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1. INTRODUCTION

The future of bilateral aid to basic education is at risk, placing the educational opportunities of many of the world’s poorest girls and boys on the line. Some donor governments are reducing overall bilateral assistance, others are phasing out long-standing partnerships with particular developing countries and several are abandoning education as a priority sector altogether. All of this, it appears, is being carried out with little donor coordination, resulting in the substantial reduction of external education support and technical assistance for countries where it is desperately needed. While there are several donors increasing their aid to basic education, such as the United Kingdom and Australia, the overall picture looks bleak with bilateral aid to basic education stagnating, at best, and, at worst, significantly declining in the coming years. Current and future multilateral contributions to basic education are not expected to fill the financing gap left by donors’ withdrawal from the sector in several countries, barring a major effort to raise funding for the Education for All-Fast Track Initiative’s (EFA FTI) trust fund and a significant increase in World Bank International Development Association (IDA) loans for education. Taken together, this likely spells difficult times ahead for the education systems of many developing countries, some of which are losing basic education support from up to five bilateral donors at once.

These reductions are poorly timed, arriving precisely when many developing countries are most in need of aid to reach the Education for All (EFA) and the education Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) by 2015. In 2000, at the World Forum on Education in Dakar, Senegal, over one thousand participants agreed to work cooperatively to help developing nations achieve six education-related goals. The six EFA goals include a call to support early childhood education, universal primary education, basic life skills, adult literacy, gender equality, and education quality. That same year, the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) were adopted by the international community and added an increased focus to two of the EFA goals, namely universal primary education and gender parity in school. In support of these goals, representatives from 164 countries in Dakar signed a pledge that “no countries seriously committed to Education for All will be thwarted in their achievement of [these] goal[s] by lack of resources.” Given the current widespread reduction in support for education however, this scenario seems increasingly likely to happen.

In spite of some impressive increases in enrolling children into primary school over the past decade, over 67 million children are still out of primary school, with many more dropping out before they acquire basic skills such as literacy and numeracy. By some estimates, approximately 200 million students are enrolled in schools of such poor quality that they learn very little. If the population growth of young people continues to follow current trends, at least 27 million children will be born into low-income countries each year, vastly increasing the youth age demographic. This “youth bulge” will no doubt add considerable pressure on education systems to absorb increasing numbers of children reaching school-age. According to UNESCO’s Education for All Global Monitoring Report (GMR), as the number of youth in developing countries rises, more children will be out-of-school in 2015 than are out-of-school today. As such, the gains made to enrol more children in primary school since 2000 will be lost unless serious consideration is given to increasing the capacity of school systems to support the increased number of children and youth. The initial success of increasing global enrolments by 52 million since 2000 – a product of renewed political commitment and increasing resources for education – will not be sustained without continued support to improve access and second-stage efforts to improve education quality. Protecting the recent gains in education will require donors to re-commit to the Education for All agenda, increase their investments in basic education development, and put aid effectiveness principles into practice by coordinating aid flows in predictable, coordinated ways.

In light of the challenge the current reductions in bilateral aid to education are posing to the achievement of universal quality education, the Center for Universal Education and the Education for All Fast Track Initiative have undertaken a preliminary analysis of the current trends in donor aid to education. This paper starts by setting out the financing need in developing countries, in the context both of progress made throughout the past decade, and of the remaining progress yet to be made to strengthen education systems in low and middle income countries. Our analysis uses public reports and the results of a short survey of donors (See Annex 1) to create a forecast of the overall picture of bilateral aid to basic education over the next few years, as well as the impact on individual developing countries. Specifically, we focus on low- and low middle-income countries, as defined by the World Bank classifications. This initial analysis reveals that donors are pulling out of the education sector in several countries simultaneously, with little coordination or effort to ensure that funding is not dramatically cut. However, with many countries still coping with large numbers of out-of-school children, and more which have yet to ensure that the education provided is of good quality, the timing for donor withdrawal
could not be worse. The fragile gains made in the past decade may be lost altogether if this trend is not mitigated by increased and better coordination of aid to education.

2. BASIC EDUCATION IS A NECESSARY INVESTMENT FOR DEVELOPMENT

The arguments for investing in Education for All are clear. Education has been proven to reduce poverty, improve health outcomes, and promote gender equality:

- Each year of schooling translates into a 10 percent increase in potential income
- An increase of one standard deviation in student mathematics and literacy scores can increase annual GDP by 2 percent
- In Africa, children of mothers who complete primary education are 40 percent more likely to survive to age 5 and are 50 percent more likely to receive potentially life-saving immunizations
- One year of schooling reduces fertility rates by 10 percent
- Each additional year of school has the potential to raise a woman’s income by 15 percent
- HIV/AIDS rates are halved among men and women who complete primary education

Basic education, defined by the Global Monitoring Report to include primary education, basic life skills for youth and adults, and early childhood education, is a vital foundation for a healthy education sector and a robust economy. Of course, no country will develop successfully through a reliance on education alone, but choosing to neglect basic education can also have damaging consequences. Quality basic education is a necessary stepping-stone to higher education and sustained economic growth. In fact, the acquisition of basic cognitive skills such as literacy and numeracy has been strongly and positively linked to individual earnings, equality of income distribution and economic growth. Without it, countries have difficulty expanding their knowledge economy, building important 21st-century skills and creating a qualified workforce—all of these important drivers of economic and social development. Thus, expanding access to and improving the quality of basic education are compelling, necessary, and urgent national and global objectives to fuel overall development.

3. EVEN WITH PROGRESS IN BASIC EDUCATION, A LARGE FINANCING GAP REMAINS

Good progress has already been made toward the EFA goals with increasing numbers of children enrolled in primary school and major gains in several countries facing large gender disparities in education. Developing countries have increased domestic financing to education, indicating their commitment to Education for All. However, there are other countries that admittedly could do better; for example, in 2009 Pakistan only spent 2.7 percent of its GDP on education, Cambodia spent 2.1 percent and Central African Republic spent just 1.3 percent.

In spite of increased financial commitments by developing countries, there is an on-going and significant need for external financial assistance in education. Many developing countries rely heavily on Official Development Assistance (ODA) to help finance their education sectors. In Sub-Saharan Africa, fifteen countries have a ratio of education ODA to public expenditure on education of over one-fourth. This ratio indicates that for every...
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Although not all ODA to education will be spent in public expenditure (some aid is allocated to non-governmental groups, for instance), presumably a part of this ODA to education does go through the public account. Therefore, it is likely that any changes in bilateral aid to education, in particular to countries with high ODA-to-public spending ratios, will have a significant impact on those countries’ abilities to provide access to quality Education for All of their young people.

The 2011 Global Monitoring Report also estimates that another US$16 billion in external aid is needed annually to fill the financing gap required to achieve the Education for All goals by 2015. So far, donors are coming up far short of this estimate and worrisome trends in bilateral aid indicate an urgent situation for basic education in the near future.

4. BILATERAL AID TO BASIC EDUCATION: THE STORY SO FAR

According to recent projections, at best, bilateral aid to basic education for the world’s poorest countries may flat-line, and at worst it will decrease significantly. Some major education donors are pulling out of the sector or significantly reducing aid, and increases in bilateral aid to education by other donors may not cover the losses. Total aid to education, including bilateral and multilateral aid, has followed a general upward trend in recent years, other than in 2008 when there was a slight decrease (see Chart 1). Disbursements to education have more than doubled since 2002, from US$6.1 billion to US$13.4 billion in 2009. Data on ODA to education in 2010 will likely reflect significant increases, perhaps partly due to a one-time US$1.05 billion World Bank IDA loan to India for education. However, despite overall increases in 2010 and a commitment by the World Bank to make an additional $750 million available for primary education over the next five years, initial evidence shows that Bank education financing in 2011 will actually drop to less than half of the 2010 amount, further threatening the scale of financing available in the sector. As the single largest multilateral education financier, the reduction in World Bank total education lending and even sharper decreases in its basic education financing will have a dramatic impact on ODA levels to education.

Although aid to basic education has more than doubled since 2002, basic education as a share of total aid to education seems to have stagnated in recent years, at just over 40 percent of total education aid since 2007. The majority of education aid is concentrated in post-basic and vocational education. Aid data can be misleading too; some donors report university scholarships to students from developing countries to study in the donor country as aid, yet this aid does not reach education sectors in developing countries.
Bilateral aid is a major component of ODA to education, comprising more than 70 percent of disbursements in 2009, with the remaining channeled through multilateral arrangements. Bilateral aid not only provides direct funding to developing countries, but also provides staff and technical partnerships between donor and developing countries, partnerships that risk termination when aid is cut. As donor countries pare down the lists of their developing country partners, implications are not only financial, but technical and policy-based as well. Thus, developing countries are set to lose much more than financial assistance when they are eliminated from donors’ rosters. While bilateral aid to education has also followed an upward trend since 2002, the share to basic education has remained at around one-third of aid to education (see Chart 2). This means that with decreases in external education financing, the amount allocated to basic education is likely to decrease in proportion.

![Bilateral Aid Disbursements to Education, 2002-2009](image)

Source: Calculations based on OECD-DAC Creditor Reporting System

**5. POOR DONOR COORDINATION LEAVES SIGNIFICANT EDUCATION GAPS AT COUNTRY-LEVEL**

In the past two years, several donors have decided to reduce or eliminate aid to education and many have reduced the number of developing countries to which they will provide education aid. As an institutional decision, this may not have immediately perceived negative value, as there are normally good rational reasons for doing so within agencies. On the other hand, there appears to have been little communication or coordination between donors about the collective impact their individual actions may have, despite their expressed commitment to aid effectiveness principles. At the country level, this can have particularly devastating implications. This unpredictability and lack of coordination is made abundantly clear, for example, in the cases of Burkina Faso, Cambodia, and Nicaragua, each of which will have lost five bilateral donors within the past two years. Some donors, such as the Netherlands, are de-prioritizing education altogether, claiming it is not their comparative advantage. Yet Dutch leadership and expertise in education has been described by many as instrumental in helping move the field forward and accomplishing some of the hard-earned education gains over the last decade. Assessing comparative advantages, as called upon by aid effectiveness principles, requires a close look across donor agencies, not only identifying internal agency priorities or strengths.

In 2005, the international community came together in Paris for the Second High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness and created what is known as the “Paris Declaration.” This declaration was reaffirmed in 2008 and was followed up with the Accra Agenda for Action, signed by 136 donor and developing countries, multilateral agencies, and civil society organizations. The Paris and Accra declarations emphasize five principles of aid effectiveness: (i) ownership by developing countries; (ii) alignment of aid to their national priorities; (iii) harmonization among donors; (iv) results-based management; and (v) mutual accountability. These principles are
meant to improve the efficiency and impact of aid, in particular by encouraging donors to coordinate with each other to concentrate their efforts and deliver aid in line with their respective comparative advantages. Donor harmonization is important and in theory should reduce costly fragmentation of aid. A developing country is better served through one or two high-quality programs, rather than with many smaller programs. Thus, in the Paris and Accra declarations, donors commit to “work together to reduce the number of separate, duplicative missions to the field...” and to “make full use of their respective comparative advantage at sector or country level by delegating, where appropriate, authority to lead donors for the execution of programmes, activities and tasks.”

In practice, this translates to individual donors engaging with fewer countries and sectors, as they endeavor to reduce duplicative programs and do only what they do best. Aid effectiveness principles also encourage donors to reduce their geographical scope and concentrate aid in fewer developing countries, ideally those low- and low middle-income countries that truly need aid. So while many bilateral donors are focused on having more effective development assistance, the detailed coordination needed to ensure that changes in individual agency policies do not leave collective education gaps appears to be missing. Too many low- and low middle-income countries, like Benin and Burkina Faso, are losing several bilateral donors each, and, consequently, significant amounts of basic education aid.

Predictability of aid is low as well. Without aid predictability, developing countries that depend heavily on external financing for education cannot be confident in their future ability to scale-up or even maintain national education sector plans. The volatile nature of aid threatens country plans to build classrooms, hire teachers, buy textbooks, or implement school feeding programs. Students may suddenly find themselves without materials or an instructor, and the chances of reaching the millions of children who have so far been excluded from the classroom could be significantly reduced. The Paris and Accra declarations call on donor countries to increase the transparency and predictability of aid; yet the process for gathering data for this report alone indicates a long way to go toward those principles.

6. THE TROUBLED FUTURE OF OVERALL BILATERAL AID TO BASIC EDUCATION

From currently available information, the apparent trend in bilateral aid to basic education shows a stagnation or decrease in the next few years, with the top two education donors reducing the number of developing country partners and/or their bilateral aid to education (see Chart 3). Given the scale of resources and technical assistance provided by the United States and the Netherlands, any down-scaling of their support for basic education will have a large impact on aid to the sector. Both countries have shown strong leadership and commitment to the cause of improving basic education over many years, unsurprisingly, there is widespread concern that even with strong basic education contributions from the U.K. and Australia, a reduction of support and commitment from the U.S. and the Netherlands may lead to serious impacts in many countries.

The Netherlands, as mentioned previously, has eliminated basic education as a development priority and as a result it will cut most, if not all, bilateral aid to the sector (the future of its contribution to multilateral education programs is unclear). In the short term the Netherlands will cease providing aid to half of the countries where it had done so previously and education aid in some of the remaining developing countries will be or is being phased out.

The United States, like the Netherlands, has also historically been a top contributor of bilateral aid to basic education. Future aid reductions of up to 20 percent come from an overall budget reduction in ODA, but specifics are unclear, including whether the United States will stop providing any basic education aid to any particular developing country. A $684 billion spending cap on “security category” appropriations administered under the recent debt ceiling legislation will certainly lead to reduced funding for foreign assistance generally and likely to the basic education account.

Denmark has committed to maintaining its education aid and appears poised to provide important political leadership in the sector through their role co-hosting the EFA-FTI Pledging Event in Copenhagen in November 2011 (which aims to raise $8 billion in basic education aid). The Danish government’s total aid to basic education is expected to remain unchanged, although Denmark will reallocate $26 million of bilateral aid to education for four countries (Benin, Burkina Faso, Nepal, and Zambia) to the Education for All - Fast Track Initiative, doubling its annual contribution to the multilateral entity to about US$ 52 million. While overall financing for
教育丹麦将被维持，但至关重要的技术援助损失四个国家的（包括不丹、越南、尼加拉瓜、玻利维亚，以及还未确认的柬埔寨）令人担忧。

在另一侧，澳大利亚、英国、德国和法国都将增加对基本教育的双边援助。新西兰可能会增加对基本教育的双边援助，尽管谈判目前正在进行中。

澳大利亚计划在2011年到2015年间花费530亿美元在教育上，年平均花费130亿美元在努力将ODA提升到国内生产总值的0.5%。澳大利亚将分配19%的ODA（887百万美元）用于教育，其中57%将用于基本教育。教育的大部分援助（5亿）将针对太平洋地区。

这代表了对教育总援助和基本教育份额的极大增加。


德国预计会大大增加教育援助，包括增加双边援助，特别是将教育援助增加到非洲2013年约200亿美元。但是德国的传统上是集中在职业教育和后高等教育，因此其新的教育策略仍然很专注在这些领域。

法国，另一个教育援助大部分分配给基本教育的国家，计划总体上增加教育援助，特别是在基本教育。法国对基本教育的援助自2002年有所增加，但可能在未来的几年内会有所增加。

图表3总结了世界上最大的双边援助者的一些基本教育援助变化，包括受影响的国家。当信息在双边援助方向上的援助和.RequestMethod不明确时，国家将被排除在图表之外。
### Chart 3: Changes in Bilateral Aid to Basic Education

#### (In descending order of total aid to basic education)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor</th>
<th>Rank in total aid disbursements to basic education from DAC donors, average 2006-2009</th>
<th>Anticipated directional change in bilateral basic education aid</th>
<th>Low- and low middle-income countries which will have bilateral education aid phased out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>Decrease - based on overall budget cuts and reduced prioritization of education vis-à-vis other sectors</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>Decrease – reduced prioritization of education</td>
<td>Bangladesh, Benin, Bolivia, Burkina Faso, Democratic Republic of Congo, Egypt, Ethiopia, Georgia, Ghana, Guatemala, Indonesia, Kosovo, Moldova, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Rwanda, Senegal, Tanzania, Vietnam, Zambia; Possibly: Mali, Uganda, Yemen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>Angola, Burundi, Cameroon, Cambodia, China, Gambia, Indonesia, Iraq, Kosovo, Lesotho, Moldova, Niger, Vietnam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>#4</td>
<td>Increase in overall education aid, share to basic unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>#6</td>
<td>Increase in overall education aid, share to basic unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>#7</td>
<td>Decrease - based on overall budget cuts</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>#10</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>#13</td>
<td>Decrease – move from bilateral to multilateral channels, total education aid level to remain the same</td>
<td>Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Vietnam, Zambia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**7. Particular countries will be greatly affected by education aid cuts**

Through analyzing the limited information available, it can be determined that, thus far, over 40 low- and low middle-income countries have recently lost or are losing in the near future at least two bilateral donors (see Annex 3). Chart 4 shows a selection of the countries with the poorest education indicators that are poised to lose at least one major basic education donor and a large share of aid to basic education. Countries with very strong education sectors are not included here, even though they may also lose a large portion of basic education aid in the near future. The rationale behind this decision is to identify those particular countries that risk a sharp reduction in the external financing for their education sector and related cuts in important expenditure areas which will slow progress toward universal quality education.

A more comprehensive version of Chart 4 can be found in Annex 2.
In the most striking example, Burkina Faso is losing or has already lost a total of five donors, which provided 53 percent on average of total aid to basic education from 2006 to 2009. Clearly Burkina Faso is losing a significant portion of its aid to basic education, but what makes this more problematic is its high ratio of education aid to public expenditure on education, at just over one-third. This ratio indicates that Burkina Faso is fairly dependent on aid for its education sector. These donor withdrawals not only represent a huge loss in potential money, staff, and technical assistance, but also indicate a lack of cooperation among donors. Burkina Faso has very poor education statistics: 63 percent primary net enrolment rate and only 43 percent primary completion rate. This means that 63 percent of school-age children attend primary school, and only 43 percent of children who do enrol actually complete the last grade of primary school. Therefore, it is a country where donors should stay, not leave. The improvements that Burkina Faso has made in primary enrolments and gender parity risk being reversed with such a large aid withdrawal. Even worse, there is no clear replacement of this aid.

Cambodia will also lose five donors to basic education, among them Belgium, a major education donor to the country. Those five donors provided on average almost one-fifth of total basic education aid to Cambodia from 2006 to 2009. Its primary education sector is strong in terms of access, but significant challenges regarding quality and marginalized populations remain, with the average number years of schooling just 3.4 for the poorest 20 percent of the population. Cambodia has set ambitious targets for education quality, thus it would be premature for donors to pull out of the education sector before solid advancements are made in that area.

Nicaragua is also set to lose five donors, whose average share to total basic education aid was 35 percent over 2006 to 2009. This large potential reduction in aid may be problematic for Nicaragua as its primary completion rate is still only 75 percent, well below the regional average, and 53,000 children of primary school age are still out-of-school. As a country with over 20 percent illiteracy and with the poorest quintile completing only 2.5 years of school on average, Nicaragua needs sustained support to continue improving its educational status. External financing has been critical to making gains in primary education coverage, improving teacher qualifications and purchasing didactic materials for pre-primary and primary public schools; however, lack of school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Primary Completion Rate, 2009</th>
<th>Donors Planning to Phase Out (or Who Recently Phased Out) Aid</th>
<th>Share of Average Annual Total Aid to Basic Education, 2006-2009, from Departing Donors</th>
<th>Is a Top Three Basic Education Donor to Country Departing?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Italy, Netherlands</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>Yes, Netherlands and Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>75%*</td>
<td>Canada, Denmark, Finland, Netherlands, Sweden</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>Yes, Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>Canada, Denmark, Netherlands</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>Yes, Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>Canada, Denmark, Netherlands</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>Yes, Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>Denmark, Netherlands</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>Yes, Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Germany, United Kingdom</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>Yes, Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>Yes, Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>Denmark, Netherlands, Sweden, United Kingdom</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>Yes, United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>54%*</td>
<td>Canada, Netherlands</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>Yes, Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>Italy, Netherlands</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>Yes, Netherlands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2008 data
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infrastructure and qualified teachers (both of which benefit from external investments) will continue to pose challenges to Nicaragua if it reduces its current expenditures on education.

Vietnam is losing four donors, including a major education donor in the United Kingdom which will phase out aid by 2016. The average share of total basic education aid from these donors is 14 percent. Vietnam has a strong primary education sector in terms of access, though like Cambodia, Vietnam is working toward improving quality of education, so donor phase-outs in education may be premature. Continuing widespread inconsistencies in the quality of education across the country, as well as persistent inequalities in access to secondary school are challenges in Vietnam unlikely to be overcome with potential cuts to the education budget as a consequence of reduced external financing.

For Zambia, the three departing donors funded about one-third of total aid to basic education. Zambia appears to be highly dependent on aid for education, with a ratio of education aid to public expenditure on education of just over one-half. Despite major progress in the past decade during which time Zambia increased the primary enrolment rate by 25%, there are still over 81,000 children of primary school age who are out-of-school. The United Kingdom will keep Zambia as a bilateral partner, but any increases in education aid may not cover the losses from other donors. In Benin, these three donors funded over twenty percent of total aid to basic education. With a primary completion rate of only 62 percent and nearly 100,000 primary-school aged children still out-of-school, Benin is not in a good position to be experiencing aid reductions.

8. DONORS MUST INCREASE AND COORDINATE EDUCATION AID

Without adequate coordination of education aid, two serious problems confront the international community in its efforts to achieve the Education for All goals. The first is the significant recent reductions in bilateral aid to education by major donors such as the Netherlands and the U.S. The second urgent issue is the simultaneous withdrawal of multiple sources of education aid in several countries, leaving large financing gaps at a time when developing countries need external education financing in this final push to achieving the education goals set for 2015. Low- and low middle-income countries with struggling education sectors like Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Nicaragua, and Benin are poised to lose a large amount of bilateral aid in the near future with no clear replacement for that aid. While there will also be increases in bilateral aid to basic education from other donors, these increases may not make up for the losses. These rough estimates based on initial data from donors indicate that uncoordinated donor decisions about their aid to education could be disastrous for children around the world. With reductions in bilateral aid to basic education in the near future, countries that have enjoyed significant improvements in education risk regressing on those improvements, especially if there is no clear replacement of the aid to be lost.

Basic education, with its immense health, economic, and social benefits, must be a global priority. Yet, even in the best of circumstances, the Global Monitoring Report estimates that there will be more out-of-school children in 2015 than today – and uncoordinated and unpredictable reductions in education aid threaten to further undermine the progress that has been made to improve education over the last decade. For the sake of the 67 million children still out of primary school, and the millions more already in school, it is time for donors pulling out of the education sector to act responsibly and reverse the course they have set. Donors must provide predictable and coordinated education aid – or the consequences will be felt by children who will be deprived of the quality education they were promised in Dakar.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would especially like to thank Anda Adams, David Bridges and April Golden for their inputs and support in writing this report. Many thanks also go to Sandra Barton, Angela Bekkers, Laurent Cortese, Margarita Licht, Michelle Mesen, Nicole Metz, Robert Prouty, Tal Sagorsky, Caroline Schmidt, and Kouassi Soman for their research help and valuable comments. Thank you also to those donor representatives who took the time to thoroughly answer the questionnaire.
ANNEX 1: DONOR QUESTIONNAIRE

The following questionnaire was sent to 19 bilateral donors plus the European Commission on April 21, 2011, and then again on May 12. Partial or full responses were received from 8 bilateral donors.

1) Looking forward, do you plan to increase or decrease total bilateral aid to basic education (primary and lower secondary only)?

__ Increase  __ Decrease

1a) If you do plan to increase or decrease aid, by how much and by when?

Amount change: _______________ (Please specify currency)
Effective date: _________________

2) Looking forward, for which countries do you plan to increase, decrease, or eliminate bilateral aid to basic education, and by what date?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>INCREASE, DECREASE, OR ELIMINATE AID TO BASIC EDUCATION?</th>
<th>AMOUNT OF AID INCREASED, DECREASED, OR ELIMINATED (SPECIFY CURRENCY)</th>
<th>DATE BY WHICH THE CHANGE IN AID WILL TAKE EFFECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) If you noted a decrease in total bilateral aid to education in question 1, which option(s) indicate the particular shift in funding?

_____ Overall decrease in bilateral aid to education

_____ Funds will be shifted to another non-education sector (eg. Health)

If so, to which sector(s)?

_____ Shift to another education donor mechanism (eg. FTI fund)

If so, to which donor mechanism(s)?

_____ Negotiated agreement with other donors

If so, please explain: ________________________________

_____ Other

If so, please explain: ________________________________
ANNEX 2: LOW AND LOW-MIDDLE INCOME PARTNER COUNTRIES RECENTLY PHASED OUT OR TO BE PHASED OUT FROM 2 OR MORE BILATERAL PARTNER PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRIES WITH 2 BILATERAL PARTNER PROGRAMS PHASING OUT</th>
<th>COUNTRIES WITH 3 BILATERAL PARTNER PROGRAMS PHASING OUT</th>
<th>COUNTRIES WITH 4 BILATERAL PARTNER PROGRAMS PHASING OUT</th>
<th>COUNTRIES WITH 5 BILATERAL PARTNER PROGRAMS PHASING OUT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angola, Armenia, Bhutan, Bolivia, Costa Rica, Cuba, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Georgia, Ghana, Haiti, India, Indonesia</td>
<td>Ivory Coast, Kenya, Lesotho, Macedonia, Malawi, Moldova, Mongolia, Mozambique, Niger, Rwanda, Tanzania, Thailand</td>
<td>Benin, Cameroon, Egypt, Namibia, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Tunisia, Zambia</td>
<td>Peru, South Africa, Vietnam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Nicaragua</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANNEX 3: SELECTION OF COUNTRIES TO LOSE EDUCATION AID

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DONORS TO PHASE OUT (OR WHO RECENTLY PHASED OUT) AID</th>
<th>PRIMARY NET ENROLMENT RATE, 2009</th>
<th>PRIMARY COMPLETION RATE, 2009</th>
<th>RATIO OF ODA FOR EDUCATION TO TOTAL PUBLIC EXPENDITURE ON EDUCATION, 2008</th>
<th>AVERAGE ANNUAL TOTAL AID TO BASIC EDUCATION FROM DROPPED DONORS, 2006-2009, 2009 US$ CONSTANT MILLIONS</th>
<th>DROPPED DONORS’ SHARE OF TOTAL AVERAGE ANNUAL AID TO BASIC EDUCATION, 2006-2009</th>
<th>IS A DEPARTING DONOR A TOP THREE DONOR FOR TOTAL BASIC EDUCATION AID TO THAT COUNTRY?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh, Netherlands</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>24.75</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>Yes, Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>Canada, Denmark, Netherlands</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Italy, Netherlands</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>54.16</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>Yes, Netherlands and Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Germany, United Kingdom, United Kingdom</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>Yes, Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>Italy, Netherlands</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>Insufficient information</td>
<td>8.57</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique, Denmark, Netherlands</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>Insufficient information</td>
<td>26.08</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>Yes, Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Netherlands, Sweden</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>Insufficient information</td>
<td>16.47</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>Yes, Netherlands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Donors to Phase Out</th>
<th>Primary Net Enrolment Rate, 2009 33</th>
<th>Primary Completion Rate, 20092</th>
<th>Ratio of ODA for Education to Total Public Expenditure on Education, 2008 34</th>
<th>Average Annual Total Aid to Basic Education from Dropped Donors, 2006-2009, 2009 U$$ Constant Millions 35</th>
<th>Dropped Donors’ Share of Total Average Annual Aid to Basic Education, 2006-2009</th>
<th>Is a Departing Donor a Top Three Donor for Total Basic Education Aid to That Country? 36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>Canada, Netherlands</td>
<td>96%6</td>
<td>54%6</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>Yes, Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>Denmark, Netherlands, Sweden, United Kingdom</td>
<td>94%39</td>
<td>92%7</td>
<td>Insufficient information</td>
<td>18.08</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>Yes, United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>Canada, Denmark, Netherlands</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>26.97</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>Yes, Netherlands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ENDNOTES


4 Preliminary conclusions are based upon information from a limited number of donor countries. Other donors have not yet made decisions on future bilateral aid to education, or have not made those decisions public.

5 The preceding figures are from Education for All Fast Track Initiative, “More Financing for Education” (http://www.educationfasttrack.org/replenishment [June 2011]).


10 World Development Indicators (http://data.worldbank.org [June 2011]).


Calculations are based on the formula used in the 2011 Global Monitoring Report: Total aid to education = direct aid to education + 20% of general budget support. Total aid to basic education = direct aid to basic education + 10% of general budget support + 50% of ‘level unspecified’ aid to education.

Calculations are based on the formula used in the 2011 Global Monitoring Report: Bilateral aid to education = direct bilateral aid to education from DAC donors + 20% of general budget support from DAC donors. Bilateral aid to basic education = direct bilateral aid to basic education from DAC donors + 10% of general budget support from DAC donors + 50% of ‘level unspecified’ aid to education from DAC donors.

Calculations are based on the formula used in the 2011 Global Monitoring Report: Bilateral aid to education = direct bilateral aid to education from DAC donors + 20% of general budget support from DAC donors. Bilateral aid to basic education = direct bilateral aid to basic education from DAC donors + 10% of general budget support from DAC donors + 50% of ‘level unspecified’ aid to education from DAC donors.


age, based on the International Standard Classification of Education 1997, who are enrolled in school to the population of the corresponding official school age. Primary completion rate is the percentage of students completing the last year of primary school. It is calculated by taking the total number of students in the last grade of primary school, minus the number of repeaters in that grade, divided by the total number of children of official graduation age.

Source: UIS, Financing Education in Sub-Saharan Africa, 2011, for Sub-Saharan African (SSA) countries, 2008 data; author calculations from World Bank World Development Indicators for non-SSA countries, 2009 data.

Source: OEDC-DAC Creditor Reporting System. Total aid to basic education = direct aid to basic education + 50% of aid to “education, level unspecified + 10% of general budget support.

Top three donors in average total aid to basic education from 2006 to 2009.

While Burkina Faso is no longer a “country of focus” for Canada, there will be small education projects there in the near future.

2008 data.

Source: UNICEF country statistics.