Guidelines for the Panel Discussion at the 2010 EFA Global Monitoring Report Launch
25 June 2010, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok

Theme for Panel Discussion: Reaching the marginalized and minimizing the impact of the financial crisis on education

The Report notes that failure to reach the marginalized has denied many people their right to education. With the effects of the global financial crisis still being felt, there is a real danger that much of the progress of the past ten years will stall or be reversed. The report concludes that given the EFA progress in countries and current economic situation, education is at risk and governments must develop more inclusive approaches, linked to wider strategies for protecting the vulnerable populations and overcoming quality.

The 2010 GMR recommends a 10-step plan for overcoming marginalization in education:
1. Set equity-based targets for all EFA goals
2. Develop data collection systems with a focus on disaggregated statistics to identify marginalized groups and monitor their progress
3. Identify drivers of marginalization for specific groups
4. Adopt an integrated policy approach that addresses interlocking causes of disadvantage, within education and beyond
5. Increase resource mobilization and strengthen equity in public spending
6. Honour aid donor commitment and convene an EFA pledging conference
7. Improve aid effectiveness, with a strengthened focus on equity and conflict-affected countries
8. Strengthen the multilateral architecture for aid to education
9. Integrate successful NGO interventions into national education systems
10. Expand the entitlements of the marginalized through political and social mobilization

I. First round of questions

Each panelist has 3-4 minutes to respond to each question
1. Albert Motivans, EIDA Section Chief, UNESCO Institute for Statistics
   - From the UIS perspective, what are the key data issues which are hampering efforts for countries, donors and EFA partners to get a comprehensive picture of progress in meeting the EFA goals, including progress in reaching the marginalized groups? (The UIS is the main source of education data used in the Global Monitoring Report. Please also briefly mention how education statistics used in this report came about.)

2. Anupama Rao Singh, Regional Director, UNICEF East Asia and Pacific Office
   - In the East Asia and Pacific region, what are the main obstacles to reaching the marginalized populations? The GMR uses data from the Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey (MICS) supported by UNICEF; briefly explain how MICS data is useful in understanding disparities in education. What, if any, has been the impact of the financial crisis in financing efforts to reach the marginalized both by governments and donors?

3. Abhimanyu Singh, Director and Representative, UNESCO Beijing Office (DPR Korea, Japan, Mongolia, PR of China and Republic of Korea); former Lead Manager, Dakar follow-up unit, Education Sector, UNESCO Paris (Director of Publication of the 2001 EFA Monitoring Report); former Director, UNESCO’s Division of International Coordination and Monitoring of EFA (2005)
   - What has been the impact of the financial crisis in terms of education financing in China and the rest of East Asia, if any? What specific efforts are being undertaken to reach the marginalized? In relation to education financing, how do you see China’s role as a donor? Do you foresee China increasing aid to low income countries, in particular for basic education?
4. Harry Patrinos, Chief Economist, World Bank: Can you tell us more about the Bank’s work in the area of addressing marginalization in education, including indigenous peoples? What are the key challenges to addressing this issue in particular given that 2015, the target date for meeting the EFA goals and the MDGs on education, is getting close?

II. Other panelists’ can give brief comments to the other panelists’ responses (total of 10 minutes)

III. Second round of questions -each panelist is requested to reply to the same question and discuss specific sub-topics as indicated below

III.1 With regard to the 2010 GMR recommendations (summarized above), what policies and strategies does your organization support? Do you have other suggestions on how to reach the marginalized groups, in particular in Asia-Pacific given the current economic situation facing countries and donors?

In relation to the question above, each panelist is also requested to discuss as part of their response the following:

1. Albert Motivans, UIS - Last year, the UIS did a study on the impact of the global financial crisis on education spending. The study covered 4 countries in Asia: Bangladesh, Nepal, Sri Lanka and Timor Leste. Based on this study, how have these countries in general been affected by the economic crisis, in particular spending for education?

2. Anupama Rao Singh, Regional Director, UNICEF – What are your views on tapping other sources of aid for education, including other donor countries (i.e. China, Saudi Arabia), and other innovative strategies?

3. Abhimanyu Singh, UNESCO Beijing – The GMR identified group-based identities related to race, ethnicity or language as one of the drivers of marginalization. These are also linked to location and livelihoods. How are these group-based identities manifested in the case of China? Which of the 10 recommendations above would apply the most in overcoming marginalization in education, particularly in China and East Asia?

4. Harry Patrinos, World Bank – Based on the Bank’s work in overcoming marginalization in education, which of the GMR recommendations (see above) would be most effective? In relation to financing of EFA, what are your thoughts on recommendation 7 (above) related to calling an EFA donor pledging conference. Do donors have the capacity to pledge more aid to education, given the already existing financing gap? Please also share your views on tapping other sources of aid for education outside the OECD such as China and Saudi Arabia, as well as getting more funds from the private sector and using innovative education financing (e.g. FIFA World Cup’s “better future” levy which can generate $50 million annually for education)?

IV. Questions and Comments from the plenary in relation to the statements from the panelists and the presentations on the highlights of the 2010 GMR (30 minutes)