



Oxford Policy Management

A Review for Norad: Education in Fragile Situations

Christine Smith Ellison, University of Ulster

October 2013

Acknowledgements

Sincere thanks to Alan Smith, University of Ulster; Anna Haas, Senior Consultant, Oxford Policy Management; Randi Gramshaug and Helge Brochmann Senior Advisers Global Health, Education and Research Department, Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (Norad); and Sindre Grøslie Wennesland, Adviser, Statistics Unit, Department of Quality Assurance, for their guidance, help and support throughout the study. I would also like to express my appreciation to Norad advisers and statisticians who provided comments on an early draft and to people from other organisations who provided information to help estimate the amount of funding from Norway that goes to education in fragile situations.

Acronyms

ALP	Accelerated Learning Programme
ARTF	Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Fund
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
DDR	Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration
DIIS	Danish Institute for International Studies
DFID	Department for International Development (UK)
EC	European Commission
EFA	Education for All
GiZ	Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (Germany)
GMR	Education for All, Global Monitoring Report
GPE	Global Partnership for Education (formerly the Fast Track Initiative)
GCPEA	Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack
IIEP	UNESCO International Institute for Education Planning
INEE	Interagency Network for Education in Emergencies
JFA	Joint Financing Arrangement
MFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
NOK	Norwegian Krone
Norad	Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation
OCHA	United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
ODA	Official Development Assistance
PBEA	UNICEF Peacebuilding, Education and Advocacy programme
PBF	United Nations Peacebuilding Fund
PBSO	United Nations Peacebuilding Support Office
SIDA	Swedish International Development Agency
SSRP	School Sector Reform Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	2
Acronyms	2
Executive Summary.....	4
Section One: Introduction.....	5
Section Two: International field of education and fragility	9
2.1 Historical trends and concepts.....	9
2.2 International ‘best practice’	13
2.3 Key Actors and Agencies	21
Section Three: Norway’s contribution to education and fragility	28
3.1 Norway’s Strategy	28
3.2 Norwegian aid to Education and Fragility	33
3.2.1 Official Development Assistance	33
3.2.2 Channels of Delivery	34
Multilateral Aid.....	34
Support to Governments.....	39
Civil Society Organisations	41
3.2.3 Humanitarian Funding	44
Section Four: Conclusions and Recommendations.....	47
References	54
Annex A: Terms of Reference	59
Annex B: Methodology of Country Classification	61
Annex C: Earmarked fund for Education and Fragility 2013.....	64

List of Tables

Table 1: Composite List of 51 ‘Fragile States’, 2012	8
Table 2: Summary of Key Terms	10
Table 3: Summary of Norwegian ODA 2010- 2012, NOK 1000.....	33
Table 4: Norwegian ODA to Education in Fragile Situations (NOK 100), 2010-2012.....	34
Table 5: Aid to Education through Multilateral Organisations (1000 NOK), 2010-2012	35
Table 6: Norwegian Support to UNESCO 2010-2012 (NOK Million) Error! Bookmark not defined.	
Table 7: Norwegian Contributions to Pooled Funds (1000 NOK), 2010-2012	37
Table 8: Summary of Aid to Education and Amount Provided as Support to Government (1000 NOK), 2010-2012	39
Table 9: Funding allocated to civil society organisations through the earmarked fund (1000 NOK), 2013	43
Table 10: Summary of education projects supported through the humanitarian budget (2010-2012) not currently coded under the category of education, NOK 1000.....	45
Table 11: Funding allocated to civil society organisations in the second round of the earmarked fund 2013 (1000 NOK)	64

List of Graphs

Graph 1: ODA to Education in Fragile Situations by Region 2010-2012.....	33
Graph 2: ODA to Education in Fragile Situations by Country 2010-2012	34
Graph 3: Aid to Education in Fragile Situations through the Civil Society Department by Country 2010-2012.....	41
Graph 4: Education Sectors Supported through the Civil Society Department 2010-2012	42
Graph 5: Norwegian Humanitarian Aid to Education 210-2012 (NOK 1000)	44
Graph 6: Funding for Education Activities supported through the Humanitarian Budget (NOK 1000), 2010-2012	46
Graph 7: Humanitarian Funding to Education in Fragile Situations by Region (NOK 1000), 2010-20.....	46

Executive Summary

As a directorate within the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, The Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (Norad) commissioned this report to provide a synthesis of key concepts, current practice and actors in the area of education and fragility and an analysis of Norway's contribution to the field, with the aim of informing future practices and positioning.

Norway's policies prioritise humanitarian assistance and education in fragile situations

Norway does not have a strategy specific to education and development. However, following discussions with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, International Development Policy Unit it was agreed that this analysis would take account of Norway's humanitarian policy strategy (2008-2013) plus three government white papers on 'Climate, Conflict and Capital (2008-2009)', 'Norway and the United Nations (2011-2012)', and 'Promoting Democracy, Fair Distribution and Growth (2012-2013)'. The analysis of these Norwegian policy documents indicates that:

- Education should be prioritised in humanitarian assistance.
- Norwegian aid to education should be primarily channelled through multilateral organisations.
- Norway will move issues of significant political priority higher up on the agenda by providing funding to, and participating actively on, the governing boards of multilateral organisations.
- In countries that are able to demonstrate priority to the education sector, Norway's Policy is to integrate funding for education into general budget support.
- Education should be explicitly linked to efforts to increase equitable distribution and growth.

As the review was completed, a new coalition government formed by the Conservative and Progressive Parties took office from October 2013. ODA will become the responsibility of the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and there will be no minister for international development. The new coalition has made commitments to take global leadership in the field of Education For All (EFA) and prioritise girls' education in poor countries.

At least half of Norwegian aid to education goes to fragile situations

Norway distributed a total of 4.74 billion NOK (6% of total ODA) to education over the three-year period 2010-12. Of this, the estimate is that 1.28 billion NOK (27%) of Norwegian development aid to education was spent on education in fragile situations, but this is a very conservative estimate based on official DAC coding. According to these figures, Africa received half of all aid to education in fragile situations. Countries in Asia accounted for 31% of funding, the Middle East received 10%, Europe received 7% and America received 2%.

A more realistic estimate is that at least 50% of Norway's ODA to education went to fragile situations through the following main channels: multilateral organisations, support to governments, civil society organisations. The main difference between the official statistics and this estimate is due to estimates for unearmarked funding to UNICEF and GPE that goes to education in fragile situations.

Almost half of Norwegian education aid to multilateral organisations goes to fragile situations

Norway provided 2.51 billion NOK (53% of ODA to education) through multilaterals (2010-12). Of this, it was only possible to track 114 million NOK to fragile situations. This means that 4.5% of education aid to multilaterals went to fragile situations (2010-2012). However, this is undoubtedly an under-estimate as the three largest multilateral recipients (UNICEF, GPE and UNESCO) receive between 90-98% of funds as 'global unspecified' core and thematic funding. More detailed estimates for the three-year period indicate that Norway contributed a further 868 million NOK through UNICEF and 211 million NOK through GPE to education in fragile situations. This suggests that a more realistic estimate is that almost half (48%) of Norwegian education funding to multilateral organisations went to fragile situations.

Almost all of Norway's education support to governments goes to fragile situations

Just under 370 million NOK (8% of ODA to education) was channeled through support to governments (2010-12), of which 316 million NOK was allocated to fragile situations (85% of education aid channelled through governments). Norway channels education support through the governments in Nepal, Palestine, Burundi, Pakistan, and Madagascar and provides support to Afghanistan's education sector through a multi donor trust fund. There appears to be no formal criteria for why these countries receive direct support. The general approach taken in these contexts is to provide support for the implementation of an education sector plan and coordinate donor efforts through some form of joint financing arrangement, a basket fund or multi-donor trust fund. This is intended as a mechanism for improving collaboration, coordination and avoiding duplication of reform efforts.

Civil society organisations are a very important channel for education in fragile situations

1.08 billion NOK (23% of ODA to education) was channeled through Civil Society Organisations, of which 625 million NOK was allocated to fragile situations, 58% of education aid to CSOs (2010-12). Norad's Civil Society Department allocated 273 million NOK, of which 77% supported projects in Africa, 12% supported projects in Asia, 8% of funds were disbursed in America (Colombia) and 3% in the Middle East (Palestine). Most funding via the Civil Society Department (88%) went to primary education.

Included in the total amount allocated through the Civil Society Department is an earmarked budget of 20 million NOK for education and fragility which was announced by the Minister in 2012. This is a mechanism for profiling the Norwegian Government as a supporter of the field, but there is a need for clearer guidelines around the type of activities it should be used to support.

At least 2% of Norway's humanitarian aid goes to education in fragile situations, but more is needed

A detailed analysis of Norway's humanitarian aid using DAC sector categories shows that 85 million NOK (1% of the humanitarian budget) went to 27 education projects in fragile situations. More detailed analysis includes a further 10 projects that have not been coded as education and brings the total to 165 million NOK, but there are a further 40 projects that may have some element of education. This leads to the overall conclusion that at least 2% of humanitarian funding from Norway (double the amount officially recorded) went to education in fragile situations during 2010-12. However, UNHCR states that 36% of identified needs in education have not received funding (2012) and there is an argument that more funding is needed to meet a recommended target that 4% of humanitarian aid should go to education in fragile situations. Through the humanitarian channel 80% of funds were allocated to the Middle East, Asia received 19% and Africa received 1%.

Recommendations

The review makes the following recommendations for priorities for education in fragile situations:

1. Develop an Education Strategy that prioritises Education for All and defines Norway's commitments to education in fragile situations
2. Make clearer agreements with multilaterals about education priorities in fragile situations
3. Ensure the amount of humanitarian aid to education meets a target of 4%
4. Encourage the allocation of more funds to the education of refugees and IDPs
5. Bridge the humanitarian – development gap in fragile and conflict affected situations
6. Support the development of conflict sensitive education plans
7. Clarify Norway's position on the role of education in peacebuilding
8. Continue funding the GMR and maintain a focus on education inequalities in fragile situations
9. Clarify the added-value of channelling support through governments in fragile situations
10. Channel more funding towards secondary education and teacher quality in fragile situations
11. Increase funding to civil society organisations to work with youth in fragile situations
12. Introduce a marker that tags education more clearly in the monitoring system

Section One: Introduction

This report has been commissioned by Norad to provide a synthesis of key concepts, current practice and actors in the area of education and fragility and an analysis of Norway's contribution to the field. The aim is to draw lessons which could inform future practices and positioning. The Terms of Reference (Annex A) specified the production of a 30-page report to address the following:

- Provide a brief overview of key concepts (fragile situations and states, conflict and post-conflict affected states, education in emergencies etc.) as well as a brief outline of historical trends in the field of education in fragile situations.
- Provide an overview of the key actors and their priorities and strategies within the field of education in fragile situations.
- Provide an analysis of Norway's current work on education in fragile situations including national policies, strategies and guidelines. The analysis should also include an outline of the main channels for the Norwegian support to education in fragile states.
- Identification of best practices within the field of education in fragile situations and an assessment of the "value added" of the interventions discussed.
- Identify key issues that need to be addressed in order to strengthen education in fragile situations. Based on the findings make suggestions for how these issues can best be addressed including concrete suggestions for future work.

Interviews with MFA and Norad personnel took place in Oslo during the period 19th-21st June 2013. The study was then completed as a desk-based review of relevant documentation. More information will be given on the methodology used at the start of each section.

A key issue relates to the concept of fragility. A study on donors and the 'fragile states' agenda (Cammack et al, 2006: ix) suggests that fragility is variously defined in terms of the functionality of states (lacking the will or capacity to perform functions necessary for the security and wellbeing of citizens), of their outputs (likely to generate poverty, security threats, epidemic diseases, environmental degradation), or of their relationship to donors ('difficult partners'). The report states that 'the international development community came to the fragile states agenda from three different directions: (i) an emphasis on human security and peacebuilding; (ii) a concern with poor development performance and state effectiveness; and (iii) a belief that underdevelopment and insecurity are interrelated.' It suggests that the fragile states agenda has been strengthened by UN multilateral peacekeeping responses in the 1990s and increased concerns about global security since the attacks of 11 September 2001. More recently the OECD has defined fragile states as follows:

'A fragile region or state has weak capacity to carry out basic governance functions, and lacks the ability to develop mutually constructive relations with society. Fragile states are also more vulnerable to internal or external shocks such as economic crises or natural disasters. More resilient states exhibit the capacity and legitimacy of governing a population and its territory. They can manage and adapt to changing social needs and expectations, shifts in elite and other political agreements, and growing institutional complexity. Fragility and resilience should be seen as shifting points along a spectrum' (OECD, 2012).

The term ‘fragile state’ is widely used, but highly contested. This report uses the term ‘fragile situation’ which was provided in the TOR. This is in part because the conditions of fragility could affect a region within a state or regional areas that cross international borders. The concept of a fragile state is also critiqued as implying a static, negative state that stigmatizes a country (Mosselson et al. 2009; Bengtsson, 2011). However, the quantitative analysis required a list of countries, even though ascribing fragility definitively to any country is a contentious issue. The analysis in this report is based on a list of 51 countries (Table 1) derived from the World Bank-African Development Bank-Asian Development Bank harmonised list of fragile and post-conflict countries for 2012, the 2012 Failed State Index (FSI) and Project Ploughshares 2012 report. More detailed information on the methodology used for the quantitative analysis can be found in Annex B.

Table 1: Composite List of 51 ‘Fragile States’, 2012

Afghanistan	Guinea	Pakistan
Angola	Guinea-Bissau	Palestine
Algeria	Haiti	Philippines
Bangladesh	India	Sierra Leone
Bosnia & Herzegovina	Iraq	Solomon Islands
Burundi	Kenya	Somalia
Cameroon	Kiribati	South Sudan
Central African Republic	Kosovo	Sri Lanka
Chad	Liberia	Sudan
Colombia	Libya	Syria
Comoros	Marshall Islands	Thailand
Congo, Rep.	Micronesia, FS	Timor-Leste
Cote d'Ivoire	Myanmar	Togo
DRC	Nepal	Turkey
Egypt	Niger	Uganda
Ethiopia	Nigeria	Yemen
Eritrea	North Korea	Zimbabwe

The rest of the report is structured as follows. Section two begins with a brief review of academic literature on key concepts, historical trends and current debates in the field of education and fragility. It then reviews the evidence-base on programming ‘best practice’ based on an analysis of five significant reviews of existing research literature that have been completed within the past three years (2010–2013). It then highlights the current priorities of a number of key actors and agencies in the field of education and fragility.

Section three provides an analysis of Norway’s support to the field of education and fragility. It starts with an analysis of four key policy documents that currently frame Norway’s support in this area. It then provides an analysis of Norwegian official development assistance to education in fragile situations between 2010 and 2012. It first examines the three main channels for the delivery of Norwegian development aid: multilateral organisations; support to governments; and civil society organisations. It then provides a detailed analysis of Norwegian humanitarian aid during the period. Section four draws conclusions and makes a number of recommendations.

Section Two: International field of education and fragility

2.1 Historical trends and concepts

In a recent report Winthrop and Matsui (2013) identify three phases in the development of the field of education and fragility: proliferation; consolidation; and collaboration.

The first phase is termed *proliferation* and refers to a period of activity (1948-mid 1990s) of grassroots refugee education, largely driven by displaced parents and community members. There were, however, no systematic policies on education at this stage and even the 1990 Education for All meeting at Jomtien paid limited attention to the issue of children affected by crisis or conflict.

The second stage is termed *consolidation* and refers to a period lasting from the mid-1990s until the mid-2000s. During this period increasing attention was paid to the need to protect children during humanitarian crises. This grew partly out of the children's rights movement and the ratification of the Convention on the Rights of the Child in 1989. A key report by Graça Machel to the United Nations in 1996 identified a number of important impacts of conflict on education requiring responses for the education of refugees and displaced persons, strategies to prevent the use of child soldiers, protection for girls against sex crimes, and the provision of landmine education and trauma counselling.

At the same time, there was a global push for primary education for all. In 2000, when the world's education ministers met in Dakar to review progress on the 1990 Education for All goals, 164 countries re-established their commitment to the sector at the Dakar World Education Forum in 2000. Two of the goals were incorporated into the UN Millennium Development Goals (primary school completion and gender parity), thereby establishing education as a global priority. As Winthrop and Matsui state, 'the underlying assumption in these education goals, much like the understanding of education's role in child protection, is that schooling is good and thus more of it is better' (2013: 17).

These developments led to the formation of the Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE) in 2001. 'Focusing on including education in humanitarian response was determined to be the most useful strategy for advancing this cause, particularly because to date education had been decidedly absent' (2013: 18). In 2004, following a highly consultative process including more than 2,250 people from over 50 countries, INEE released a set of Minimum Standards for education in emergencies. In 2005 when education was not initially included as part of the UN's humanitarian reform process, INEE successfully advocated to have education included into the humanitarian cluster process in 2006. During this period the focus was on advocating for education's inclusion as part of humanitarian response which left little room for analysis of the political nature and potentially negative impact of education.

The mid-2000s initiated a period of *collaboration* with other sectors and sets of actors. This was a period of increased scrutiny of the role of international aid. The growing realisation that development and humanitarian interventions could have negative impacts on affected populations

led to commitments to ‘do no harm’ and increased attention towards conflict sensitivity approaches to education. Work in this area has built on an important study by Bush and Saltarelli (2000) highlighting the ‘two faces’ of education and its role in both fuelling and mitigating conflict. It includes consideration of areas such as language of instruction, history teaching, teacher recruitment and deployment (including gender balance, and ethnic and language diversity), education structures (for example, segregated versus integrated systems) and systems of governance. In April 2013 the Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE) released a set of Guidelines and Principles for integrating conflict sensitivity in education policy and programming in conflict-affected and fragile contexts¹.

More recently there have been calls for educationalists to move beyond conflict sensitivity and place greater emphasis on the ways in which education can actively contribute to social transformation and long term peacebuilding (EFA-GMR 2011). Smith identifies a number of positive contributions education can make based on Galtung’s (1975) distinction between negative peace (the absence of violence) and positive peace (structural changes that address social injustice). These include the role that access to education can play in addressing group inequalities, the importance of education sector reform and the potential for education to support transformation processes related to security sector reform, political institutions, economic regeneration and social development.

Table 2: Summary of Key Terms

Concept	Definition
<i>Education in emergencies</i>	A set of linked project activities that enable structured learning to continue in times of acute crisis or long-term instability. Nicolai 2003: 11
<i>Conflict sensitive Education</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Understanding the context in which the education policy/programme takes place 2. Analysing the two-way interaction between the context and the education policy/programme; and 3. Acting to minimise negative impacts and maximise positive impacts of education policies and programming on conflict, within an organisation’s given priorities www.ineesite.org
<i>Education for Peacebuilding</i>	Education that supports the elimination of direct violence and transformation of the structural conditions and social relations that generate violent conflict. Smith et al 2011

¹ INEE (2013). INEE Guiding Principles on Conflict Sensitivity in Education Policy and Programming in Conflict-Affected and Fragile Contexts. [http://toolkit.ineesite.org/toolkit/INEEcms/uploads/1150/INEE_Guiding_principles_A3_English\[1\].pdf](http://toolkit.ineesite.org/toolkit/INEEcms/uploads/1150/INEE_Guiding_principles_A3_English[1].pdf)

Developments at the global level relevant to education in fragile situations include:

Education for All (EFA)

The Education for All movement is a global commitment to provide quality basic education for all children, youth and adults. The movement was launched at the World Conference on Education for All in Jomtien (1990) by UNESCO, UNDP, UNFPA, UNICEF and the World Bank. A renewed commitment to six EFA Goals² was made in Dakar (2000). The six EFA goals include commitments to early childhood education, girls' education, access to primary education, quality education and measurable learning outcome, life skills and adult literacy. However, the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) have focused on two main goals related to access to basic education and gender equality. UNESCO has been mandated as the lead agency to coordinate international efforts to reach Education for All goals and provides a mechanism for national reports on progress, but it is the MDGs, rather than EFA goals that seem to have driven donor funding over the past decade. This incomplete alignment between EFA goals and MDGs has given rise to a number of critical perspectives that have emerged through updates from the EFA Global Monitoring Reports and consultations on EFA. Some key points include:

- Worldwide, there are still 57 million children out of primary school and 'it is estimated that an additional \$26 billion will be needed per year to make sure all children receive a basic education by 2015' (UNESCO, 2013a).
- While aid to education increased steadily after 2002, this trend is now reversing: total aid to education declined by 7%, from US\$6.2 billion in 2010 to US\$5.8 billion in 2011. During this period, six of the ten major bilateral donors to basic education reduced their aid to basic education: Canada, France, Japan, Netherlands, Norway and United States (UNESCO, 2013a).
- A recent policy paper from the Brookings Institute and the GMR an analysis of the six most important multilateral donors in education states that 'despite strong prioritization and demand there is evidence that multilateral support for basic education is slowing compared to other sectors and to bilateral donors. This has led to a reduction in basic education's share of the total education aid from multilateral institutions - from 62 percent at the beginning of the decade to 51 percent in 2011.' (Rose and Steer, 2013).
- The GMR (2011) identified conflict as one of the most significant barriers to Education for All. A more recent GMR Policy Paper states that, 'Globally, the number of children out of school has fallen, from 60 million in 2008 to 57 million in 2011. But the benefits of this progress have not reached children in conflict-affected countries. These children make up 22% of the world's primary school aged population, yet they comprise 50% of children who are denied an education.' (UNESCO, 2013b).
- Children in conflict affected countries are twice as likely as children in other low income countries to die before their fifth birthday. Refugees and internally displaced people face

² <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/education/themes/leading-the-international-agenda/education-for-all/efa-goals/>

major barriers to education, and conflict-affected countries have some of the largest gender inequalities and lowest literacy levels in the world.

- Initiatives such as Education First, established by the UN Secretary-General, place a particular emphasis on securing the right to education for children from marginalized populations, especially girls who are affected by armed conflict, extreme poverty and disability. However, education remains a low priority in conflict affected and fragile situations. 'The global education community has been calling for 4% of humanitarian aid to be allocated to education. Yet new analysis by the EFA Global Monitoring Report team shows that the share of humanitarian aid for education has declined. In 2012, education accounted for just 1.4% of humanitarian aid, down from 2.2% in 2009.' (UNESCO, 2013b).

The New Deal for Engagement in Fragile States

The New Deal for Engagement in Fragile States was signed by more than 40 countries and organisations at the Fourth High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness at Busan in December 2011. The New Deal represents a commitment to five peacebuilding and statebuilding goals; an agreement to support country-led and country-owned transitions out of fragility; and a commitment to building mutual trust and strong partnerships. Whilst discussions at Busan reaffirmed the commitments made at Paris and Accra, they also marked a greater recognition of the political nature of aid to fragile states. The Aid Effectiveness debate had traditionally been the reserve of donors. However, increasing awareness that effective aid depends on a commitment from all development actors has led to a broadening of membership over the years.

Busan not only involved a much broader range of actors (including civil society organisations and the private sector) but also promoted a new form of relationships based on horizontal partnerships. Throughout the Busan Partnership Agreement the term donor is replaced by 'provider country', and 'aid' by 'development cooperation' (Aidwatch 2012: 18). This has been made possible through the emergence of g7+ and the International Dialogue which has created a forum for donors, g7+ recipient governments, and other development actors to have an open conversation about the specific challenges of engagement in fragile states.

The Post-2015 Development Goals

The High-Level Panel report on the Post-2015 Development Agenda (UN, 2013) provides a framework for new global development goals to replace the millennium development goals (MDGs) and set the international development agenda for a further 15 years. A number of issues have arisen through the consultation process relevant to education in fragile situations:

- The HLP report states that the new goals 'must go beyond the MDGs. They did not focus enough on reaching the very poorest and most excluded people. They were silent on the devastating effects of conflict and violence on development' The report calls for an emphasis on building peace as one of five big transformative shifts, stating that, 'Freedom from fear, conflict and violence is the most fundamental human right, and the essential foundation for building peaceful and prosperous societies.' (UN, 2013, Executive Summary). A specific Goal 11 to 'Ensure Stable and Peaceful Societies' is proposed and may include an indicator related to the equitable provision of social services as a measure of peacebuilding.

- A consensus seems to have emerged that Goal 3 'Education' should go beyond a focus on access to basic education, but be more widely concerned with quality of learning outcomes across pre-primary, primary, secondary, youth and adult education, including technical and vocational skills. This seems to be strongly influenced by targets and indicators developed by the Brookings Institution (2013).
- There has been a debate about strengthening the emphasis on reducing inequalities. Some have argued for a separate equality goal, whilst the current HLP report reflects the view that equity should be a concern across all the goals with a strong cross-cutting focus on gender equality. The GMR has developed a tool known as the World Inequality Database on Education (WIDE) to monitor disparities in education within and between countries based on wealth, gender, ethnicity and location - see <http://www.education-inequalities.org/>

2.2 International 'best practice'

This section provides a brief review of lessons learned regarding international best practice in the field of education and fragility. Firstly, we summarise findings from two recent reports related to education, conflict and peacebuilding. Secondly, we review the evidence base specifically related to programming best practice in order to identify examples of successful models for education in the context of fragility.

The EFA Global Monitoring Report (2011) focused on education and armed conflict and highlighted four key issues:

1. **The need to combat violations and attacks on education.** Sexual violence as a weapon of war, the use of child soldiers, education of refugees and IDPs, the traumatic effect of violence on families and children, and the need for psychosocial support all continue to feature as significant impacts of conflict. The GMR also reports on research (O'Malley 2010) on the way in which children and education personnel have become deliberate targets and this has subsequently led to the establishment of the Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack (GCPEA).³
2. **Problems with funding, security and the humanitarian aid system.** The GMR highlights continuing concerns about the lack of adequate funding for education in conflict-affected countries. Education receives only 2 per cent of humanitarian aid (p.204)⁴, and development aid to conflict-affected low-income countries is less (US\$16 per pupil) when compared with other low-income countries (US\$22 per pupil). In addition, the report highlights concerns about links between aid and security. It identifies 21 developing countries that are spending more on arms and the military than on primary schools (p.148) and presents evidence that the amount of aid to certain countries is driven more by global security concerns rather than poverty (p. 173).

³ <http://www.protectingeducation.org/who-we-are>

⁴ A recent update indicates that half of all children out of school live in conflict affected countries yet humanitarian aid to education has declined further to 1.4% of all humanitarian aid (GMR Policy Paper 10, July 2013)

3. **Identifying opportunities to support post-conflict peacebuilding.** The report refers to the Secretary-General's establishment of the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) as a means of quick response to support early post-conflict development and to prevent relapses. The GMR recommends a significant injection of funding of between US\$500 million and US\$1 billion a year to integrate education into wider peacebuilding strategies. The suggestion is that the international aid system needs to engage earlier with education in post-conflict societies and stay engaged over a longer period of time in a way that makes a smoother transition between humanitarian and development funding.
4. **Unlocking the potential of education to act as a force for peace.** The GMR concludes that education is not being used to its full potential as a force for peace. It identifies a range of areas where education can contribute to greater equality and social cohesion including education governance, policies and programmes related to teachers, and aspects of curriculum reform and identity based issues such as gender, language of instruction, religion and citizenship. In conflict affected countries, education is challenged by complex issues of truth and reconciliation processes, and youth engagement should be a priority based on research by Collier and Hoeffler (2004) which suggests that the main three factors that make people more likely to engage in political violence are being young, being uneducated, and being without dependents. Barakat and Urdal (2009) found that countries with large youth populations that invest less in secondary education for young men are more likely to experience armed conflict. The response of many agencies has been to invest in youth training and employment schemes, but it has yet to be proved that these necessarily result in positive outcomes in terms of conflict prevention, particularly where increasing the supply of skills cannot be met by the labour market.

A second report is the recent literature review commissioned by UNICEF as part of its Peacebuilding, Education and Advocacy (PBEA) programme (Smith et al. 2011).. The report highlights that supporting education's role in peacebuilding remains a significant development challenge and provides more detail on education responses categorised in terms of humanitarian response, conflict-sensitive education and education for peacebuilding.

In broad terms education as part of a humanitarian response involves education programming that is distinctive in terms of a focus on protection, refugee and IDP education, early reconstruction and development, and psychosocial support and recovery.

Conflict sensitive education places an emphasis on education policy and programming that 'does no harm'. The Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE) has identified a set of principles as part of guidelines on conflict sensitive education.⁵

Education for peacebuilding is primarily concerned with the role of education in supporting transformation of the conditions that generate conflict. This means there is more emphasis on the role of various forms of education policy and programming in addressing structural inequalities and promoting social cohesion using theories of change such as the following⁶:

⁵ <http://www.ineesite.org/en/education-fragility/conflict-sensitive-education>

⁶ Smith, A., McCandless, E. Paulson, J. and Wheaton, W. (2011) Education and Peacebuilding in Post-Conflict Contexts. A Literature Review. New York: UNICEF. http://www.unicef.org/education/files/EEPCT_Peacebuilding_LiteratureReview.pdf

The Contribution of Education to Peacebuilding	
Transformation	Theory of change and role of Education
<p>Security The challenge is to move to a more safe and secure society, free from intimidation and violence and subject to the rule of law.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If education services can be maintained during conflict, then it can protect the most vulnerable, especially children and girls. • Early reconstruction of education services can provide a return to normality and a sense of hope for the future. • If education can provide education free from violence and equip children to resolve conflict in non-violent ways, then these life-skills may contribute to a more peaceful society. • Education related to policing, rule of law, attempts to strengthen confidence and trust in the justice system to underpin transformation to a more peaceful society.
<p>Political The challenge is to establish functioning political structures for participation in decision-making as a sustainable alternative to violence</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education sector reform can support peace if it addresses issues that may have fuelled conflict, such as unequal access to services and lack of opportunity. • A commitment to secondary education by government can provide added protection against relapses into conflict (Collier et al 2004). • Civic and 'political' education can support peacebuilding by educating members of society about their rights and responsibilities and their relationship to the state as citizens. • Education can model participatory behaviours in decision-making and engagement with political institutions.
<p>Economic The challenge is to develop the economy in a way that provides equitable and sustainable livelihoods</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An economic commitment of at least 20% of national budget to education is necessary to support peacebuilding (FTI/GPE). • Equitable and transparent distribution and use of funding for education will prevent grievances and support peacebuilding. • Economic growth leads to development (education underpins this). • Unemployed youth is a risk factor for conflict (Urdal 2004, Thyne 2006), particular attention should be given to the relevance of secondary, technical and vocational education.
<p>Environment and Natural Resources The challenge is to develop equitable and sustainable ways of managing the environment and natural resources</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disputes over land and territory are often a cause of conflict, education can help populations understand historical roots and explore non-violent compromises or resolutions. • Increasing population creates competition and disputes over access to food, water and natural resources, education can highlight more sustainable, just and non-violent ways of managing environment. • Extraction of minerals and exploitation and natural resources can generate grievances and inequalities that lead to violent conflict, education can provide knowledge, skills to empower populations to manage their natural resources for the public good.
<p>Social /Cultural The challenge is to (re)develop social relations in a way that lead to more equity, inclusion, and commitment to non-violence</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If learner's attitudes towards other groups change/ become more tolerant, conflict can be prevented (contact hypothesis). • Personal attitudes will only change if structural inequalities are also addressed and education is implicated in these. • Education has an important role to play in identifying underlying causes of conflict related to inequality, social justice (Stewart 2008) • Education has a role to play in helping new generations understand why conflict took place and dealing with its legacies (TRCs, TJ).

Evidence base on programming best practice

This section reviews the evidence-base on programming ‘best practice’ in order to identify examples of successful models for education in the context of fragility. For the purpose of this review ‘education’ is considered to include the following modes of programming

- Catch up education
- Alternative Learning Programmes
- Primary education
- Secondary education
- Technical and vocational training

Within the constraints of this study it was only possible to briefly summarise the ‘lessons learned’ regarding effective programme design based on findings of five further reviews of existing research literature that have been completed within the past three years (2010–2013).

RECENT REVIEWS OF RESEARCH & ‘BEST PRACTICES’ FOR EDUCATION IN FRAGILE SITUATIONS

Burde, D. et al. (2013) What Happens to Education in Emergencies? A Literature Review of How Education is Affected by Crises and What Works to Protect and Support It

Danish Institute for International Studies report (2013) Regaining a Future? Lessons Learned from Education of Young People in Fragile Situations

James, C. (2010). Supporting quality education for conflict affected children and young people. Report prepared for Comic Relief.

INEE Adolescent and Youth Task Team (AYTT) (2011) Education for Crisis-Affected Youth: A Literature Review Summary

USAID (2013). State of the Field Report: Examining the Evidence in Youth Education in Crisis and Conflict

The main implications for programming from these studies are summarised below, although it should be noted that they are context dependent and it would seem likely that some of the implications may apply equally to non-fragile situations.

Catch up and Alternative Learning Programmes

Accelerated Learning Programmes (ALPs) are a cost-effective method (Baxter and Bethke 2009) of concentrating formal education programmes into fewer years of schooling, therefore potentially speeding up a country’s recovery from conflict. At the primary level they have been shown, at times, to produce better learning outcomes than the regular schooling system (UNICEF/MOE 2011). Evidence also reveals better indicators of gender equality than formal schools, particularly in relation to young mothers who appreciate the flexibility of ALP and the proximity of classes to their homes (Save the Children 2012a, IBIS 2012). However, the necessary involvement of humanitarian NGOs in establishing ALPs makes it difficult to ensure long-term impacts and buy-in from the ministry of

education (DIIS 2013). It also risks establishing a parallel system: the popularity of ALPs means under-age students may prefer to enrol in the ALP rather than the formal education system.

- ALPs are effective for older children (Nicolai 2009) but who are still of school age (i.e. 12-18 years- Dennis and Fentiman 2007).
- Where there are a large number of students the recent ALPs should be divided into several classes according to age, e.g. 7-10 years, 11-18 (the normal ALP age), and 19 and above (Manda 2011)
- It is better to locate ALPs, if possible, in existing school buildings. This provides a physical sign that they are part of the same system and facilitates the eventual transfer of the ALP to the ministry of education (DIIS 2013). It also means renovation work will benefit both the ALP and the established school, thereby speeding up renewal of the national school system (Nicolson 2007).
- It is important to ensure teacher salary and incentives correspond to those in the regular system.

Catch-up education programmes have similar goals but operate by supporting children who have missed out to catch up with their age group and reintegrate into school. Catch up education may be more suitable for conflict affected situations as they can be simpler than ALPs due to the fact that they generally focus on standard teaching approaches and curriculum rather than including additional subjects (Baxter and Bethke 2009).

Primary education

In the midst of conflict the literature indicates that education plays an important role in providing a return to a sense of normality. In particular, formal primary education has particular symbolic significance for many communities that helps to restore hope (Nicolai 2009, Dennis and Fentiman 2007, Tomlinson and Benefield 2005). Secondly, the literature indicates that group inequality can be a source of conflict (Stewart 2008). Due to its role as a mechanism of societal equality, it is believed that primary Education for All (EFA) may contribute to greater stability. One criticism of the EFA movement, however, is that the vast expansion in global primary education has been accompanied by a decrease in the quality of education (Nicolai 2009).

Approaches that have proved successful in increasing access and enrolment include:

- Locate schools at a distance close to learners. For each additional mile between a child's home, school enrolment falls by 16% and test scores decrease by .19 standard deviations (Burde and Linden 2012).
- 'Schools as zones of peace' has been a successful model used in the context of Nepal to ensure the physical protection of students and teachers (DIIS 2013).
- Psychosocial programmes in primary schools can decrease psychological distress and restore optimism (Gupta and Zimmer 2008). Based on a review of thirteen studies of psychosocial interventions it was concluded that these initiatives can help to improve aspects of psychosocial functioning in children and that the evidence is strongest for group interventions focusing on normalisation (Mental Health and Psychosocial Guidelines in Emergencies 2007).
- Flexible timing has helped children adjust after conflict (Boyden and Ryder 1996, Dennis and Fentiman 2007). For instance gradually increasing the hours of school so children can carry out routines and daily tasks at home (Save the Children 2008)

- Life skills training is often used to address issues such as landmine awareness, problem solving, preventing HIV, health and hygiene. It is most successful when it is based on areas that students will apply to their everyday reality and when accompanied by follow-up visits (James 2010).

Secondary education

The literature indicates that secondary schooling can play an important role in reducing a society's propensity for violence. Economic evidence demonstrates that it can lower the incidence of violence by increasing the opportunity cost to individuals of participating in violence (Dupuy 2008). Others argue that it acts by decreasing the motivation for violence by restoring hope for the future. Thyne (2006) found that the higher school enrolment rates (primary enrolment rate, secondary enrolment rate, and the male secondary enrolment rate) the lower is the probability of civil war. Among the three types of enrolment rates tested, the male secondary education enrolment rate was found to have the strongest effect. Similarly, Barakat and Urdal (2009) found that a large proportion of the population being young males is likely to increase the risk of conflict in societies where male secondary education enrolment is low, particularly in low and middle-income countries. Secondary level education can be the site where education can move beyond basic literacy and numeracy to begin to prepare students to be active citizens. Evidence indicates that secondary schooling is a central state institution in local areas that reconfirms the young people belonging and obligations towards their society (DIIS 2013). It can also enhance self-esteem by providing a schooled identity (DIIS 2013). Those who pass secondary education are seen to play key roles in their community which has lasting impact on reconstruction and development (Morlang and Watson 2007).

However, secondary schooling is an important form of education that is available only to those who have managed to successfully pass primary level education and able to invest several further years in their schooling (DIIS 2013). In contexts where there has been growing secondary enrolment, the evidence also indicates the importance of quality education and links to further education or job opportunities for graduates (DIIS 2013). Otherwise, disappointment and frustration increase the risk of violent conflict.

Compared to primary education, there are far fewer secondary schools and they are more likely to be difficult to access. Therefore much of the literature on best practice relates to successful models of increasing access and enrolment. These include the following:

- Hostels have been used in Nepal to ensure those in remote rural areas can regularly access secondary school (Peterson 2011).
- Youth clubs and peer support have been used in South Sudan to successfully increase enrolment (UNICEF 2010).
- Home-based or community-based schooling has been successfully used in Afghanistan to increase girl's enrolment (Rasmussen et al. 2012)
- Community-based education, where teachers and teaching are local, is the safest and most successful way of providing education in the most insecure areas (Rasmussen et al. 2012)
- Accredited learning and exams have proven successful tools to motivate learning and open doors to further learning and employment (RET 2009).
- The use of technology including text messaging and SMS community forums has proven successful in increasing literacy and numeracy test scores (Beltramo & Levine 2010).

In terms of content the evidence also indicates:

- Civic education is a key component in many youth programs, and several resulted in increased knowledge about civic activities (Abdalla, 2012; Dahal, Kafle and Bhattarai, 2008; Shrestha and Gautam, 2010).
- Prioritising equality and inclusiveness is more important than introducing peace materials for creating a peaceful culture (Smith et al. 2011)

Technical and vocational training

As technical and vocational training is practical and short term it is the most likely way of supporting those young people who have been most severely affected by fragility and conflict (DIIS). There are many studies that demonstrate young people gaining employment or becoming self-employed following participation in holistic programs that include some kind of vocational or entrepreneurship training (Blattman and Annan, 2011; Cook and Younis, 2012; IYF, 2011; Whalen, 2010). Just as with the evidence on secondary schooling, successful TVET programmes can contribute to societal stability by reducing the opportunity cost and motivation for violence. The literature also indicates that if it does not lead to increased income and job opportunities it can lead to frustration and a source of grievances. Furthermore, it is a very expensive form of youth education and the coordination and integration into the education system is often weak. Some examples of best practice include:

- It is most effective with 17-30 year olds (James 2010).
- Programmes must be linked to a strong market analysis (Baxter and Bethke 2009).
- It must be based on an analysis of local trainer capabilities (DIIS 2013).
- Programmes must involve the local business environment to ensure provision of relevant skills and to secure their commitment to ensuring apprenticeship and employment after the end of training (DIIS 2013).
- Skills should also be targeted towards the informal market (Fields 2013).
- Successful programmes are holistic and combine a focus on both hard and soft skills. Examples of relevant programmes incorporate literacy, numeracy and life skills (Baxter and Bethke 2009). Skills that make youth employable in society, for example ICT skills and those related to entrepreneurship (budgeting, marketing, organisation) have also proven successful (DIIS 2013).
- It is useful to create groups that can support each other by working together and sharing tools (Moberg and Johnson-Demen 2009).

Teachers

Throughout the literature it is clear that teachers play a vital role in ensuring relevant and effective learning in the context of conflict and fragility. Some findings from the research literature include:

- Successful programmes prioritise training, recruitment, distribution and support of teachers (DIIS 2013).
- Qualified teachers are important in ensuring enrolment. In Afghanistan enrolment increased by 2% for each additional teacher who has higher level of education (Burde and Linden 2012).
- The availability of qualified female teachers plays an important role in ensuring girl's education in fragile situations (Burde and Linden 2013).
- Teachers are under considerable pressure in conflict-affected contexts, so it is important to balance innovation with familiar approaches so they have the confidence to teach (Nicolai 2009).

Summary – what is the added value of funding education in fragile situations?

Virtually all of the literature refers to the need to strengthen the evidence base for the role of education in fragile situations. ‘There are many reasons for this: The field is a complex area with imprecise definitions of terms and many variables, so it is difficult – if not impossible – to demonstrate correlations, let alone causality; implementation in the field is mainly undertaken by development agencies whose main priority is quick impact rather than reflective research; the volatile environments in conflict-affected societies mean that operational conditions and data gathering are difficult; short programme cycles, high levels of staff mobility and poor institutional memory make systematic research uncommon; and even where there is a commitment to evaluation this is most commonly defined in terms of indicators of achieving programme goals.’ (Smith et al 2011).

Nevertheless, there are a number of implications from the existing research base that suggest there is ‘added value’ to investments in education in fragile situations such as:

- The inclusion of education in humanitarian responses provides an opportunity to strengthen protection for children and ensure their right to education.
- Humanitarian responses that include education are the main way of maintaining the right to education for refugees and displaced children, especially in fragile contexts where the host government is unable or unwilling to respond.
- The research evidence suggests that psychosocial support has positive outcomes for children who have experienced trauma in fragile situations.
- Accelerated learning and catch-up education programmes provide a ‘second chance’ for children who have missed out on education due to natural disasters and conflict, but it is important that these do not become parallel systems of education.
- Early reconstruction and restoration of education provides an opportunity to build confidence in the state since these services are highly visible and valued by communities in fragile situations.
- The inclusion of ‘life skills’ in education for children in fragile situations can contribute to survival, health and social outcomes.
- The research literature suggests that addressing inequalities through education may reduce the likelihood of conflict in fragile situations.
- In fragile situations investment in male secondary enrolment was found to have the strongest effect in reducing the probability of civil conflict.
- Investment in technical and vocational education is considered effective only if it is able to link training with job opportunities in the labour market.
- Investment in qualified teachers in fragile situations such as Afghanistan has been shown to increase enrolments.
- Training and recruitment of female teachers is considered to be especially important for ensuring girls’ education in fragile situations.

2.3 Key Actors and Agencies

This section provides an overview of the key actors and their priorities and strategies within the field of education in fragile situations. They include UN multilateral organisations, global networks, bilateral donors, international and national NGOs. The following is an indicative list:

UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA)

OCHA is the part of the UN Secretariat responsible for the coordination of humanitarian response, policy development and humanitarian advocacy. It carries out its coordination function primarily through the Inter-Agency Standing Committee which ensures inter-agency decision-making in response to complex emergencies. OCHA also manages three pooled humanitarian funds.

- **Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF)**
A global fund that allows rapid coordinated humanitarian response to those affected by natural disasters and armed conflicts. Allocations are normally limited to \$30 million per emergency.
- **Common Humanitarian Fund (CHF)**
A country-based fund for protracted crises. Funding received is totally unearmarked so that funding can be allocated on the basis of needs (as defined in the emergency's humanitarian action plan).
- **Emergency Response Funds (ERF)**
A country-based fund to provide speedy response to sudden unforeseen emergencies. In contrast to CHF, ERFs have the facility to provide finance to small- to medium scale projects (less than \$500,000), allowing more national NGOs to access resources.

In 2012 Norway was the fifth largest donor to OCHA, contributing a total of 424 million NOK between 2010 and 2012. In addition, it contributed 1.96 billion NOK to the three pooled funds during the same period.

The Education Cluster

The Education Cluster is an open formal forum for coordination and collaboration on education in humanitarian crises. It was established in 2007 by the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC), a mechanism for inter-agency coordination of humanitarian assistance. 'The Education Cluster brings together NGOs, UN agencies, academics, and other partners under the shared goal of ensuring predictable, well-coordinated and equitable provision of education for populations affected by humanitarian crises.'⁷ At the global level, the Education Cluster is co-led by UNICEF and Save The Children. Education Clusters also operate at the country level.

The Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE)

An important initiative is the Inter-Agency Network on Education in Emergencies (INEE), a network of over 9500 individual members working to promote quality, safe, and relevant education for all those affected by crisis. The Norwegian Refugee Council was a founding member of the INEE

⁷ <http://education.humanitarianresponse.info/>

Steering Group. INEE's work has focused on bringing individuals together to facilitate collaboration, establish standards for the field, and engage in advocacy regarding the right to education in emergencies. In 2004 following a highly consultative process INEE released an influential set of Minimum Standards for actors and agencies involved in the field. Evaluations of the standards show they improve the coordination, prioritization and quality of education work on the ground in these difficult contexts (INEE 2008).

A key part of the network is the Working Group on Education and Fragility which was established in 2008 and is now made up of representatives of 29 organisations. The Working Group has completed important work in the area of conflict sensitive education and released a Conflict Sensitive Education Pack⁸ (launched in April 2013) containing guiding principles, a guidance note and a reflection tool. Norway has provided an annual contribution of 0.5 million NOK to INEE during the period 2011-2012 through its humanitarian budget.

The Global Partnership for Education (GPE)

In order to support the attainment of EFA goals the G8 nations and the World Bank established the Education for All-Fast Track Initiative (EFA-FTI) in 2002 and provided US\$2.2 billion in financial aid between 2004 and 2010 (UNICEF 2012). Its aim was to ensure that donors would fulfil their commitment made at Dakar that '*No countries seriously committed to Education for All will be thwarted in their achievement of this goal by a lack of resources*'. Over the course of the past eleven years this partnership has evolved to comprise 58 developing countries and more than 25 bilateral, regional, and multilateral agencies and organisations. Since 2011 it has been renamed the Global Partnership for Education (GPE). Norway is the fifth largest donor to GPE and contributed 228 million NOK in 2011 and 190 million NOK in 2012.

The Global Partnership's mission is 'to galvanize and coordinate a global effort to deliver a good quality education to all girls and boys, prioritizing the poorest and most vulnerable.' The GPE's strategic plan identifies *four strategic goals* 'that focus on access to school, quality education, equity for all children, and strong national education systems.' In addition there are *five targeted objectives* for the period 2012-2015.

- Support education in fragile and conflict-affected states
- Promote girls' education
- Increase learning and basic literacy and numeracy skills in primary school
- Improve teacher effectiveness by training, recruitment and retaining teachers
- Expand volume, effectiveness, efficiency, equitable allocation of external and domestic funding.

GPE is therefore the main mechanism for bringing together key development partners to fund and support education. Up to the end of December 2012, GPE had made \$350.6 million in grants. The GPE Board (Brussels, May 2013) approved a further \$439 million grants to 12 developing countries.

Over the past year GPE has increased its engagement in fragile states from 13 to 21 countries adding Burundi, Comoros, Chad, Democratic Republic of Congo, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan and

⁸ <http://www.ineesite.org/en/education-fragility/conflict-sensitive-education>

Zimbabwe (GPE 2013). It has adopted a mechanism for accelerated support in fragile contexts 'which is critical to providing quick assistance in emergency situations, as well as to serve as a bridge between humanitarian and development interventions' (GPE 2013: 2). GPE is also currently working with USAID to determine how conflict sensitivity can be better incorporated into education sector plans and will be strongly encouraged as part of all applications to GPE.

UNICEF

The leading UN agency focused on children, particularly in developing countries, and they play an important role in advancing basic education. Norway has provided 3,995 million NOK to UNICEF between 2010-2012, although this is not limited to education. UNICEF, together with Save the Children, is co-leader of the Education Cluster, as assigned by the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC). The aim of the cluster system is to ensure better coordination around education interventions in humanitarian emergencies.

Another key commitment to the area of education and fragility was the Back on Track Programme on Education in Emergencies and Post-Crisis Transition (2006-2010), a partnership between UNICEF and the Government of the Netherlands. The aim of the project was to help countries build capacity in the education sector in order to help them to secure traditional global education funding. It also placed emphasis on building partnerships with communities and civil society.

This project has now been superseded by the Peacebuilding, Education and Advocacy Programme (PBEA) which has received US\$150 million from the Netherlands, Ministry of Foreign Affairs. This four-year project (2012-15) aims to strengthen resilience, social cohesion and human security in the following fourteen countries; Burundi, Chad, Cote d'Ivoire, DRC, Ethiopia, Liberia, Myanmar, Pakistan, Palestine, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Sudan, Uganda and Yemen. The PBEA focuses on achieving five key outcomes:

- Increase inclusion of education into peacebuilding and conflict reduction policies, analyses and implementation.
- Increase institutional capacities to supply conflict-sensitive education.
- Increase the capacities of children, parents, teachers and other duty bearers to prevent, reduce and cope with conflict and promote peace
- Increase access to quality and relevant conflict-sensitive education that contributes to peace.
- Contribute to the generation and use of evidence and knowledge in policies and programming related to education, conflict and peacebuilding.

UNESCO

UNESCO is the UN organisation mandated to promote education globally as one its five objectives. Norway has provided almost 196 million NOK to UNESCO between 2010 and 2012, although this is not limited to education. UNESCO has been mandated as the lead agency to coordinate international efforts to reach Education for All goals and provides a mechanism for national reports on progress. UNESCO also supports education in fragile and conflict affected situations through specialised institutes such as the International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP) and the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS). The International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP) was

created by UNESCO in 1963 to provide technical assistance, training and research to support countries in the development of their education systems. It has developed Guidance Notes for educational planners who wish to integrate conflict and disaster risk reduction into education sector planning. IIEP also partners with INEE, in particular through participation in the INEE Working Group on Education and Fragility and the Global Education Cluster. UNESCO also hosts the Global Monitoring Report (GMR), produced by an independent team to produce an independent, annual report monitoring progress against the EFA goals. In 2011 the report extensively covered the issue of education in the context of conflict.

UNHCR

Since 1950 UNHCR has been mandated to lead and coordinate international action to protect the rights and well-being of refugees and stateless people. This includes ensuring their right to education. In total, Norway has provided almost 1.4 billion NOK to UNHCR during the period 2010-2012, although this is not limited to education. UNHCR recently launched its new Education strategy (2012-2016) with the following goals:

- Ensure that 3 million refugee children have access to primary education
- Expand secondary education to 1 million young people
- Provide safe schools and learning environments for all young learners
- Ensure that 70% of refugee girls and boys achieve quality learning in primary school
- Provide teacher training that leads to professional qualifications so that 80% of teachers are trained
- Provide non-formal education and training opportunities for 40% of young people, male and female
- Increase by 100% the number of students attending tertiary education
- Enable early childhood education for 500,000 children aged 3 to 5
- Increase literacy rates among refugee adults by 50%

United Nations Peacebuilding Fund (PBF)

Norway is the fourth largest donor to the United Nations Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) after DFID, Sweden and the Netherlands. Norway has contributed 61,013,000 NOK to the PBF during the period 2010-2012. In his 2009 report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict, UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-Moon places social services, including education, among the five recurrent priorities for peacebuilding in post-conflict transition. Nevertheless, to date social services, and in particular education, have not been prioritised as compared with interventions in the security sector and political processes. Since 2006 the PBF has received US\$347 million and education specific projects account for just 3% of total funding provided (EFA- GMR 2011: 36).

USAID

The USAID Education Strategy (2011-2015) has three overarching goals, one of which is to 'increase equitable *access to education in crisis and conflict* environments for 15 million learners by 2015'. This includes increasing enrolment in the context of conflict, natural disasters, lawlessness, crime and gang activity.

USAID has been an active member of the INEE Education and Fragility Working Group and provided funding to support the development of the INEE Conflict Sensitive Education Pack. An update to INEE in April 2013 states that USAID is undertaking the following (USAID 2013):

- Production of a Checklist for conflict sensitivity that has been piloted in Liberia and Somalia;
- ICTs and Conflict Compendium – a compilation of the best practices of technology-supported interventions to deliver education services that promote equitable access to children and youth in environments affected by crisis and conflict;
- GPE and Conflict Sensitivity in Education Sector Planning – a piece of work has been commissioned to (i) conduct a review of existing approaches, methodologies and tools for analyzing conflict and fragility in the social sectors, (ii) provide a review of existing approaches, methodologies and tools for analyzing the education sector, and (iii) to propose a methodology for integrating conflict and fragility analysis into education sector analyses.
- The Impact of Conflict on Education Equity - a study on the impact of conflict on equity in education in Sub-Saharan Africa, to be conducted by two Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO) researchers;
- Innovative approaches to equitable access - a study that aims at reviewing and comparing various strategies that have been tried in conflict and non-conflict settings that have demonstrated an impact on access. The study will identify innovations that could have an impact on access in conflict environments;
- Conflict sensitive education strategies designed in Afghanistan, South Sudan, and Nigeria.

DFID

The UK Department for International Development is currently implementing an Education Strategy (2010-15) that was developed under a previous Labour government. The strategy focuses on three strategic priorities (i) access to a basic education cycle of primary and lower secondary, particularly fragile and conflict affected states; (ii) quality of teaching and learning, particularly for basic literacy and numeracy; (iii) skills, to link young people to opportunities, jobs and growth. The strategy made a 'commitment to spend at least £8.5 billion over the ten year period to 2015. Annual expenditure would rise to £1 billion per annum by 2010, half of which will go to Africa'. There was also a commitment to 'allocate most of our bilateral aid to basic education (around 70%)' and 'increase the volume and proportion of our bilateral aid to fragile and conflict affected states (to around 50%)' (DFID, 2010).

A new coalition government of Conservative and Liberal Democrat Parties was elected in 2010. Since then DFID has produced a new 'Education Position Paper: improving learning, expanding opportunities', launched at the annual UKFIET Conference, Oxford, September 2013⁴. The paper continues a commitment to the Millennium Development Goals and the Education For All goals with greater emphasis on accountability and results through three core priorities:

- to improve learning
- to reach all children, especially those in fragile states
- to keep girls in school, helping the most marginalised girls stay in school and learning for longer.

‘DFID’s approach to education combines strengthening national education systems to ensure better provision for improved learning; improving accountability to citizens and taxpayers for results; and improving what happens in classrooms. There is no single technical fix to guarantee improved learning outcomes for every child and affecting change in learning outcomes can take time. A focus on learning does, however, provide a clear measurable indicator of education quality and impact’ (DFID Position Paper, 2013).

GIZ

A key initiative currently being implemented by GIZ is the BACKUP, one of the five flagship measures identified in BMZ’s education strategy. It is aimed at providing support to low income African countries in applying for and implementing funding provided by the Global Partnership for Education and other financing initiatives. BACKUP is based on a model used successfully in the health sector since 2002, the German BACKUP Initiative on AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria.

BACKUP engages with decision-makers in Ministries of Education, members of local donor groups (e.g. Local Education Groups) and representatives of civil society in African countries. The initiative is demand-led and applicants can apply for three modes of support:

- **Fast Access Mode:** this mode provides funding at short notice for one-off activities such as conference participation, vocational training (up to EUR 20,000).
- **Consultancy Mode:** BACKUP Education helps to pay for the commissioning of experts to provide advisory services on formulating and implementing national education strategies (up to EUR 50,000).
- **Project Mode:** This is used to enter into financing agreements and grants with government and non-governmental organisations in the partner countries. This mode may also include a limited volume of material supplies (up to EUR 100,000).

SIDA

Alongside Norway, Sweden is one of the six countries that identify education as a priority in its humanitarian policy. Currently, Afghanistan is the largest recipient of Swedish support to education, with priority placed on the issue of girl’s education. A new global results strategy for Swedish assistance in the area of socially sustainable development is also under development. The strategy remains in its draft form but currently includes education with an explicit focus on fragile and conflict-affected situations. Sweden also supports the Global Partnership for Education’s (GPE) strategic priority on fragile states as well as contributing a substantial amount to UNICEF (in 2011 it was the fifth largest donor to UNICEF, contributing a total of US \$176 million).

Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC)

The NRC runs education programmes in 22 countries supporting displacement affected children and youth, with a specific focus on conflict-induced displacement. Particular strengths lie in the fields of non-formal, alternative education; youth education; and rapid response education. NRC is a

founding member of the INEE and contributed to the formation of the Minimum Standards for Education in Emergencies in 2004 and their revision in 2010. They currently have representation in the INEE Minimum Standards Working Group and the INEE Education Cannot Wait advocacy group.

Save the Children Norway (SCN)

SCN is a 'dual mandate' children's charity, meaning that it prioritises both humanitarian and long-term relief and development work. It has a strong interest in the field of education and fragility. In 2005 Save the Children, partly supported by the Norwegian MFA, launched *Rewrite the Future*, a major global campaign on the right to education of children in conflict affected countries. The campaign played an important role in highlighting the serious underfunding of education in countries affected by armed conflict. In its 2013 annual plan for international programs Save the Children (2012b) stated its commitment to fulfil children's right to quality education in conflict areas. Specifically it outlines plans to focus on three key areas:

- Access to quality education for children in conflict areas
- Programme development and the development of best practices related to the quality learning environment (QLE) in conflict areas
- Schools as Zones of Peace (SZOP)

Section Three: Norway's contribution to education and fragility

3.1 Norway's Strategy

This section provides an overview of the policy documents that currently frame Norway's contribution to education and fragility. Norway no longer has a strategy specific to education and development. Following discussions with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs International Development Policy Unit it was suggested that this analysis focuses on Norway's humanitarian policy strategy (2008-2013) along with three government white papers on the topics of Climate, Conflict and Capital (2008-2009), Norway and the United Nations (2011-2012), and Promoting democracy, fair distribution and growth (2012-2013).

Norway's Humanitarian Policy (2008-2013)

This policy documents sets out the plan for achieving the four main goals of Norwegian humanitarian assistance:

- ensure that people in need receive the necessary protection and assistance
- finance humanitarian assistance based on the principles of humanity, impartiality and neutrality
- equip the international community to meet future global humanitarian challenges
- prevent, respond to and initiate the recovery of communities after humanitarian crises

It further sets out the following areas of priority:

- Endeavour to expand new humanitarian alliances including with non-western donors
- Continue support for the UN and humanitarian reform
- Recognise the more complex humanitarian system and work to ensure that humanitarian access and the protection of aid workers is a priority
- Strengthen international humanitarian law and support the Red Cross movement
- Support humanitarian disarmament and implementation of the Mine Ban Convention
- Prioritise needs-based assistance. Integrate the gender perspective and prioritise protection and participation of children and young people in humanitarian response
- Prioritise protection of refugees and internally displaced persons
- Focus on a more coherent response by coordinating Norway's contributions in early recovery and transition and promoting a stronger focus on the long-term effects of humanitarian assistance
- Maintain a balance between flexibility and predictability
- Further develop the 'Norwegian model'
- Improve administrative capacity for humanitarian assistance, the ability to document results and increase the use of evaluations.

In terms of education, specific mention is made of the way in which a lack of education can be both a symptom of a poor-functioning state and an important factor that can fuel the incidence of violence (2008: 17). Education is highlighted as one of the fields to be prioritised within humanitarian assistance. In particular, the strategy makes the following commitments to:

- support educational programmes adapted to the needs of children and young people in refugee situations, including the internally displaced, and support reintegration programmes for children who have been associated with military forces.
- support educational programmes for children and young people in humanitarian crises in order to prevent them from becoming victims of exploitation as child soldiers or prostitutes

Alongside the humanitarian strategy, there are the following three white papers which establish the policy direction for education and fragility.

Climate, Conflict and Capital (2008-2009)

This paper focuses on three issues particularly relevant in developing countries; climate change, violent conflict and the control of capital flows. The paper makes the following findings:

- Developing countries must make their own choices and set their own priorities
- It is primarily developed countries that must shoulder the burden of climate change and implement concrete measures that make it attractive for partner countries to choose climate-friendly development options.
- Developing countries must be given greater access to global capital, better opportunities for value creation, and more control over their own economic resources.
- Addressing the issue of tax havens will be a key element in efforts to combat illicit financial flows.
- The white paper also proposes the establishment of a system of annual reporting on the coherence between Norway's domestic and development policy.

The paper sets out the following strategy:

- In sectors where Norway is not considered to have a comparative advantage Norwegian aid will primarily be channelled through multilateral organisations. This applies in particular to sectors such as health and education, and to parts of other sectors such as governance, agriculture and general capacity and institution building. The total Norwegian aid to these sectors will be maintained at least at the 2008 level.
- Bilateral aid, primarily government-to-government, will be increasingly focused on areas where Norway has recognised expertise. Relevant sectors include climate, the environment, sustainable development, peacebuilding, human rights and humanitarian assistance, oil and clean energy, women and gender equality, good governance and the fight against corruption.
- Norway will move issues of significant political priority higher up on the agenda by providing funding to, and participating actively on the governing boards of, multilateral organisations.
- The gradual shift in focus to countries that are emerging from armed conflict, and to countries that are facing particular challenges relating to climate change, will continue. This applies to all channels for Norwegian aid.
- Environment and climate change is the sector where funding will increase most in the future.

In relation to education it also makes the specific commitments:

- The Government intends to focus particularly on support for education in fragile states and countries affected by conflict.

- With a view to achieving the best possible coordination of international aid, the Government wishes to focus more on multilateral channels in its efforts to promote education.
- In countries that, as a result of long-term assistance, are in a better position to give priority to the education sector, Norway's policy is to integrate funding for education into general budget support.

Norway and the United Nations: Common Future, Common Solutions (2011-2012)

The white paper highlights the fact that global power dynamics are changing with the rise of new powers who are seeking an international system that better reflects today's reality. The Norwegian government therefore sets out its plans to support reform of the UN so that it is perceived to be more effective, legitimate and representative.

The paper also emphasises the fact that Norway's long-term engagement with the UN has been largely successful. 'By building alliances, adopting a strategic approach and being willing to contribute financial support, we have generally succeeded in gaining acceptance for our interests and priorities'.

It reasserts its intention to 'actively support the least developed countries and fragile states'. Recognising its mandate, logistic capacity and experience of operating in difficult situations, the paper states that support to the UN will continue to play an important role in Norway's engagement in this field. Leadership from within these countries is also key to sustainable peacebuilding. The UN's role in providing long term engagement and coordination between international partners is crucial to success.

The white paper states that the government will:

- Promote Security Council reform to ensure its legitimacy and effectiveness
- Seek to increase Norway's contributions to UN-led operations
- Continue its efforts to strengthen the UN's capacity for mediation and conflict prevention
- Share the Norwegian experience of gender equality with member states
- Give priority to UN Security Council resolutions on women, peace and security
- Ensure greater mainstreaming of humanitarian principles and strengthen respect for international humanitarian law
- Strengthen efforts in the UN to promote equitable distribution of resources and opportunities between and within countries
- Ensure that the UN plays a role in efforts to combat tax havens and illicit financial flows.

The paper highlights the success achieved in the area of girl's education, due partly to Norway's sustained and significant contributions to UN agencies. In particular, it highlights the fact that in 2012 Norway contributed NOK 550 million to UNICEF's Girls Education Thematic Fund, making it the largest donor. The paper reasserts Norway's commitment to strengthen UN efforts in education. In terms of the post-2015 agenda, Norway seeks to influence the design of an education goal that goes beyond issues of access to incorporate measures of quality, relevance and learning. It also believes that 'the poorest countries should be assisted to develop their higher education systems, especially teacher training, so that they can draw up systems and curriculums that meet their needs'.

Overall, it argues that the new post-2015 goals ‘must reflect the fact that more effective measures against poverty and better access to health and education services are closely linked with a greater capacity for economic development and growth that takes account of environmental and social considerations and equitable distribution’.

Promoting democracy, fair distribution and growth in development policy (2012-2013)

This white paper focuses on the distribution of resources within countries, not just between them. It highlights the fact that more than 70% of the 1.2 billion people living in extreme poverty are now located in middle-income countries. It sets out Norwegian plans to place more emphasis on fair distribution and growth through targeted efforts to promote democracy, human rights and equality.

It sets out four main approaches for Norwegian support in this area:

1. In low-income countries that themselves are seeking to achieve social development with low levels of inequality, we will engage in direct dialogue with the authorities and use aid strategically to improve fair distribution and increase growth. At the same time we will continue efforts that we know help reduce poverty, such as strengthening the health and education sectors.
2. In our dialogue with the authorities in middle income countries, we will draw more attention to the fact that these countries need to prepare for the time when they no longer receive international aid and have to take greater responsibility for providing services and welfare to their people.
3. In countries with authoritarian regimes, or where there is marked discrimination or secrecy, the Government will give priority to cooperating with agents of change in civil society, rather than providing aid via the authorities.
4. In the international arena the Government will seek to draw greater international attention to national distributive policies.

The paper identifies a number of strategies for supporting more equitable distribution. Among these, education is highlighted as an active method of redistribution. The paper highlights ‘Safeguarding the right of all citizens to basic education and health services is a cornerstone of distributive policy’. Education also has a role to play in contributing to a number of other strategies identified in the paper. For example, the paper argues that democracy is a key mechanism for ensuring equal distribution of power and, by extension, economic resources. As it states, ‘this entails not only strengthening the national authorities’ ability to protect their citizens’ rights but also increasing citizens’ knowledge of their rights and their ability to claim these rights’. A second strategy proposed by the paper to contribute to fair distribution is the promotion of ‘Sustainable growth that creates jobs’. The paper highlights, ‘creating decent jobs is the best way of lifting people out of poverty and ensuring fair distribution of social goods’. Once again, there is clearly a role for education in preparing and enabling citizens to take up these jobs.

New Coalition Government Priorities in Norway

During the period of this review, there was an election in Norway which has led to the establishment of a new coalition government formed by the Conservative and Progressive Parties. The new government has 17 Ministers, but there will no longer be a ministerial post devoted to aid and development cooperation – this will become the responsibility of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

In October 2013 the new Norwegian coalition government announced that:

‘The Government will work for a modernized, strong and more effective UN. Norwegian efforts and financial commitment should be relocated in the *direction of the parts of the organization that effectively delivers good results and work in line with Norwegian priorities*. The government will be a reform-oriented and constructive contributor and partner in the United Nations.

The Government will work to spread awareness about human rights and combating violence and oppression, such as female genital mutilation, forced marriage, trafficking and sexual abuse of children. The Government will give particular attention to vulnerable groups such as women, children, religious minorities, people with disabilities and sexual minorities.

The announcement stated that the government will:

- Take a global leadership role in the field of Education for All.
- Further develop Norwegian efforts in global health, particularly health of women and children.
- Prioritise thematic areas such as human rights, poverty reduction, development of civil society and good governance, as well as humanitarian aid.

(Extract translated from ‘Political Platform for a government by the Conservative Party and the Progress Party’, Sundvolden, 7 October, 2013)

The cooperation agreement between Social Liberal party, the Christian Democrats, the Progress Party and the Conservative Party also indicates that priority will be given to girl’s education in poor countries.

In summary

The four existing policy documents frame Norway’s current approach to development and the field of education and fragility. Overall they suggest that:

- Education should be one of the fields prioritised in humanitarian assistance
- The government intends to focus particularly on support for education in fragile states and countries affected by conflict.
- Norwegian aid to education will primarily be channelled through multilateral organisations.
- In countries that are able to demonstrate priority to the education sector, Norway’s policy is to integrate funding for education into general budget support.
- Norway will move issues of significant political priority higher up on the agenda by providing funding to, and participating actively on the governing boards of, multilateral organisations.
- Education initiatives be explicitly linked to efforts to increase equitable distribution and growth.

A new coalition government formed by the Conservative and Progressive Parties has taken office from October 2013. ODA will become the responsibility of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and there will be no minister for international development. The new coalition has made commitments to take global leadership in the field of Education for All and prioritise girls’ education in poor countries.

3.2 Norwegian aid to Education and Fragility

This section provides an analysis of Norwegian assistance to education in fragile situations during the period 2010-2012. It begins with an analysis of official development assistance (ODA) through the three main channels of delivery: multilateral organisations; support to governments; and civil society organisations. Throughout the report the term ODA is used to include all aid (including humanitarian support) provided by Norway. The section then provides a detailed analysis of humanitarian aid. This is a subset category of ODA and refers only to aid delivered through chapters 163.70 and 163.71 in the Norwegian system. The following table provides a summary of Norwegian assistance during the period 2010-2012 as it is officially coded using DAC sector categories.


Table 3: Summary of Norwegian ODA (NOK 1000) 2010- 2012


	Humanitarian Aid <i>Chapters 163.70 and 163.71</i>	Total ODA <i>All aid</i>
Total Support	8 426 726	80 721 283
Total to Education	85 354	4 741 765

3.2.1 Official Development Assistance

During the period 2010-2012 Norway distributed a total of 4.74 billion NOK of ODA to education. The analysis of Norwegian assistance as it is currently coded using DAC sector categories reveals that 27% of this, 1.28 billion NOK, was spent on education in fragile situations (defined as the 51 countries on our consolidated list, p.8). The funding was spent in thirty five countries, with Nepal, Palestine, Uganda and Sudan receiving the highest amounts. In terms of regional distribution, based on official DAC coding, Africa received half of all aid, countries in Asia accounted for 31% of funding, the Middle East received 10%, Europe received 7% and America received 2%.

Graph 1: ODA to Education in Fragile Situations by Region 2010-2012



Graph 2: ODA to Education in Fragile Situations by Country 2010-2012

3.2.2 Channels of Delivery

The analysis examines the three main channels for the delivery of ODA: multilateral organisations; support to governments; and civil society organisations. Other channels including consultants, private sector and Norwegian public sector are outside the scope of this study. The analysis of Norwegian assistance as currently coded using DAC sector categories reveals that 9% of development aid to education in fragility was delivered through multilaterals. However, due to the decision by Norway to deliver the majority of its aid to multilaterals as untied core or thematic funding, this is almost certainly an underestimate. A quarter of development aid to education and fragility is delivered as support to governments to the following four fragile situations: Nepal, Burundi, Palestine, Pakistan. Assistance is also provided to Afghanistan through a multi-donor trust fund. Finally, the analysis reveals that almost 50% of development aid to education and fragility is delivered through NGOs, with the majority of funding (89%) allocated to Norwegian NGOs.

Table 4: Norwegian ODA to Education in Fragile Situations (NOK 1000), 2010-2012

	ODA to Education (NOK 1000)	ODA to Education in Fragile Situations
Multilaterals	2,511,945	114,577
Support to Governments	369,793	316,942
Civil Society Organisations	1,084,429	625,628
Other Channels	775,598	227,046
Total	4,741,765	1,284,193

Multilateral Aid

A large proportion of aid to education is delivered through multilateral organisations. In the period 2010-2012 this was equal to 2.5 billion NOK which represents 53% of total development aid to education. Of this total amount we can say with certainty that 114.5 million NOK (4.6%) was allocated to education in fragile situations through multilateral institutions. This amount, however, is undoubtedly an underestimate since for many of these multilaterals it is impossible to break down all the funds by country. In fact, 88% of funds to education channelled through multilateral organisations are coded as 'global unspecified'. The table below provides a summary of all the multilateral organisations that received Norwegian support for education during the period 2010-2012. In particular, it reveals that the three largest recipients of Norwegian support to education receive high levels of core and thematic funding which is coded as 'global unspecified'. Although UNICEF, the Global Partnership for Education (GPE) and UNESCO certainly use some of this 'global unspecified' funding to undertake education activities in the context of fragility, it is not currently captured as such as it is not traceable to a particular country.

Table 5: Aid to Education through Multilateral Organisations (1000 NOK), 2010-2012

Partner organisation	ODA to education	ODA to education 'global unspecified'	ODA to education traceable to fragile situations
UNICEF	1,708,068	1,550,000 (90%)	57,721
International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD)	536,009	527,500 (98%)	-
UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO)	142,573	142,515 (99%)	35
UN Development Programme (UNDP)	28,042	-	27,800
International Labour Organisation (ILO)	26,440	-	-
UN Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA)	24,500	-	19,000
Asian Institute of Technology (AIT)	24,381	-	10,000
Nordic Council of Ministers	10,601	-	-
UN Industrial Development Organisation (UNIDO)	3,620	-	-
World Food Programme (WFP)	3,000	-	-
OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities	2,914	-	-
International Organisation for Migration (IOM)	1600	-	-
UN Volunteers (UNV)	144	-	-
UN University (UNU)	33	-	-
North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO)	21	-	21
Total	2,511,946	2,220,015 (88%)	114,577 (4.6%)

Although it is not possible to identify exactly the countries in which this core funding is spent, it is possible to make some estimates on the overall proportion that is spent in fragile situations. However, caution must be exercised when considering these estimates as the proportion allocated to fragile states through these organisations may vary from year to year.

UNICEF is the largest multilateral recipient of aid to education from Norway. Within the small proportion of Norwegian funding to UNICEF to education that can be tracked to a particular country (9%), it is possible to determine that 57.7 million NOK was allocated to fragile situations. However, the majority of Norwegian education support to UNICEF was allocated as thematic funding to its basic education and gender equality programme. In 2010-2012 this was equal to 1.55 billion NOK. Using information on programmable aid for the year 2012 it is possible to calculate that 56% of funds through the basic education and gender equality programme were spent in countries that this study has identified as fragile. It is therefore possible to assume that 56% of the 1.55 billion NOK that Norway provided to this thematic programme was spent in fragile situations. According to this estimate, Norway contributed a further 868 million NOK to education in fragile situations during the period 2010-2012 through UNICEF.

The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development is the second largest multilateral recipient of aid to education from Norway. This includes Norway's contribution to the **Global Partnership for Education (GPE)** which was equal to 527.5 million NOK during the period 2010-2012. Using information on country grant allocations and country data on cumulative disbursements it is possible to assume that approximately 40% of Norway's contribution to GPE has been allocated to fragile situations. According to this estimate, Norway contributed 211 million NOK to education in fragile situations through GPE during the period 2010-2012.

If these estimates for UNICEF (868 million NOK) and GPE (211 million NOK) are included, the overall amount of estimated aid to education in fragile situations via multilaterals is significantly increased to 1.2 billion NOK (25% of all ODA to education). This would mean that almost half (48%) of ODA to education through multilaterals went to fragile situations (2010-12).

UNESCO is the third largest multilateral recipient of aid to education from Norway. In 2010-2012 Norway contributed just under 142.6 million NOK to UNESCO, 99% of which was delivered as core funding and as such is not captured by our analysis of funding to education in fragile situations. However, there are a number of UNESCO commitments involving education in fragile situations. One core area relates to UNESCO's role in the coordination of national reporting on EFA by national governments. Another is through the work of UNESCO's specialised institutes such as the **International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP)**. IIEP has a strong commitment to training and support in fragile and conflict affected countries and is currently launching a programme on crisis-sensitive planning, policy and curriculum, in partnership with Protect Education from Insecurity and Conflict (PEIC) of the Education Above All Foundation, and collaborating with INEE Working Group on Education and Fragility (WGEF) members. This includes, among other activities, the revision of IIEP's distance course on crisis-sensitive educational planning and the production of guidance notes on crisis-sensitive curriculum review, reform and development for senior decision-makers. Table 6 provides a summary of the institutions and education activities that have been supported through Norway's contribution to UNESCO 2010-2012.

Table 6: Norwegian Support to UNESCO (1000 NOK), 2010-2012

Partner	2010	2011	2012
International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP)	15550	16000	14500
UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning (UIL)	3000	3000	1500
International Bureau of Education (IBE)	-	-	4000
UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS)	4000	4000	4000
Education for All (EFA) Global Monitoring Report	3000	3000	3000
Capacity Development for EFA (CapEFA)	19400	19400	18400
Education- Post-conflict and post disaster (PCPD)	1100	1100	-
External evaluation of UNESCO	450	-	-
Education Total	46500	46500	45400

Source: Programme Cooperation Agreements between UNESCO and Norwegian MFA, 2010-2011 and 2012-2013.

It should also be noted that other multilateral organisations such as **OCHA** and **UNHCR** receive funding from Norway. They are not included in Table 5 (above) because their funding is not coded as education, but undoubtedly their operations do involve some element of education in fragile contexts in terms of coordination of humanitarian response and provision of education for refugee and displaced children. Therefore, we also include a brief section on each below:

The **United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA)** received a total of just under 424 million NOK from Norway during the three year period 2010-12. In addition, Norway contributed 1.96 billion NOK to the three humanitarian funds managed by OCHA. Table 7 provides a summary of Norwegian contributions below.

Table 7: Norwegian Contributions to Pooled Funds (1000 NOK), 2010-2012

	2010	2011	2012	Total
Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF)	385,600	400,222	435,425	1,221,247
Common Humanitarian Fund (CHF)	146,942	206,037	265,715	618,694
Emergency Response Fund (ERF)	45,599	52,476	25,018	123,093
Total				1,963,034

Using 2012 figures it is possible to determine that 3.2% of total pooled funds were allocated to education. Unfortunately it was not possible within the time limits of this study to gain an estimate for the proportion that was spent in countries defined as fragile situations.

Norway's largest contribution during the three year period was to the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF). Of the three funds, CERF allocated the lowest proportion to education (1.2%). In contrast, 6% of the Common Humanitarian Fund (CHF) and 1.7% of the Emergency Response Fund (ERF) was spent on education.

UNHCR received a total of just under 1.4 billion NOK for the three-year period (2010-12) of which 905 million NOK (65%) was not earmarked. Funding that is not earmarked allows greatest flexibility, but it is not possible to track exactly which country or sector have received un-earmarked funds. For earmarked funding, 494.9 million NOK (35%), Norwegian funds to UNHCR have sometimes been earmarked at the regional, sub-regional or national level. Several Norwegian contributions have been attached to special projects and appeals as well as to the payment of Junior Professional Officers. No contributions have been earmarked for education between 2010-12.

Due to the above, UNHCR can only come up with a rough estimate of how much Norwegian contributions may have gone to education. To come up with a reasonable estimate, UNHCR looked at all budget lines reflecting Norwegian funding in between 2010-12. Any budget line that was clearly not linked to education (refugee status determination, JPO positions) was not taken into account. This means that just under 53 million NOK of Norwegian funds (approximately 4%) received by UNHCR may reasonably be estimated to have gone to education (2010-12).

Using UNHCR country-level data for the years 2010-2012 it is also possible to state that approximately 75% of education aid was spent in the countries that this study has defined as fragile. According to this estimate, Norway contributed a further 40 million NOK to education in fragile situations through its contribution to UNHCR. Maintaining the right to education for refugee and displaced children is an important aspect of humanitarian assistance. The following points are relevant to the role of UNHCR:

- UNHCR has developed a five-year Education Strategy (2012-16) focused on life-long learning and the need for quality education. It is currently being rolled out in 20 countries with additional countries will be added each year which will need increased financial and technical support.
- Global enrolment and retention rates for refugee children are low: an estimated 76 per cent of refugee primary-school aged children are enrolled in primary education and the enrolment drops to 36 per cent at the secondary education level. These global figures hide big differences between regions: in the countries affected by the Syria crisis, for example, only one third of Syrian refugee children are going to school.
- Quality education for boys and girls, men and women, also helps reach gender equality. Education, and in particular secondary and tertiary education as well as vocational training, are key in helping women gain self-reliance, have access to the job market and pursue careers that have traditionally not been open to them.

Although a relatively low proportion (4%) of Norwegian contributions to UNHCR are spent on education, a relatively high proportion of these funds (75%) are spent on education in fragile situations. The proportion of UNHCR funds that have been allocated to education has increased during the period of analysis which indicates a growing level of need (from 3.8% in 2010 to 5.1% in 2012). Despite this, UNHCR states that 36% of identified needs in education have still not received funding (2012) which makes a strong argument for increasing funding for education of refugees and displaced persons in fragile situations. However, this would need to be done in a way that recognises the role of the Education Clusters in encouraging coordination at country level between multiple

agencies (such as OCHA, UNHCR, UNICEF, NRC, Save the Children and others) involved in supporting and implementing provision of education in fragile situations.

Support to Governments

Norway provides support to governments for education in Nepal, Palestine, Burundi, Pakistan, and Madagascar as well as support to Afghanistan's education sector through a multi-donor trust fund. Except for Madagascar, all of these countries meet this study's criteria as a fragile situation. There appears to be no formal criteria for why these countries receive government support, although it is informally suggested that these are countries with historical ties with Norway and that have demonstrated a level of commitment to education reform. This appears to be in line with Norway's strategy that states that in countries that, as a result of long-term assistance, are in a better position to give priority to the education sector, Norway's policy is to integrate funding for education into general budget support.

Table 8 provides a summary of the overall amount of aid to education received by these countries as well as the amount of this support that is channeled through the government. It indicates that Burundi receives 84%, Nepal receives 81%, and Pakistan and Palestine both receive 51% of aid to education as support to government. There appears to be no clear rationale for the proportion of aid that is delivered through this channel. During the period 2010-2012 Norway also contributed 900 million NOK to the Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Fund (ARTF). However, as Norwegian support to the fund is not earmarked it is not possible to determine the amount that has been spent on education activities.

Table 8: Summary of Aid to Education and Amount Provided as Support to Government (1000 NOK), 2010-2012

	Support to Education	Amount Provided as Support to Government
Nepal	191,082	155,412
Palestine	138,196	70,650
Pakistan	88,432	45,000
Burundi	48,607	41,000

The general approach taken in these countries is to provide support for the implementation of a national education sector plan and coordinate donor efforts through a joint financing arrangement (JFA), a basket fund or multi-donor trust fund. In Nepal, Norway, the UK, Finland, the World Bank, Australia, the EC, UNICEF and the Asian Development Bank are contributing to a JFA in order to support the School Sector Reform Program (SSRP). In Palestine, Norway is supporting the implementation of the Education Development Strategic Plan through a JFA with the Palestinian Authority, Belgium, Ireland, Finland and Germany. Since 2012 Norway contributes, together with France and Belgium to an Education Basket Fund to support the implementation of the Burundi national education strategy. GPE and UNICEF also entered into the partnership in 2013. Norway also provides funding to the ARTF which provides support to education through the EQUIP II programme which is fully aligned with the Afghanistan national education strategic plan. These Joint Financing Arrangements appear to be appreciated as a means of improving collaboration, coordination and avoiding duplication of efforts.

This approach also has advantages in terms of contributing to capacity development within national education systems. For example, the goal of the Norwegian support to Palestine is the establishment of a Palestinian state based on a negotiated agreement. Part of the rationale for shifting to support of the sector plan was a desire to support capacity building within the Palestinian Ministry of Education as part of statebuilding processes. The education development strategic plan is aligned to government plans, enhancing ownership, and also makes use of Palestine's own financial channels as funding is channeled through the Ministry of Finance.

Given the number of actors and agencies contributing to these joint mechanisms, however, it can be difficult to determine the impact of Norwegian assistance in achieving Norwegian priorities. It is not possible to identify the particular activities that are funded by Norwegian assistance. However, there are annual reporting mechanisms on the implementation of all of these education sector plans. As one example, the recent education joint sector report for Afghanistan highlights key challenges such as the inequitable provision of education in terms of both gender and location (rural-urban and regional disparities exist) and the lack of suitably qualified female teachers. These align with Norwegian priorities of gender equality and the equitable distribution of educational opportunities.

Furthermore, Norway provides not only financial assistance, but also technical support through its engagement in education dialogue linked to the sector programme. Throughout a long period of cooperation in Nepal, Norway has highlighted the issue of gender through policy dialogue (as documented through mandates for annual meetings) and actively contributed to the gender audit of the SSRP (Terry and Thapa, 2012). According to the most recent Implementation and Status Report (World Bank, 2011), the gender parity index for basic education in Nepal has reached 0.97. Although it is not possible to quantify these efforts, Norway's role in consistently raising and highlighting this issue should be recognized.

In contrast, Norwegian education support to the Pakistani government continues to be based on project funding. A major project supported by Norway is the Basic Education Improvement Project (BEIP I) (2003-2011) in the province of Khyber Pakhtunka (KPK). Construction of Local Education Offices (LCOS), strengthening of the role of Parents' Councils, the training of teacher mentors, development of teaching manuals and dialogue with religious schools are elements of the project that could be said to have impact in terms of long-term peacebuilding. The second phase of the project (BEIP II) has three areas of focus: rehabilitation and upgrading of girls' schools for primary and secondary level, construction of school libraries, and upgrading of playgrounds for sports. The majority of Norwegian funds will therefore be used for construction, rehabilitation and upgrading.


A sector plan for education in KPK has now been developed. However, the KPK government has requested continued support from Norway for BEIP II rather than direct funding to the education sector development plan. There are three other donors investing directly into the education sector plan (DFID, Germany and the EU) and so it will be important for Norwegian funding of BEIP II to be seen as part of the funding for the sector programme in order to avoid duplication of efforts.

Civil Society Organisations

Overall, 23% of Norwegian aid to education is channelled through civil society organisations (CSOs). In the case of education in fragile situations an even higher proportion of development aid is delivered in this way. The analysis of Norwegian assistance as currently coded using DAC sector categories shows that 625.6 million NOK, almost half of education support in fragile situations, was allocated to civil society organisations during the period 2010-2012. Of this amount, 89% (555.6 million NOK) was allocated to Norwegian CSOs such as Save the Children Norway, Norwegian People's Aid, Norwegian Refugee Council, Norwegian Church Aid, and Digni, amongst others. The rationale for the high proportion of ODA which is provided through Norwegian NGOs appears to be based in a belief that these organisations have built up strong experience in their areas of expertise.


Of the 625.6 million NOK allocated to education in fragile situations through CSOs, 272.9 million NOK was channelled through Norad's Civil Society Department. The department provided support to CSOs to undertake education projects in 19 countries. Somalia received 78.2 million NOK, 29% of aid to education in fragile situations through the civil society department. In terms of regions, 77% of funds supported projects in Africa, 12% supported projects in Asia, 8% of funds were disbursed in America (Colombia) and 3% in the Middle East (Palestine).

Graph 3: Aid to Education in Fragile Situations through the Civil Society Department by Country 2010-2012



In terms of activities, the majority of funds, 239 million NOK, supported primary education, projects supporting life skills for youth and adults received 11% of funds and early childhood development activities received 1%.

Graph 4: Education Sectors Supported through the Civil Society Department 2010-2012



Included in the total amount allocated through the Civil Society Department is an earmarked budget of 20 million NOK for education and fragility which was announced in 2012. Save the Children Norway was allocated 12 million NOK. This was used to provide access to education for marginalised and hard to reach populations including ethnic minorities in Nicaragua and Zimbabwe, refugee children in Lebanon and children with disabilities in Palestine. Save the Children's annual report highlights that in RAAN Province in Nicaragua enrolment rates have increased, children are reported to have increased self-confidence and to participate actively in classroom activities. The report also highlights progress in the Bing district of Zimbabwe where 'net enrolment and retention rates have improved as a result of better learning environments and capacity building for teachers' (2012: 12). The remaining budget was allocated to the following organisations: Adventist Development and Relief Agency (ADRA) (NOK 2 million), Hei Verden (NOK 0.465 million), Digni (NOK 1 million), Plan (1.5 million), SOS barnebyer (NOK 1.5 million) and Strømme Foundation (NOK 2 million).

The year 2013 is not included in our analysis due to the fact that the year has not yet come to a close. However, it is of note that an earmarked budget of 75 million NOK was also announced for 2013 in the area of education and fragility to be administered through the civil society department. Table 9 provides a summary of the organisations that were allocated support. More information on this earmarked fund can be found in Annex C.

Table 9: Funding allocated to civil society organisations through the earmarked fund (1000 NOK), 2013

Civil Society Organisation	Amount received
Save the Children Norway	26,700
Adventist Development and Relief Agency (ADRA)	10,000
Right to Play	10,000
Digni	9,000
Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC)	9,000
Strømme Foundation	8,000
Norwegian Students' and Academics' International Assistance Fund (SAIH)	5,500
Atlas Alliance	4,040
Plan Norway	3,600
Caritas	1,700
Rahma	1,000
Total	88,540

The announcement of funds earmarked for education in fragility appears to be appreciated as an important mechanism in profiling the Norwegian Government as a supporter of the field. It also provides a level of balance to the frustration felt towards the inability to determine the precise levels of development aid currently supporting the area due to the decision to deliver a large proportion of aid to education as core and thematic funding. However, the method of announcing earmarked budgets does also present challenges for both Norad and civil society organisations.


Within Norad, both the Civil Society Department and the Education Department expressed difficulties with a lack of guidance on how this budget should be dispersed. The Civil Society Department was tasked with distributing the earmarked budget to civil society organisations. Particularly given the short term nature of the fund, the department based its decisions on whether the proposed activities were in line with the civil society organisations' area of experience and expertise. The Education Department also offered technical advice on the quality and relevance of the proposed activities. However, neither department was aware of any agreed definition or understanding of fragility or of the activities that were to be included in the proposals.

Members of civil society organisations also experienced challenges related to planning. The Norwegian Minister of Development announced that the Norwegian Government would give 75 million NOK in support to education in fragility in September 2012. However, it was not until spring 2013 that the call for proposals was launched. Combined with a lack of guidance on how this money was to be spent, this made it challenging for organisations to prepare the proposals. Both the Civil Society Department and civil society organisations also expressed concerns over the sustainability of projects funded under this earmarked budget due to its short term nature.

3.2.3 Humanitarian Funding

An analysis of Norwegian humanitarian aid reveals that Norway is supporting substantially more education activities than are reflected in the current system of coding. Over the 2010-2012 period our conservative estimate shows that Norway's humanitarian aid to education was nearly double the amount currently recorded as such. While Norway recorded 85 million NOK as humanitarian aid to education for this period, a detailed analysis of humanitarian aid activities points to a total amount of humanitarian aid to education of 165 million NOK.

Graph 5: Norwegian Humanitarian Aid to Education 2010-2012 (NOK 1000)



According to the system which uses the DAC sector categories, during the period 2010-2012 Norway supported a total of 27 education projects through its humanitarian budget. This amounts to a total budget of 85 million NOK and represents 1% of the humanitarian budget.

Further careful analysis of humanitarian project agreements provides a conservative estimate that Norway supported a further ten education projects during this period. The table below provides a summary of education projects that are currently coded under other category labels. This brings the total humanitarian aid spent on education during 2010-12 to 165 million NOK, approximately 2% of the humanitarian budget.

Even this is likely to be an underestimate as the analysis also revealed a further 40 projects that contain some reference to education-related activities as part of a broader package of humanitarian response. However, in these additional projects there was insufficient detail available to provide a reliable estimate of the amount of funding that went to education. Therefore the overall conclusion is that at least 2% of humanitarian funding from Norway went to education during 2010-12.

Table 10: Summary of education projects supported through the humanitarian budget (2010-2012) not currently coded under the category of education, NOK 1000


Year	Partner	Project Description	DAC Sector Code	Amount
2012	NRC	School reconstruction after conflict. Vocational training.	730 - Reconstruction relief and rehabilitation	15,000
2012	University of Oxford	Education publication- Forced Migration Review	220 – Communications	350
2012	SCN	Temporary learning programme to internally displaced children	720 - Emergency response	9,989
2012	UNRWA	Human Rights Education Programme in Gaza	151 - Government and civil society	19,993
2011	SCN	Early Childhood. Improved access and quality of education facilities.	720 - Emergency Response	2000
2011	UNESCO	Seminar on education under attack	998 - Unallocated/unspecified	11
2011	University of Oxford	Education publications- Forced Migration Review	220 – Communications	300
2010	UNRWA	Human Rights and Remedial Education Programmes Gaza	151 - Government and civil society	29,000
2010	Norsk Folkehjelp	Mapping TVET Providers to Palestinian Refugees in Lebanon	160 - Other social infrastructure and services	1425
2010	University of Oxford	Education publications- Forced Migration Review	220 – Communications	350
Total				78,418

In this analysis education was taken to include primary education, secondary, education, technical and vocational training and catch up or alternative learning programmes. Humanitarian assistance was considered to be supporting education and fragility if it met any of the following criteria:

- a) Aid was disbursed in a country meeting this study's criteria of a fragile situation
- b) Assistance was specifically targeted towards refugees originating from a country that meets this study's definition of a fragile situation
- c) It supported research specifically on the subject of education in emergencies.


During the period 2010-2012 100% of humanitarian aid to education was spent on activities in fragile situations. Graph 6 provides a summary of the type of projects and activities supported under the humanitarian budget during this period. It includes 37 individual projects. 51% of funds were spent on human rights education, 20% were spent on the provision of basic education to displaced children, 12% was dedicated to school reconstruction, 8% was allocated to teacher training programmes, 3% to sport and play activities and 2% was spent on skills training. Education research, life skills and early childhood activities each received 1% of funds.

Graph 6: Funding for Education Activities supported through the Humanitarian Budget (NOK 1000), 2010-2012




Graph 7 indicates that 80% of funds were allocated to the Middle East, Asia received 19% and Africa received 1%. This seems like a low percentage of humanitarian funding for education in Africa, but is based on the documentation made available for analysis. It may also reflect the urgency of humanitarian needs in the Middle East during the period 2010-12.

Graph 7: Humanitarian Funding to Education in Fragile Situations by Region (NOK 1000), 2010-2012



Section Four: Conclusions and Recommendations

The following chart provides an overview of the findings from this analysis of Norway's funding to education in fragile situations:



There are three important qualifications to note about this summary:

1. The total ODA to education does not include OCHA and UNHCR since this is not coded as education. OCHA received NOK 425 million (2010-12) and NOK 1.96 billion to three humanitarian funds (CERF, CHF and ERF). The estimate is that 3% of OCHA pooled funds went to education. It is estimated that Norway also contributed 40 million NOK to education in fragile situations (4% of Norway's contribution to UNHCR).
2. Most aid to multilaterals is not earmarked, so only 4.5% of education aid to multilaterals is traceable to fragile situations. However, our estimate is that Norway has contributed a further 868 million NOK through UNICEF and 211 million NOK through GPE to education in countries defined as fragile. This means that close to 1.2 billion NOK (48% of Norway's aid to education through multilaterals) was allocated to fragile situations (2010-12).
3. Humanitarian aid is part of overall ODA. The analysis identified additional projects with education components that had not been coded as such. This means that at least 2% of humanitarian aid (double what is officially recorded) goes to education in fragile situations.

The following conclusions can be drawn from this analysis of Norway's contribution to education in fragile situations (defined in terms of a consolidated list of 51 countries):

1. Norway has identified education as a priority in its humanitarian policy and is supporting substantially more education activities than are reflected in the current system of coding.
2. Norway contributes a high proportion of its gross national income (GNI) to official development assistance (ODA). Although it fell from 0.96% of GNI in 2011 to 0.93 in 2012, this remains above the international target of 0.7%.
3. The White Paper on Climate, Conflict and Capital states that aid to education will be maintained at least at the 2008 level. Although the annual contributions remain similar (1,541 million NOK in 2008 compared to an annual average of 1,580 million NOK in 2010-2012), this represents a decline in the share of ODA allocated to education from 10% in 2008 to 6% over the three-year period 2010-12 (EFA-GMR Aid Disbursement Tables 2013).
4. A new coalition government formed by the Conservative and Progressive Parties took office from October 2013. Aid and development cooperation will be the responsibility of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the new government has stated that priorities will include a continued commitment to humanitarian assistance and taking a global leadership role in the field of Education for All.
5. During the period 2010-2012 Norway distributed ODA in total of 4.74 billion NOK to education. The analysis of Norwegian assistance as it is currently coded using DAC sector categories reveals that 1.28 billion NOK (27%) of Norwegian aid to education was spent in fragile situations (defined as the 51 countries on the consolidated list). Based on these figures, Africa received half of all Norwegian aid to education in fragile situations. Countries in Asia accounted for 31% of funding, the Middle East received 10%, Europe received 7% and America received 2%.
6. Official Development Assistance (ODA) was provided through three main channels: multilateral organisations, support to governments, and civil society organisations. The table below provides a summary of Norwegian assistance as it is officially coded using DAC sector categories.

	ODA to Education (NOK 1000)	ODA to Education in Fragile Situations
Multilaterals	2,511,945	114,577
Support to Governments	369,793	316,942
Civil Society Organisations	1,084,429	625,628
Other Channels	775,598	227,046
Total	4,741,765	1,284,193

7. Norway provided 2.51 billion NOK (53% of ODA to education) through multilaterals. Of this, it was only possible to track 114 million NOK to fragile situations. This means that 4.5% of education aid to multilaterals went to fragile situations (2010-2012). However, this is undoubtedly an under-estimate as the three largest multilateral recipients (UNICEF, GPE and UNESCO) receive between 90-98% of funds as 'global unspecified' core and thematic funding.
8. Further analysis estimates that for the three-year period, Norway contributed a further 868 million NOK through UNICEF and 211 million NOK through GPE to education in fragile situations. If these estimates are included this means that 1.2 billion NOK (48% of Norway's aid to education through multilaterals) was allocated to fragile situations (2010-12).
9. In addition, funding to multilateral organisations such as OCHA and UNHCR is not coded as education, but undoubtedly their operations do involve some element of education in fragile contexts. These are not included in the figures in this report, but estimates were made below.
10. OCHA received a total of 424 million NOK from Norway during the three year period 2010-12. In addition, Norway contributed 1.96 billion NOK to the three humanitarian funds (CERF, CHF and ERF) managed by OCHA. Of these, CERF allocated the lowest proportion to education (1.2%) and CHF (6%) the highest proportion. Overall, the estimate is that 3.2% of OCHA pooled funds were allocated to education, but it was not possible to estimate how much went to fragile situations.
11. UNHCR received a total of just under 1.4 billion NOK for the three-year period (2010-12) of which 905 million NOK (65%) was not earmarked. Earmarked funding from Norway to UNHCR amounts to 494.9 million NOK (35%). Using UNHCR country-level data for the years 2010-2012 it was estimated that Norway contributed a further 40 million NOK to education in fragile situations (4% of its contribution to UNHCR). The proportion of UNHCR funds that have been allocated to education has increased during the period of analysis which indicates a growing level of need (from 3.8% in 2010 to 5.1% in 2012). Despite this, UNHCR states that 36% of identified needs in education have still not received funding (2012).
12. Just under 0.37 billion NOK (8% of ODA to education) was channeled through support to governments. Of this, 316 million NOK was allocated to fragile situations, which represents 85% of education aid channelled through governments (2010-12). Norway provides support to education through the governments in Nepal, Palestine, Burundi, Pakistan, and Madagascar as well as support to Afghanistan's education sector through a multi-donor trust fund. The general approach is support for education sector plans and coordinated donor efforts. However, the implementation of education sector plans in Afghanistan, Burundi, Madagascar, Nepal and Pakistan are also supported through the Global Partnership for Education (GPE). As Norway is a large contributor to GPE (contributing 200 million NOK in 2011 and 190 million NOK in 2102), there is a question about what bilateral support can achieve that support through GPE cannot.
13. 1.08 billion NOK (23% of ODA to education) was channeled through civil society organizations. The analysis of Norwegian assistance as currently coded using DAC sector categories indicates that 625 million NOK was allocated to fragile situations, 58% of education aid to CSOs (2010-12). Most of this (555.6 million NOK) was allocated to Norwegian CSOs. This is more than double the

proportion of ODA to education in non-fragile situations that is channelled through CSOs. This reflects a belief that these organisations have built up strong expertise in fragile situations, particularly in Africa which receives 77% of funds provided by Norad's Civil Society Department. In terms of activities, the majority of funds from the Civil Society Department, 239 million NOK (88%), supported primary education, projects supporting life skills for youth and adults received 11% of funds and early childhood development activities received 1%.

14. In the past two years the Norwegian Minister of Development announced an earmarked fund to be spent on education in fragile states, administered through the Civil Society Department. In 2012 this was equal to 20 million NOK and in 2013 an additional 75 million NOK was made available to CSOs. This mechanism suggests that education and fragility is a political priority in Norway and, since it supports project funding it is also useful in identifying the type of activities Norwegian assistance is supporting in the area of education and fragility. However, the nature of the fund is short term and announced on a year-by-year basis which causes difficulties for CSOs in terms of predictable planning as well as dilemmas for Norad regarding what type of proposals it is best to support.
15. Norway distributed a total of 4.74 billion NOK (6% of total ODA) to education over the three-year period 2010-12. Of this, the estimate is that 1.28 billion NOK (27%) of Norwegian development aid to education was spent on education in fragile situations, but this is a very conservative estimate based on official DAC coding. However, if estimates for unearmarked funding for UNICEF and GPE are included in the funding to education in fragile situations through multilaterals, then at least 50% of Norway's ODA to education went to fragile situations over the three year period 2010-12.
16. The official statistics as they are currently coded indicate that during the period of analysis (2010-12) Norway allocated 85 million NOK to education in fragile situations through its humanitarian budget. However, a detailed analysis of humanitarian aid activities points to a total amount of humanitarian aid to education of 165 million NOK. This is a conservative estimate and represents at least 2% of humanitarian aid. This is above the current global average; in 2012 new analysis by the EFA Global Monitoring Report team revised the estimated share of humanitarian aid to 1.4%, down from 2.2% in 2009 (EFA-GMR 2012: 1). However, it also remains below the global target to allocate 4% of humanitarian aid to education.
17. Based on the documentation made available for analysis, only 1% of humanitarian funding to education supported projects in Africa. 80% of funds were allocated to the Middle East and Asia received the remaining 19%. This may reflect the urgency of humanitarian needs in the Middle East during the period 2010-12, but also suggests that it is important to maintain commitment to existing humanitarian needs which may be overshadowed or forgotten when new crises emerge in other regions.

Recommendations

The following recommendations arise from the analysis and are provided as a basis for further discussion of possible priorities for education in fragile situations:

1. Develop an Education Strategy that prioritises Education for All and defines Norway's commitments to education in fragile situations

Norway currently has no strategy specific to education and development. This is despite spending 4.74 billion NOK of ODA on education (2010-2012). The new coalition government has stated its commitment to being a global leader in Education for All and, since 50% of out of school children are in fragile and conflict affected situations and furthest from reaching the EFA goals, these should be the priority. A first crucial step will be the development of an education strategy that prioritises Education for All and defines Norway's commitments to education in fragile situations.

2. Make clearer agreements with multilaterals about education priorities in fragile situations

Most aid to multilaterals is not earmarked, so only 114 million NOK (4.5% of education aid to multilaterals) is traceable to fragile situations. Norway's decision to channel education assistance mainly through multilateral organisations is reflected in the analysis, but makes it difficult to attribute spending to education in fragile situations. The three largest, multilateral commitments to education are to UNICEF, GPE (via IBRD) and UNESCO. If estimates for unearmarked funding to UNICEF and GPE are added this means that close to 1.2 billion NOK (48% of Norway's aid to education through multilaterals) was allocated to fragile situations (2010-12). In addition, Norway provides significant funds to other UN multilateral organisations such as OCHA and UNHCR, but these are not currently coded as contributions to education. Within a policy framework to prioritise Education for All and education in humanitarian assistance, clearer agreements would be needed with multilateral organisations about how a Norwegian priority to support education in fragile situations is being met.

3. Ensure that the amount of humanitarian aid to education meets a target of 4%

In the context of humanitarian policy, Norway has taken an international lead in commitment to the inclusion of education within humanitarian assistance. Globally this area is underfunded by donors. The GMR (2011) suggested a target of 4%, but the percentage of humanitarian assistance for education in fragile contexts has actually dropped to 1.4% (GMR Policy Paper, 2013). Norway is still amongst the most committed donors to this area. This analysis estimates that at least 2% of current Norwegian humanitarian aid goes to education. Whilst this may be an underestimate (due to difficulties of attribution), it still suggests that the current amount of humanitarian aid to education may need to be increased to meet the global target of 4%.

4. Encourage the allocation of more funds to the education of refugees and IDPs

Education for refugees and IDPs is one of the most significant challenges in fragile situations. Norway is the seventh largest donor to UNHCR (1.4 billion NOK for 2010-12), yet only 4% of Norwegian support to UNHCR has been attributed to education in this analysis. UNHCR has developed an Education Strategy (2012-16) that is consistent with the Norwegian priorities for humanitarian assistance, but UNHCR states that 36% of education needs were not met in 2012.

This strengthens arguments that funding for safe learning environments and education for refugee girls and boys in fragile contexts should be increased. Norway is already a significant donor to UNHCR. Although it does not earmark funding, Norway could encourage UNHCR to allocate more to education in fragile situations, as well as encouraging other donors to fund this area. However, this would need to be done in a way that takes account of the multiple agencies involved in supporting and implementing provision of education in fragile situations, and the role of the Education Clusters in encouraging coordination at global and country level.

5. Bridge the humanitarian – development gap in fragile and conflict affected situations

There are many concerns about the discontinuities between humanitarian and development assistance in fragile and conflict affected situations. This is partly a structural issue within development organisations, but also a symptom of the way that donors distribute funding. Norwegian commitment to humanitarian assistance that ‘does no harm’ and provides a basis for transition from instability or conflict, places it a strong position to pilot innovative ways to make education funding available in fragile situations in a way that reduces discontinuities.

6. Support the development of conflict sensitive education plans

Norway is a substantial contributor to GPE (527 million NOK for 2010-12) and also supports the implementation of education sector plans through bilateral support. GPE has now identified conflict sensitive education planning and implementation as one of its five key objectives. Norway also contributes an annual amount of 500,000 NOK to the Inter-Agency Network on Education in Emergencies (INEE) which has developed guidelines on conflict sensitive education. One way to consolidate these investments could be additional support and funding for the implementation of conflict sensitive education plans.

7. Clarify Norway’s position on the role of education in peacebuilding

Given Norway’s international reputation and strategic commitment to peacebuilding, it is surprising that there is not a more explicit position in terms of the contribution of education to peacebuilding. Norway is the fourth largest donor to the UN Peacebuilding Fund (61 million NOK during 2010-12) and the PBF is being encouraged to support social development such as the provision of education services as part of peacebuilding. Three broad rationales for the contribution of education to peacebuilding concern i) protection of children and creation of safe learning spaces; ii) addressing structural change and education inequalities; and iii) promoting social cohesion through education. UNICEF is currently developing education programming in these areas in 14 fragile situations and is developing a new strategic plan that will include a commitment to work in this area. Norway’s international profile in peacebuilding, its role in the PBF and its multilateral support for UNICEF means it is well placed to play a strategic role in the post-2015 development of the role of education in peacebuilding.

8. Continue funding the GMR and maintain a focus on education inequalities in fragile situations

Norway is an important funder of the GMR and there is a strong evidence base in the research literature that reduction of education inequalities can reduce grievances in fragile situations. The GMR is already developing a tool known as the World Inequalities Database on Education (WIDE) which has the potential to provide a particular focus on addressing education inequalities in fragile situations. This would also be consistent with the emerging Post 2015 development goals

and continued funding for GMR would ensure that there is a focus on education inequalities in fragile situations.

9. Clarify the added-value of channelling support through governments in fragile situations

316 million NOK (85% of education aid channelled through governments) went to fragile situations (2010-12). Whilst the rationale for continued bilateral engagement with certain countries may involve historical connections, it is not clear what the nature of the dialogue between Norway and these countries is in terms of education in fragile situations. For example, what is Norway seeking to achieve through participation in pooled funding arrangements in fragile situations that are not possible to achieve through multilateral funding? Is there any reason why this type of engagement in a fragile context might be more effective and in what way?

10. Channel more funding towards secondary education and teacher quality in fragile situations

Two aspects that may be of particular significance for education in fragile contexts concern greater attention to secondary education (since research shows that increased years of secondary education decreases the likelihood of violent conflict) and teachers (research suggests they add the most value to the quality of learning but recruiting, training, deployment of good quality teachers is one of the most difficult challenges in fragile situations). Although the review of the literature on education programming best practice highlighted the importance of these two issues in the context of conflict, the funding analysis reveals they are currently under-prioritised in Norwegian assistance.

11. Increase funding to civil society organisations to work with youth in fragile situations

Youth continue to be a neglected population in fragile situations. Concerns about out of school, uneducated and unemployed youth without the means to secure a sustainable livelihood continues to be one of the most cited factors in analyses of fragile situations, regarded as both a threat to security and an under-utilised resource for reconstruction and recovery. However, the analysis shows that most of the projects supported by the Civil Society Department (88%) were for primary education and only 11% went to youth and life skills. Norwegian commitment to work with youth in fragile contexts could be strengthened, particularly through increased funding to civil society organisations and partners that have developed expertise to work with youth and livelihoods in fragile situations. One way to do this would be to consolidate and increase funding through the current civil society funding scheme by prioritising funding for non-formal education and CSOs working with youth in fragile situations.

12. Introduce a marker that tags education more clearly in the monitoring system

The current monitoring system does not easily allow the identification of Norway's contribution to education within broader projects and through humanitarian assistance. However, this could be partly resolved through the introduction of a tag to indicate proposals that contain some aspect of education, even when the overall project is described by a broader category such as emergency response.

References

- Abdalla, A. (2012). *The Team: Kenya final evaluation report*. Costa Rica: University of Peace.
- Aidwatch (2013) *The Unique Role of European Aid: The fight against poverty*
www.concordeurope.org
- Barakat, B.F and H. Urdal (2009). *Breaking the waves? Does education mediate the relationship between youth bulges and political violence?* Washington DC: World Bank.
- Baxter P and L. Bethke (2009), *Alternative Education - Filling the Gaps in Emergency and Post-Conflict Education*. Paris: IIEP/ UNESCO. <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0018/001849/184938e.pdf>
- Beltramo, T. and D. Levine (2010). *Do SMS text messaging and SMS community forums improve outcomes of adult and adolescent literacy programs? Evidence from the Jokko Initiative in Senegal: Final report*. New York, N.Y. & Dakar, Senegal: UNICEF.
- Bengtsson, S.E.L. (2011). 'Fragile States, Fragile Concepts: A Critical Reflection on the Terminology of Fragility in the Field of Education in Emergencies.' In J. Paulson (ed.), *Education, Conflict and Development*. Oxford Studies in Comparative Education. Oxford: Symposium Press.
- Blattman, C. and J. Annan (2011). *Reintegrating and employing high risk youth in Liberia: Lessons from a randomized evaluation of a landmine action: An agricultural training program for ex-combatants*. New Haven, CT: Innovations for Poverty Action.
- Boyden J and P. Ryder (1996). *Implementing the Right to Education in Areas of Armed Conflict*. Oxford: Department of International Development, University of Oxford.
http://www.essex.ac.uk/armedcon/story_id/000454.pdf
- Brookings Institution (2103) *Towards Universal Education: What Every Child Should Learn, Washington, DC: Brookings*
- Burde, D., Kapit-Spitalny, A., Wahl, R., Guven, O. and M. Skarpetieg (2013) *What Happens to Education in Emergencies? A Literature Review of How Education is Affected by Crises and What Works to Protect and Support It* Unpublished review for Norad
- Burde, D. and Linden, L. (2012). *The Effect of Village-based Schools: A Randomized Controlled Trial in Afghanistan*. National Bureau of Economics Research (NBER).
<http://www.nber.org/papers/w18039.pdf>
- Bush, K., and D. Salterelli, eds. (2000). *The Two Faces of Education in Ethnic Conflict*. Florence: UNICEF Innocenti Research Center.
- Cammack, D., McLeod, D., and A. Rocha Menocal (2006). *Donors and the 'Fragile States' Agenda: A Survey of Current Thinking and Practice*, London: JICA and ODI.
- Collier, P. and A. Hoeffler (2004) 'Greed and Grievance in Civil War', *Oxford Economic Papers*, 56 (4)
- Cook, G., and A. Younis (2012). *Somali youth livelihood final evaluation*. Washington, D.C: USAID.

Dahal, J., Kafle, K. And K. Bhattarai (2008). *Children associated with armed force and armed groups program*. Washington, D.C.: Search for Common Ground

Danish Institute for International Studies (DISS) (2013) *Regaining a Future? Lessons Learned from Education of Young People in Fragile Situations*. Copenhagen: Danish Institute for International Studies.

Dennis C and A. Fentiman (2007), *Alternative Basic Education in African Countries Emerging from Conflict: Issues of Policy, Co-ordination and Access*. DFID.
<http://www.dfid.gov.uk/Documents/publications/education-emerging-conflict67.pdf>

Dupuy, K. (2008) *Education for Peace. Building Peace and Transforming armed conflict through education system*. Oslo: International Peace Research Institute (PRIO).

EFA-GMR (2013) Policy Paper 10. *Children still battling to go to school*.
<http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0022/002216/221668E.pdf>

EFA-GMR (2011). *The hidden crisis: Armed conflict and education*. Paris: UNESCO.

Fabra Mata, J. and S. Ziaja (2009) *Users' guide on measuring fragility* German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE) United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

Fields, G. (2013). 'Aid, Growth, and Jobs', *IZA Discussion Paper No. 7141*, ReCom, UNU-WIDER.

Galtung, J. (1975). 'Three approaches to peace: Peacekeeping, peacemaking and Peacebuilding'. In *Peace, war and defence: Essays in peace research*, ed. J. Galtung, Vol. 2, 282–304. Copenhagen: Christian Ejlertsen.

Global Partnership for Education (May 2013) *In Focus: GPE in Fragile and Humanitarian Contexts*.
<http://www.globalpartnership.org/media/docs/publications/2013-06-GPE-work-fragile-countries-Brochure.pdf>

Gupta, L. and C. Zimmer (2008). 'Psychosocial intervention for war-affected children in Sierra Leone', *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, 192: 212–216.

IBIS (2012) *Lessons from our practice: IBIS South Sudan, results, lessons learned and best practice*.

Interagency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE). (2008). *Implementation Case Studies*.
www.ineesite.org/index.php/post/implementation_cs

INEE Adolescent and Youth Task Team (AYTT) (2011) *Education for Crisis-Affected Youth: A Literature Review Summary* http://www.ineesite.org/uploads/files/resources/AYTT_LitReview_2012-02-14.pdf

IYF. (2011). *Youth empowerment program evaluation: Executive version*. Baltimore, M.D.: Author.
http://www.iyfnet.org/sites/default/files/MicrosoftYEP_Final_Report.pdf

James, C. (2010). *Supporting quality education for conflict affected children and young people*. London: Comic Relief.

Kararach, G., Kedir, A., Léautier, F. and V. Murinde (2012) *Is There a Case for Reforming the Country Policy and Institutional Assessment (CPIA) as an Aid Allocation Tool?* Africa Capacity Development, 3 (4).

Manda, S. (2011). *Evaluation of the Accelerated Learning Programme (ALP) in Liberia*, Ministry of Education and UNICEF, Liberia.

Moberg, L. and A. Johnson-Demen (2009). *Evaluation Report: 'Small-small steps' to rebuild communities with YEP: NRC Youth Education Pack Project in Liberia: Post Graduates and Income Generating Activities*. Oslo, Norwegian Refugee Council.

Morlang, C. and Watson, S. (2007), *Tertiary Refugee Education: Impact and Achievements: 15 Years of DAFI*. Geneva: UNHCR. DANIDA 2012, DIIS 2013

Mosselson, J., Wheaton W., and P. St. John Frisoli, (2009) 'Education and Fragility: A Synthesis of the Literature', *Journal of Education for International Development* 4, no. 1
<http://www.equip123.net/jeid/articles/8/Mosselson-EducationFragilitySynthesisLiterature.pdf>

Nicolai S. (2009) *Opportunities for Change - Education Innovation and Reform During and After Conflict*. Paris: IIEP/ UNESCO. <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0018/001838/183808e.pdf>

Nicolai, S. (2003) *Education in Emergencies A toolkit for starting and managing education in emergencies*. London: Save the Children

Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (NMFA) (2012) *Sharing for Prosperity: Promoting democracy, fair distribution and growth in development policy (2012-2013)* Meld. St. 25 (2012-2013) Report to the Storting (White Paper). Oslo: NMFA.
http://www.regjeringen.no/pages/38299114/PDFS/STM201220130025000EN_PDFS.pdf

Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (NMFA) (2011) *Norway and the United Nations: Common Future, Common Solutions (2011-2012)* Meld. St. 33 (2011–2012) Report to the Storting (white paper). Oslo: NMFA
http://www.regjeringen.no/pages/38267499/PDFS/STM201120120033000EN_PDFS.pdf

Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (NMFA) (2008) *Climate, Conflict and Capital: Norwegian development policy adapting to change* Report No. 13 (2008-2009) to the Storting. Oslo: NMFA
http://www.regjeringen.no/pages/2171591/PDFS/STM200820090013000EN_PDFS.pdf

Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (NMFA) (2008) *Norway's Humanitarian Policy 2008- 2013* Oslo: NMFA http://www.regjeringen.no/upload/UD/Vedlegg/Hum/humpolicy_eng.pdf

O'Malley, B. (2010). *Education under attack*, Paris: UNESCO.UN 2013 High Level Panel

OECD (2012) *The Missing Piece: Improving International Support to the Peace Process*. OECD, Paris.

Petersen, B.L. (2011) *Becoming Citizens: Youth, Schooling and Citizenship in postwar rural Nepal*. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Copenhagen/Danish Institute for International Studies.

Rasmussen, P.E., Østergaard, E. and O. Hølaas (2012) *Evaluation of the Swedish Support in the Education Sector in Afghanistan, 2012*. Evaluation Report. SIDA.

RET (2009) *The success of the RET Secondary Education through Distance Learning (SEDL) as exemplified through exams*. Geneva: The Refugee Education Trust.

Rose, P., and L. Steer (2013) *Financing for Global Education and Opportunities for Multilateral Action, Washington and Paris: Brookings Institute and UNESCO, Global Monitoring Report*.

Save the Children (2012a) *Breaking the Cycle of Crisis. Learning from Save the Children's delivery of education in conflict-affected fragile states*. London: Save the Children UK.

Save the Children Norway (2012b) *International Programmes. Annual Progress Report 2012*. Oslo: Save the Children Norway

Save the Children UK (2010) *The Future is Now: Education for Children in Countries Affected by Conflict*. London: Save the Children UK. http://www.savethechildren.org.uk/en/54_11364.htm

Save the Children (2008) *Learning From Those Who Live It: evaluation of children's education in conflict-affected Sudan*. Global Evaluation Report, Save the Children Rewrite the Future. www.savethechildren.net/.../rewritethefuture.../GlobalEvaluationMidtermReport2008.pdf

Shrestha, D. and T. Gautam (2010). *The Role of Youth in Peacebuilding and Community Decisionmaking in Nepal*. Washington, D.C.: Search for Common Ground.

Smith, A., McCandless, E. Paulson, J. and Wheaton, W. (2011) *Education and Peacebuilding in Post-Conflict Contexts. A Literature Review*. New York: UNICEF.

Stewart, F. (2008). *Horizontal Inequalities, Political Stability and Conflict: Some policy implications*. PowerPoint presentation. Oxford: University of Oxford.

Terry, G. and N. Thapa (2012). *Gender Audit of Nepal's School Sector Reform Programme*. Paper commissioned by DFID and Royal Norwegian Embassy.

Tomlinson K and P. Benefield (2005) *Education and Conflict: Research and Research Possibilities*. National Foundation for Educational Research. <http://www.transjuba.com/filestore/Educationandconflict.pdf>

UN (2013) *A New Global Partnership: Eradicate Poverty and Transform Economies Through Sustainable Development*. The Report of the High-Level Panel of Eminent Persons on the Post-2015 Development Agenda

UNESCO (2013a) *Schooling of Millions of Children Jeopardized by Reductions in Aid*. Global Monitoring Report Policy Paper 9. Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO (2013b) *Children Still Battling to Go to School*. Global Monitoring Report Policy Paper 10. Paris: UNESCO.

UNICEF (2012) *UNICEF's engagement in the Global Partnership for Education*. Partnership Profile. http://www.unicef.org/partners/Partnership_profile_2012_Global_Partnership_for_Education.pdf

UNICEF (2010). *Education in Conflict and Transition Contexts: Case studies from the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Nepal and Southern Sudan*. Field Notes: UNICEF Policy and Programming in Practice. New York, UNICEF.

USAID (2013) *State of the Field Report: Examining the Evidence in youth Education in Crisis and Conflict*. Washington, DC: USAID.

Whalen, M. (2010). *Report of prepara ami ba serbisu (PAS) project final evaluation*. Washington, DC: Educational Development Center.

Winthrop, R. and E. Matsui (2013) *A New Agenda for Education in Fragile States*. Center for Universal Education Working Paper 10. Washington, DC: Brookings

World Bank (2011) *Implementation Status and Results. Nepal: School Sector Reform Program*
http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/SAR/2011/07/17/C7928B94F6A6BB69852578D0003F8838/1_0/Rendered/PDF/P1134410ISR0Di017201101310902436561.pdf

Annex A: Terms of Reference

Study on Education in Fragile Situations

Background

61 million children are still lacking access to primary school. Almost half of these children live in countries affected by conflict. At the same time, according to the Global Monitoring Report (GMR) 2012, around 200 million young people (in low and middle income countries) cannot read and write. Many of these young people also live in countries affected by conflict.

Education for children and young people living in fragile and conflict affected states is identified as a priority for Norway's development assistance to education. This is reflected in our policies and strategies, such as the humanitarian policy, where provision of education is mentioned as one of the fields to be prioritized within humanitarian aid and White paper no. 13 (2008-09) "Climate, Conflict and Capital" where it is stated that education including education in fragile and conflict affected states and situations should be prioritized. Moreover, support to education in emergencies as well as education in post-conflict and fragile states is prioritized in our multilateral and bilateral assistance.

Purpose

In light of the emerging need to further address education in fragile situations in the "Post-2015 agenda", the main purpose of this study is to analyze and assess the evidence base that exists on achievements, best practices and emerging issues related to education in fragile situations. In addition, the study will include an analysis of Norway's current work on education in fragile situations. Based on the findings the study should also provide recommendations with regards to how Norway could continue our support to education in fragile situations.

Scope of Work

Based on an analysis of key documents (research, studies, reports and official documents) related to education in fragile states, the consultant(s) should:

- Provide a brief overview of key concepts (fragile situations and states, conflict and post-conflict affected states, education in emergencies etc.) as well as a brief outline of historical trends in the field of education in fragile situations. This part should also include limiting the scope with regards to what shall be discussed in this study.
- Provide an overview of the key actors and their priorities and strategies within the field of education in fragile situations. This should include the key international actors/networks, multilateral organizations, civil society and donors.
- Provide an analysis of Norway's current work on education in fragile situations including national policies, strategies and guidelines. The analysis should also include an outline of the main channels for the Norwegian support to education in fragile states. Since some of the Norwegian assistance to emergency is un-earmarked this work will involve an analysis of agreements especially under the emergency budget chapter to identify how education is supported through this budget. In addition, it will involve an analysis of agreements with civil society organizations that receive support from Norway (MFA and NORAD).

- Identification of best practices within the field of education in fragile situations and an assessment of the “value added” of the interventions discussed⁹. The main focus should be on primary and secondary school level interventions including vocational and non- formal education. Country examples may be used in the analysis¹⁰.
- Identify key issues that need to be addressed in order to strengthen education in fragile situations. Based on the findings make suggestions for how these issues can best be addressed including concrete suggestions for future work. This should include issues that are relevant for the development of the “Post-2015” agenda and issues that are relevant to Norway’s future support to education in fragile situations including an assessment of which would be the best channels for our support as well as which kind of thematic or geographical support that should be prioritized.

Expected outcome

The outcome of this study will be a report covering the aspects mentioned above. The report should not be more than 30 pages including a short executive summary, excluding annexes.

Working modalities

The main method to be applied for this assignment is to conduct a desk review of reports and other documents including agreements that Norway has with organizations that are supporting education in fragile situations/emergencies. There will also be a need to conduct interviews with staff working at the MFA and NORAD in Oslo to assess how education in fragile situations is supported.

The time frame of this consultancy is set to a total of 35 working days. The working days are:

- 20 days to conduct reviews of relevant documents
- 10 days to prepare a draft report. After receiving the draft report NORAD should provide comments within 10 working days
- 5 days to finalize the report and conduct a presentation of the report at NORAD

A brief inception report which includes a list of key documents to be analyzed shall be presented to NORAD for approval within the first 5 days of work. We are primarily looking for one consultant to conduct this assignment, but the assignment could also be done involving more consultants or senior and junior staff/students. The consultant(s) should have the following qualifications:

- Experience in conducting studies and reviews as well as in report writing
- Experience with analysis of education in fragile states/situations and education in emergencies
- Good knowledge of research within the field of education in fragile states/situations and education in emergencies.
- Knowledge of Norway’s policies and strategies for development cooperation within the field of education
- Experience in statistical analysis

It is desirable that the consultancy will start in May/beginning of June, 2013 and be completed at the latest by September, 2013.

⁹ NORAD is currently, in collaboration with the New York University, finalizing a literature review of research on “what works among education in emergencies programs”. This study can be used as background information when identifying lessons learnt and best practices.

¹⁰ Norway provides bilateral support to education in Nepal, Palestine, Burundi, Pakistan, Madagascar as well as support to Afghanistan’s education sector through a multi-donor trust fund. Examples from these countries would therefore be of special interest to us, but lessons learnt can also be provided from other countries.

Annex B: Methodology of Country Classification

In order to analyse aid flows to education in fragile situations this study established a list of 51 countries. There is no universally agreed definition of fragility and, as such, there is a wide variety of fragility indices reflecting a diverse range of interests and purposes. As it is difficult for any one index to fully cover the breadth of the concept many actors and agencies use a combination of indices to inform their understanding¹¹. The countries included in this study for analysis are derived from the World Bank-African Development Bank-Asian Development Bank harmonised list of fragile and post-conflict countries for 2012, those categorised as 'alert' on the 2012 Failed State Index (FSI) and the Project Ploughshares 2012 report.

The World Bank- African Development Bank-Asian Development Bank harmonised list defines a country as fragile in the event that it has either:

- a) a harmonized average CPIA country rating of 3.2 or less
- b) the presence of a UN and/or regional peace-keeping or peace-building mission during the past three years

It is the most widely used indicator of fragility and is produced in a comprehensive rating process that includes consultations with country authorities. The index is composed of macroeconomic, structural, social and governance criteria and it is argued that its focus on policies and institutions is a measure of state performance conceptually independent of income levels and conflict. However, it is a strongly value-oriented index and is based on neo-liberal economic norms that were influential during times of structural adjustment. 'The economic core of the CPIA reflects preferences for low inflation, a surplus budgetary position, minimal restrictions on trade and capital flows, promotes 'flexible' goods, labour and land markets, and the prohibition of directed/state rationed credit' (Kararach et al. 2012: 1)

The majority of indicators of fragility are produced by international organisations that collect their data from government who may have incentives to distort data. The Failed States Index (FSI), however, generates its own data and therefore provides a useful cross-check for the robustness of other indices. It is based on content analysis of electronically available documents which scores countries against social, economic and political indicators. Countries are then categorized as one of four options: alert (scores of 90-120), warning (60-90), moderate (30-60), sustainable (0-30). There are some questions regarding a lack of transparency of the methodology. It has also been suggested that the widespread reproduction of news on the internet may increase biased measurement (Fabra Mata and Ziaja 2009: 58).

Another alternative is to take a conflict perspective, irrespective of the state of development. Conflict can be a cause, symptom or consequence of fragility (Fabra Mata and Ziaja 2009: 7). Project Ploughshares produces an annual report on armed conflict which it defines as 'a political conflict in which armed combat involves the armed forces of at least one state (or one or more armed factions seeking to gain control of all or part of the state), and in which at least 1,000 people have been killed by the fighting during the course of the conflict'¹². As the project states, there are challenges to defining 'political violence' as the nature of conflict changes and the distinction between political and criminal violence becomes increasingly blurred. It also misses 'low level' conflicts where the level of casualties does not reach the threshold for inclusion, but that may signal a level of fragility.

¹¹ For example the OECD combines the CPIA, the Index of State Weakness in the Developing World and Country Indicators for Foreign Policy. Save the Children uses a combination of Project Ploughshare, the Failed States Index and the World Bank CPIA.

¹² <http://ploughshares.ca/programs/armed-conflict/defining-armed-conflict/>

Summary Table: Consolidated List of Fragile Situations

Country	Harmonised CPIA	Political/Peacebuilding Mission	Peacekeeping Mission	Failed States Index	Ploughshares Active Conflict
Afghanistan	2.74	x	x	Alert	x
Angola	2.95				
Algeria					x
Bangladesh				Alert	
Bosnia & Herzegovina	3.64	x			
Burundi	3.1	x		Alert	
Cameroon				Alert	
Central African Republic	2.84	x		Alert	
Chad	2.8		x	Alert	x
Colombia				Critical	x
Comoros	2.55			Critical	
Congo, Rep.	3.17			Alert	
Cote d'Ivoire	2.85		x	Alert	
DRC	2.85		x	Alert	x
Egypt				Alert	
Ethiopia				Alert	x
Eritrea	2.15			Alert	
Guinea	3.08			Alert	
Guinea-Bissau	3.04	x		Alert	
Haiti	2.9		x	Alert	
India					x
Iraq		x		Alert	x
Kenya				Alert	x
Kiribati	2.86				
Kosovo	3.43		x		
Liberia	3.38		x	Alert	
Libya		x		Critical	x
Marshall Islands	2.75				
Micronesia, FS	2.72				
Myanmar				Alert	x
Nepal	3.69	x		Alert	
Niger				Alert	
Nigeria				Alert	x
North Korea				Alert	
Pakistan				Alert	x
Palestine		x			x
Philippines				Critical	x
Sierra Leone	3.33	x		Alert	
Solomon	3.11			Critical	

Islands						
Somalia	1.13	x			Alert	x
South Sudan				x	Alert	x
Sri Lanka					Alert	
Sudan	2.48			x	Alert	x
Syria		x			Alert	x
Thailand						x
Timor-Leste	3.16			x	Alert	
Togo	2.94				Critical	
Turkey						x
Uganda					Alert	
Yemen	2.98				Alert	x
Zimbabwe	2.16				Alert	

Annex C: Earmarked fund for Education and Fragility 2013

In 2013 an earmarked budget of 75 million NOK was announced for 2013 in the area of education and fragility to be administered through the civil society department. This was to be administered by the civil society department following applications by civil society organisations. Due to the timing of this announcement it was decided to allocate the fund in two rounds. In the first round the following CSOs received funding: Save the Children Norway (24.7 million NOK), Digni (9 million NOK), SAIH (5.5 million NOK), ADRA (5 million NOK), Right to Play (5 million NOK), NRC (4 million NOK), Atlas Alliance (2 million NOK), Plan Norway (2 million NOK) and Rahma (1 million NOK). As this funding was allocated to CSOs to scale up existing education projects in the context of fragility, the information on exactly what type of activities were supported is limited. In the second round the remaining budget was allocated to ten civil society organisations to either start new projects in line with their area of expertise or extend existing project activities into 'harder to reach' and new locations. This table provides a summary of projects allocated support through this second round.

Funding allocated to civil society organisations in the second round of the earmarked fund 2013 (1000 NOK)

Organisation	Context	Project description	Amount
Right to Play	Lebanon, Jordan, Gaza, Uganda, South Sudan, Liberia, Kenya, Mali	Scaling up existing interventions	5,000
NRC	Yemen and Kenya	Youth Education and Livelihoods support. Expansion of Inclusive Education	5,000
ADRA	Somalia	Construction/rehabilitation of 10 schools, material resources to teachers, and capacity building of educational authorities	5,000
Strømme Foundation	Mali	Speed Schools	4,500
Strømme Foundation	South Sudan	National inclusive education policy (including teacher training curriculum) and training civil society in disability mainstreaming.	3,500
Save the Children Norway	Nepal	Support to disabled children	2,000
Caritas	Colombia	Addressing urban violence through education	1,700
Plan	Burkina Faso	Promoting education and protection for vulnerable children displaced by conflict in Mali	1,600
Atlas Alliance-NBF	Uganda	Education of visually impaired children and youths	1,100
Atlas Alliance-NHF	West Bank, Jordan and Syria	Advocacy, capacity building and policy development for inclusive education	500
Atlas Alliance-Norwegian Association of heart and lung patients	Sudan	Training and awareness-raising of teachers, children and community about TB and social inclusion	440
Total			30,340