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Objective:
- To share and exchange country experiences in carrying out the review and preparing the national EFA reports

Expected Results:
- Achievements and challenges of the national EFA 2015 reviews shared
- Steps to improving the national EFA reports identified
Q1: Review Process

- Government-led process, with strong government commitment (CA, EA, SWA, SEA1, SEA2)
- Participatory - horizontally and vertically (EA, SWA, SEA1, SEA2)
- Through existing mechanisms (e.g., National EFA Committee) (SEA2)
- New team established (SWA, SEA1, SEA2)
- Public forum, peer review (SEA1)

Challenges

- Coordination (especially inter-ministerial coordination) (EA, SEA2)
- Communication within the ministry (CA)
- National consensus building (SA)
- Linking the findings of the EFA review reports to education planning (SA)
Q2: Data issues

- Data quality (EA, SEA1, Pacific)
- Coordination among different ministries, compromising different definitions, reporting periods etc (EA, SA, SEA1, SEA2)
- Data availability
  - Disaggregated data (gender, urban/rural, ethnicity, disabilities, public/private etc) (SWA, SA, SEA1, SEA2, Pacific)
  - Data on TVET, NFE and lifeskills (CA, EA, SWA, SEA2)
  - Indicators on quality (e.g. learning outcomes etc) (EA)
- Adult literacy - self reporting vs test-based (SEA1, SEA2, Pacific)
- Limited data analysis capacity (SWA, SA, SEA2, Pacific)
- Use of NER not appropriate (Pacific)
- Reliance on secondary data (SA)
- Use of Census data to complement EMIS data useful (SEA1)
Q3: Forward-looking

Issues

- EFA as an unfinished agenda (SWA)
- Quality of learning (CA, EA, SA, SEA1)
- Equity (EA, SWA, SA, SEA1)
- Lifelong learning (beyond basic education) (EA, SWA, SA)
- Attention beyond academic excellence (e.g., GCE, ESD, peace education, “happiness” education) (EA, SWA, SA)
- ICT in education (CA, SA)
- Increasing government’s financial commitment (SWA, SEA2)

Processes (SEA1, SEA2)

- Further gap analyses (SEA1, SEA2)
- Reflecting wider national, regional and international development priorities (e.g., Vision 2030, Education Blueprints, ASEAN integration, SDGs) (CA, SEA1, SEA2)
Q4: Key steps to improving the reports

- **Data**
  - Ensuring consistency (EA, Pacific)
  - Improving presentation (SEA1, SEA2)
  - Inclusion of case studies (SEA2, Pacific)
  - Reflecting findings from diverse sources (EA, SEA2)
  - Indicators for quality (EA)

- **Participation and partnership**
  - More CSO participation (EA, SA)
  - Further consultation with partners (SA, SEA2)
  - Further reflecting emerging issues (SA, SEA2, Pacific)

- **Learning from successful examples** (CA)
- Better linkage between analysis and recommendations (SEA2)
- Enhancing sub-regional cooperation (SA)
Commonalities and differences

Commonalities

- The review process was government-led and participatory, involving key stakeholders at all levels
- Coordination is a challenge
- Data Issues - availability of disaggregated data, data on quality, data from other ministries (e.g., ECCE, TVET), indicators for Goals 3, data analysis capacity
- “Learning” and “Equity” at the center of the post-2015 agenda
- Linking education to wider developmental frameworks (e.g., SDGs, regional integration plans, national visions etc)

Differences

- Some used existing mechanisms for the review (e.g., National EFA Committee), while others established a new team
- EFA as an unfinished agenda vs going beyond basic education
- Peculiarities of small island nations (e.g., possibly skewed indicators)