage of our grants to meet the changing needs of these countries.

I think that the key word here, Rebecca, is flexibility. And if you look at the different circumstances in all of these countries, each one of them has presented to us a very different ask and a very different set of circumstances. Whether or not it's national disaster or conflict or a protracted refugee situation or just fragility, and each one of these things is very different. Often what you see in countries like this is that the government, you know, we all have thoughts and ambitions and desires about the percentage of resources that get spent on education, but governments often have to make decisions to deprioritize simply for protection purposes.

So to answer your question about who should our interlocutor be, ideally, we believe it is the government. But often in countries like this, the government is not able to do so, so we do need to be flexible and be prepared to work through others.

So on the one hand, flexibility; on the other hand, I think there are some common themes. First of all, we have to keep education going. We have to explore financial mechanisms that are able to address a wide variety of circumstances, and we have to ultimately look to build back better and build stronger systems such that we build in resiliency in these countries when the next country and the next crisis comes along.

MS. WINTHROP: Thanks. Thanks to all of you.

I'd like to switch and get our thoughts on another sort of key point that Liesbet highlighted, which is the relatively limited share of education aid that comes from multilaterals or goes through multilateral mechanisms. I mean, I think it was about a third of all education aid is sort of multilateral in nature and education and it's about double that in health. And, you know, oftentimes people say, you know, multilateralism is really important for coordination. It also spreads risk around. It's also less political, so it could be more targeted towards need. So I'd be interested, you know, maybe turning over to you, Alice and Donal, to kick it off. From your perspectives, why is it that it's so limited in education? And perhaps if people aren't convinced, why do you think it's important?

MR. AAS: Before we do that, can I make some comments on what has been (inaudible)?

MS. WINTHROP: Yes. Yes, indeed. You're taking us back to fragile states. Okay. Stay strong. Go for it.

MR. AAS: I have three comments. And my first point is on civil society and using sort of

EDUCATION-2015/09/08

the civil society and nonstate actors to sort of promote the development agenda. I think we have -- Norway, we have, of course, seen and experienced that works. And at the same time I would say I think that there it is also important to have international ownership to the development of your country, be that social, economic, or political. So which also means, and I really experienced that as a donor country, you can come up with ideas saying we should invest in the northwestern part of your country compared to the capital, but really by the end of the day, I think it really (inaudible) down to what sort of -- how to create and to be part of creating good governance, and really also to have the national footprint of development of a specific country. That's my first point.

Then I would like to say also, and it has been said that countries in crisis and humanitarian catastrophes being played out now that we see that in Syria, based on my own experience, the crisis and what is happening in the Middle East and in Syria, particularly, is so grave and so -- it is the worst human crisis we have seen since the Second World War. And that is how I see it and how I experience it engaging in my own government is that because of the crisis unfolding, it's really important also for a country like Norway to do as much as it can to alleviate the situation in, for example, Syria, which also means then that we sometimes have to redirect our resources on development aid in order to be part of a huge international endeavor to help in this case Syria. So I think we also have that to take into consideration sort of looking into what will be there, the final figure on education.

Then I would say another experience for Norway is that some years ago, I think we were giving development aid to some 100 countries or (inaudible) countries, a lot of countries. What we have done now is really we need to concentrate our efforts on some specific countries and they are now, I think it's around 20-25 in order really to see whether we can make a difference. And I think that because as a donor country, we can't be all over the country but we can really concentrate our efforts on some of these countries, and where as I said education has been a priority.

So I'm just saying this based on my own work, how this is being also reflected in discussions and deliberations going on in Oslo. Thank you.

MS. WINTHROP: And Mr. Ambassador, one of the things that I know about Norway is you are -- I'm telling you, watch, I'm going to do a very nice tie between fragile states and multilateralism - - is that Norway is a big supporter of multilateral agencies and I'm imagining that when you're thinking

EDUCATION-2015/09/08

about the Syrian crisis and you're thinking about the education piece of that, it includes refugees, it includes supporting U.N. agencies like UNHCR and UNICEF and others, right, who are dealing with Syrian refugees in the area of Syria. You know, what -- tell me a little bit about Norway's perspective on multilateralism, in education in particular, if you have thoughts.

MR. AAS: Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. I would say that multilateralism and the U.N. and the U.N. families are really a key pillar in regards to foreign policy and it has been that way for 50-60 years and it will continue to be that. We believe in multilateralism, and we believe in multilateralism combined with a strong dialogue and partnership with donor countries. So that's how we see the world and how we really normatively would like to see the national community to be moving.

At the same time, I would say also that there is -- particularly I would say in crisis, in countries with huge crisis, that it's often I would say -- it also is a question about the sort of idea of one U.N. and where you should sort of have a special envoy or representatives or the secretary coordinating and making the sort of joint efforts by the whole U.N. family. (Inaudible) that is not very often working and that is also why we really want to be part of discussions in order to achieve that. But I think the facts on the ground often make this very, very difficult. But, I mean, part of the Oslo Summit and the appointment now of Gordon Brown and the anchoring this with you and others within the sort of U.N. system is, of course, a demonstration and example of believing in the United Nations.

MS. WINTHROP: Right. But you're not the norm, Norway. I mean, we know that the bulk of money is going through bilateralism mechanisms.

Donal, what's your take on this? How is DFID on multilateralism?

MR. BROWN: So --

MS. WINTHROP: And what do you think? Do you think it's really a good idea or do you not?

MR. BROWN: I think most people agree it's a good idea, but I think it's interesting to compare the education and the health sectors. And why is there so much more, as Liesbet showed, why is there so much more money flowing through multilaterals in the health sector than the education? Well, one issue for me is you've got a lot more instruments in the health sector, multilateral instruments. You've basically got one in education, which is GPE. So you're kind of comparing apples and pears at one level.

EDUCATION-2015/09/08

And so there's a question for me. You've got one instrument, and Alice will be able to talk a lot about this and that's one of the reasons I'm here obviously this week is how do we make GPE to be a really global, strong, robust instrument so you have something that you can put large amounts of funding through? We're still not there yet and we're working on strengthening the institution. And you don't have any other alternatives. You know, in the health sector, if you don't want to put your money into a global fund for AIDS, TB, and malaria, you can put it into GABI. You can put it in something else. You've only got one in this. So I think we've got to ensure we have a strong instrument and a robust instrument.

But I think at the same time it's not just about multilateralism; it's why isn't the funding going to education and why is it going down? And for me, not as an educationalist by background -- I'm working across a number of sectors -- it seems to me that one of the fundamental problems there is actually I don't know what education is trying to sell. No one argues that education isn't important, but it's much, much clearer what the offer is in health. And I think part of the problem is funding is not the issue. You will get the funding if you're clear on what you're trying to sell and that there's evidence that what you're trying to sell works. So I think another thing you take from Liesbet's slides is actually we really, you know, we've done a reasonable job at getting kids into school but that's not the difficult thing. You know, you can always find a room and put people in it, but if they're not learning, and I think this is the heart of why aren't people investing? Because we can't convince anyone. We know the answer to how do you get kids to learn? And I think when we've got a better story to tell about that you'll get money flowing that way. So there's a question to me about what the offer is. I don't think anyone has any problem to say on the what, education, but there isn't that much out there on the how with robust evidence behind it. And that links to data. And we know there's not that much data. We know the evidence -- and I refuse to believe when I challenge people on this they say, well, it's so much more difficult in education. No, I don't think it is. It's difficult but it's difficult in health, too. And I think we have to have far more commitment on the data and the evidence side of things in education. And it seems to me that one of the starting points in this, again, looking at comparison to the health sector, is we can't even agree on an indicator. You know, if you can't say learning, you know, measuring learning looks like this, however crude or however bad, we do it for poverty. You know, what you start building a consensus around, getting a vision around, and I think one of the things we have to do is have an international indicator on learning and just agree on

EDUCATION-2015/09/08

something and get moving or we will spend our time not knowing how to package what we're trying to sell. So I think that's really important.

So it's strengthen GPE. You can look at other instruments too on the multilateral side and see what's out there. But also, be a lot, lot clearer on the evidence and the data and invest in it now, and I think we have to be pretty disruptive in what we're trying to offer out there because I think we've got a lot of stuff out there that hasn't really given us a step change on learning, so unless we can say we've got some really new ideas and some sort of different ideas, we're still going to have a real problem selling the package.

And then I think just lastly, actually, the conversation must be about domestic resource mobilization. Aid, multilateral, bilateral, (inaudible) catalytic and targeted, and we've got to get much better on that. But if I was a part in the government I would also be saying I've got many, many things you've asked me to invest in. What's the offer that you're trying to sell to me on my own domestic resource mobilization and how do I know that's going to be better than investing in health? And until we can answer those questions, we're going to have trouble attracting the funding.

MS. WINTHROP: Alice, you spend your day job talking to people about why multilateralism is important and why they should invest in GPE. And I'm sure you do many, many other things, but that's an important piece of it. You know, what's your take here on why there isn't more -- why people aren't putting more into multilateral mechanisms?

MS. ALBRIGHT: Well, I'm not sure I would characterize it as an either/or. I think that bilateral funding is also very important, and some of our biggest donors, my neighbors on the stage here being amongst them, also, certainly, the U.S. Government and a few others, are very active bilaterally and I wouldn't want to give that up.

But why multilateral? And I think the figure that you have that talks about two-thirds of aid going into health is multilateral and one-third in education. And I used to work in the health space, so I've seen the differences. The problem that we have in education with it is the lack of multilateral funding makes our job quite a bit harder, both at the global level, as well as at the national level. Globally, we do see that there is a huge room for collective action in education. It's advocacy, it's mobilizing knowledge, it's mobilizing urgency and attention. Many of you will know that there's an emerging consensus around



EDUCATION-2015/09/08

the need to do something much more in the humanitarian space in education. That is a very good example of how collective global action on something emerging attention is heading in the right direction, and I'm confident it will wind up creating I think what's going to be hopefully a promising platform for making some progress in humanitarian crises in education.

There's a number of other areas of collective action globally that education would benefit from. You know, a very interesting conversation that we have often is, is education a global public good, and can it be scaled in some way? And then quickly people get into discussions about how countries are all quite different from each other and there's nothing that we can do that is scalable. I simply don't believe that. I think there's a lot that we could be doing that's scalable. So that's an example of where we do need better multilateral action.

At the country level we see it in particular, and if you look at the numbers, and Liesbet, you've done a super job with this, what you see is if you look at multilateral aid as a percentage of the whole pie about what gets financed in education, it is a tiny, tiny percentage of the overall financing that is deployed in education domestically. Most of the money comes from the countries. So multilateral money can, however, catalyze better outcomes domestically. And this is what is at the heart of what GPE does. So we work with countries to catalyze domestic resources. In fact, that's now a requirement that we have of our new funding model. We work with countries to strengthen their sector plans in an effort to build stronger, more durable education systems, and we work across a range of different what we call sector-wide issues in countries, and that is because we have multilateral money that can catalyze responses, policy, attention to things at the country level.

But by not having a strong multilateral voice, we give up the opportunity for global action and we give up the opportunity for very collective action in the countries, and that's why we need to continue to make sure that we do have a strong multilateral instrument, which is GPE. And I'm thrilled about the work that's going on to strengthen GPE right now.

MS. WINTHROP: Great. Thanks.

I think let's turn to the audience, and Liesbet, we'll bring you back into the conversation. People have been talking about your report but we'll hear from you in the Q and A.

There are mics going around, so if you guys have questions, raise your hand high. We'll

take a couple.

Let's start over here. Can you hold your hands up again? Yeah. We'll take these two here and then these two in the corner. Yeah. Go ahead.

MR. HERSHEY: I'm Bob Hershey. I'm a consultant.

To what extent have you been able to raise private money, especially by getting together the vehicles over the Internet and getting an economic consensus?

MS. WINTHROP: To the education sector or at large?

Liesbet, why don't you take that one? Private money.

MS. STEER: Okay. So --

MS. WINTHROP: It sounds like direct marketing; right? Appealing to -- yeah.

MS. STEER: Yes. I actually -- I actually think that Donal's point around what it is we're selling is a really important one. I think -- I think we have a bit of a problem in the education sector to make a case for investment. You actually -- the profit money can span a whole bunch of things. It can be philanthropy. There's also now a lot of interest in something called impact investing, which is sort of trying to combine social returns and financial returns so we attract the private sector that way. When you speak to people who are really big in this, and actually a colleague of mine in the center is doing a lot of work on this, they just say we don't know what it is we have to invest in. Tell us what it is and we will get the investors. So I think we have a bit of a problem with this. I always get reminded of the story of why Bill Gates got involved in philanthropy and why he invested so heavily in health because the World Bank's WDR came up with this concept of dalley. It's sort of an indicator that's really clear and that shows how investing in health has specific returns. I think if we could get a dalley for education, I think we would be in a very good place and we would be much more successful in attracting private.

MS. WINTHROP: So I think the answer is not so successful.

The woman right behind him. Nice tiger print dress. Lion, tiger. That's you. You're wearing it. Yes.

MARIE: I'm Marie from Humana People to People. We're a network of local organizations investing around \$30-40 million a year in education, particularly quality, inclusive teacher training. Up to half of that money comes from national governments and other money comes from the

private sector, including many of you on the panel.

And my question goes to the whole panel because we, you know, you say, Liesbet -- and thank you very much for the great presentation. That was really informative -- that even if the national governments come up with their part, we still have a gap of \$30 billion. So my question is, because many of us here, I'm sure, in this room, we both are advocates and mobilizers of funding. So my question is twofold. One is where does that -- where do we get that \$30 billion from? And number two is what do we do as educators and implementers in education collectively to make the case for more financing and better financing?

MS. WINTHROP: Great.

Yeah, go ahead. Alice?

MS. ALBRIGHT: That's a question that many of us are thinking about, and I think that the advent of the new SDG presents us an opportunity to have a need -- it's an essential need -- to think about how do we rethink the system of financing education? Because the SDG 4 is such a broader goal than MDG 2 was. So I think that the Finance Commission that has been announced by the Norwegian government and others is a remarkable opportunity to get that right.

So just to give you one fact that I looked up this morning in coming over here, we have 60 countries at GPE. And if you just look at Ethiopia, Vietnam, Kenya, Pakistan, and Ghana, all of them have issued around a billion dollars at least in the international capital markets since 2014. And if you looked at the level of domestic sovereign debt issuance in many of these countries, it would also be a significant number.

So we're not saying that we should go out and borrow to the hilt to finance education around the world, but it shows you that the world has really moved on in terms of the areas of sources of money that can be deployed in interesting way and should be for education. And if you look at the ways that we're still thinking about education finance, it is tending to be fairly binary. It's ODA, which is an important, but ultimately small part of the overall pie, and it's domestic resources which is critically important but has some limitations to it ultimately. And so we are at a moment prompted by the SDG 4 to have to think about this in a totally different way. And I think come back to the group in a few months. Hopefully, next summer time and hopefully there will be a good answer to that question.

MS. WINTHROP: Donal, did you want to weigh in?

MR. BROWN: I do. Just in addition to the first question on private money, I mean, it seems to me that one of the areas that the private sector could really help is the issue I raised earlier about technology. I mean, and there is some real opportunities there, and I think some of the most exciting investment from the private sector will be around technology within education. We have to work that one through. And I think probably the other rider on the private money one is, as I said earlier, we've got to get away from ideology as well and we've just got to look at how do you get results in education. Too quickly, as soon as you mention the private sector, many, many people put up walls. So I think we just have to have that debate out there because it's happening. The money is there, particularly at the household level.

So then on the funding gap, I think that's part of the answer as well, about the funding gap, is we've got to be real about funding and I can't remember the exact figures, and that's Liesbet's job to be our encyclopedia. But actually, household expenditure on education, not domestic resource mobilization, is phenomenal, even in very, very poor parts of Africa.

And I thought one of the other interesting things in the report was, you know, we often in the aid business talk lots and lots about actual remittances and the evidence on remittances going into -- as a direct link to education is quite incredible. So how do we get much, much more on top of that remittance issue? Because it may well dwarf a lot of the development money going into that funding gap if we get that remittance thing. And it makes sense. You know, if you're a diaspora outside the country and you're trying to do something for your family (inaudible) you want them to get that education to get out or to get an opportunity. And so I think there's really interesting stuff around there.

But I would also come back to this issue about the financing gap. What are we trying to sell? If it's more of what was there before, forget it. You know, we've got to be much, much clearer, which goes back to the dalleys or whatever. What's that big indicator? What can we be held accountable for? You know, just to be a bit more sobering, you know, in the SDG business now, there's a lot more things to invest in. So education has got to get even better at selling their bid. And to me it's got to be about results. It's got to be about something like that. And you know, I sit there and we all agree that education is a human right, but whether we're talking about the private sector or others, actually, this

EDUCATION-2015/09/08

whole thing is an economic argument. You know, if you invest in education, what does it do? And actually, you know, in the development business, we don't want to be funding countries anymore. We want them to have prosperous economies. That isn't going to come from anything but education, but we're not very good at making those arguments and then producing the evidence behind it. You know, we all do start generally in conversations with, you know, shouldn't kids have an education? Isn't it right? Well, no one disagrees with that, but I think the crux will be you start showing Liesbet's slide of skills and the demographic bulge, and there will be a massive demographic bulge we know in South Asia and Africa with no skills to match it. They will not become an East Asia unless they get those skills, and to have that they have to have the education. We've got to get a lot sharper on the evidence and data around the economic arguments.

MS. WINTHROP: Ambassador, may I bring you in after two more questions? There's a gentleman right next to Marie, and then a gentleman on the aisle here. Let's take two questions.

MR. ROTHENBERG: John Rothenberg. I'm an Afghanistan specialist with a lot of experience in education.

My question is in the short and middle term, is there a role for microfinance to help finance education?

MS. WINTHROP: Great. And the gentleman on the aisle here? Thank you.

SPEAKER: Thank you very much. My name is Safu Mari. I'm a consultant, self-employed.

I have three questions. My first question is (inaudible).

MS. WINTHROP: All right. Let's start with one question. Be brief.

SPEAKER: Only one?

MS. WINTHROP: Yeah.

SPEAKER: Only one?

MS. WINTHROP: Only one. You can come talk to them afterwards. I promise.

SPEAKER: Okay. Liesbet, when I saw your presentation over there, you show survival rates. 55 percent survival rates for developing countries. Do you have any idea what percentage of this survival rate is rural and urban? And with that, I would also like to know how much resources have been

used to (inaudible) education?

MS. WINTHROP: Great.

SPEAKER: Because unless we know how much money has gone to rural and urban, I don't think we will be able to address the inequalities, the in-country inequalities.

And I also assume or believe that unless we harmonize our intervention, both bilateral and multilateral, we might not be able to push local or national governments to concentrate the resource allocation into the rural areas.

MS. WINTHROP: That's a very good question.

SPEAKER: So with that, I would also take advantage to ask a global partnership lady to tell us, I mean, how are you going to really bring bilateral and multilateral donors to pool resources to enhance education intervention? Also, what is your plan or thinking to bring diaspora resources and capabilities to link with rural and urban education?

MS. WINTHROP: Okay. Thank you.

And very last question right here in front. Yeah, last question. And then the panelists will each have an opportunity to make closing remarks.

SPEAKER: Hi. My name is (inaudible) in the Office of Education, USAID here in Washington.

My question has to do with the survival rates as well, and Liesbet, I would love for you to dig a little deeper into it. Most of the research that we've seen shows that survival rates issues are related to poverty and not learning. And in federal states related to crisis and mobility and not learning, and that may be a construct but that's what research shows. So when one of the answers seems to be capacity, we're not talking about governance. Capacity is not necessary an issue we can work on in federal states, but governance of the capacity and governance of the funds could be something we're looking at.

So I'd like Liesbet to dig a little deeper on the source -- the interventions related to survival rates.

MS. WINTHROP: Great. Thanks.

So Liesbet, why don't you tackle that and then we'll finish closing with you.

MS. STEER: So yes, I definitely agree we could dig in a lot more into this data. I'd say two things. One, on kind of what is the cause of this, I actually didn't mention this, but when you see that graph where you try and relate spending to outcomes, there's been a lot of research trying to figure out what really determines outcomes. And one of the findings is that actually a lot of it has to do with children's backgrounds and characteristics, which means that actually one way of getting where we need to be is investing in health. It's investing in other sectors that will be helping us to move the dial. So that's one thing I would say.

Secondly, on the inequities of spending, this is one I'm very passionate about. It seems like an odd topic to be passionate about, but we've done quite a bit of research before this report trying to track how countries are spending their money regionally, and within countries, how do they allocate urban versus rural? Where is the money going?

The first thing we observe is this is very difficult to do. Governments have no idea where the money is going, whether it is for Bangladesh, it was impossible. We were working with the government, with the research institute. They had data on the teachers and they had in another department data on capital spending. But when you don't actually ask at the school level what are the resources being spent, it's very difficult. So what we did was actually estimate, assuming, using household census, school census data, estimate, okay, if we know the school has so many teachers, if we know the building has these kind of characteristics, this is probably what is being spent. This was something they had never done. And so then you could start relating, okay, the money going to these schools is only so much, and this is what we are achieving. And this led us actually to an initiative which we are just developing here called My School. Global My School, which is really trying to push the agenda of linking financing to learning outcomes at the school level. And we've worked with Julia Gillard actually is the chair of GPE and was prime minister of Australia and introduced a platform like this actually showing how technology also can really be a game changer. We're now in Australia, and when she was prime minister she could see exactly how much money was going to different schools, how these schools were performing, and what they also did was connect socioeconomic characteristics with it. So then we could start comparing schools like we like. Schools that had poorer children with other schools that had poorer children, and then start a conversation about what resources are needed and how they could be

best used.

MS. WINTHROP: Great. Thank you, Liesbet.

I'm looking at the time and we're going to finish, Ambassador Aas, with you. You had comments I know on the private sector financing and various others, and then for those of you who want to talk more to any of our panelists, including Alice and Donal, please do come find them after this session. So final word.

MR. AAS: Thank you, Rebecca. And first of all, I would like to commend Brookings for convening this seminar. It has been really useful and I must say I have learned a lot.

My second point is I think that -- and I just want to reiterate that Norway will continue to be an excellent partner with all of you on this panel, and we are very -- and we also hope the New York meeting will be very successful and that Gordon Brown and his commission really will contribute to sort of moving this agenda forward.

Then I would say that none of us have been talking about the gender issue, and I would be interested in the next meetings to see how sort of the domestic resource mobilization (inaudible) gender issue, because I would guess that in some countries they have very low attention towards girls, and which then might be reflected in the (inaudible). But I don't know, but I think that the gender issue is really, really important on this issue. And that is also why my government is very strong on girls in conflict areas. So thank you once again for convening the meeting and inviting me.

MS. WINTHROP: Thank you. And thank you very much, Donal and Alice, and to the ambassador. And we look forward to more discussions to come. Thanks everybody.

(Applause)

\* \* \* \* \*

#### 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

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



EDUCATION-2015/09/08

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.

Carleton J. Anderson, III

(Signature and Seal on File)

Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Virginia

Commission No. 351998

Expires: November 30, 2016