

International Commission on Financing Global Education Opportunity Global Consultation: Global Campaign for Education (GCE) Response 15 May 2016

Overview and methodology

The Global Campaign for Education is the world's biggest civil society movement working to end the global education crisis. With a network of 112 national, regional and international members – themselves with networks of tens to hundreds of member organisations – operating in over 100 countries, GCE represents a broad base of civil society actors including NGOs, teachers' unions, social movements, youth networks, and grassroots groups.

From the declaration at Dakar in 2000 that “no country would be thwarted by a lack of resources”, to the Education 2030 Framework For Action commitment that every child should have free primary and secondary education and that governments should invest at least 4-6% of GDP in education, the GCE movement has consistently worked to achieve an increase in quality financing to education for everyone. In 2016, GCE is running its ‘Fund the Future: Education Rights Now’ campaign, which commenced with the Global Action Week for Education (24-30 April) and will continue with a series of publications, resources, and advocacy activities throughout the year. As such, we welcome the opportunity to input into the global consultation hosted by the International Commission.

Between April and May 2016, GCE and its members actively engaged in the consultation to ensure that the experience and political demands of citizens were given voice in this important move to increase financing for global education. This was done in two ways:

1. National coalitions were encouraged to host their own national or local level consultations, starting with their own broad-based networks and memberships but also engaging other interested parties.
2. GCE hosted an online consultation in English, French, Spanish, Portuguese, and Arabic, again combining the questions set by the Commission with those on sustainability and equity.

GCE has also intended to host a global webinar; unfortunately, due to technical problems, we were unable to deliver this aspect of the consultation. However, an in-depth call was held with the GCE member coalition in Pakistan, whose response is included in this report.

National coalitions

Several GCE member coalitions held national level consultations, including Nigeria, the United States, Pakistan, France, Norway and the United Kingdom. Where these were received by GCE in time, summary reports were taken into consideration in this response; coalitions also submitted their responses directly to the Commission.

GCE Online Consultation

The online consultation received 60 responses across the five languages, with respondents representing all world regions, and international/regional/national organisations and coalitions. Details are included in the Annex: Participating Organisations.

This response represents the views of GCE members and partners as expressed across these mechanisms.

Summary of responses

Question 1: Given that there are clear benefits of education, why do you think people have not acted and invested in education at the level needed?

Lack of political will

As a broad umbrella, a lack of political will on the part of both developing and donor country governments was identified by GCE members as the biggest reason why investment in education has been de-prioritised and insufficient. However, very diverse drivers for this lack of will were identified:

- The predominant driver identified by respondents is that education is unpopular with politicians – again, in both donor and developing countries – as it is a long-term goal, requiring long-term, sustained funding. This was particularly frustrating for respondents in countries which have explicit national policies on education financing. With a need to show a ‘return on investment’ in the short-medium term, political preference is usually given to infrastructural projects, such as road building, or to security-focused programmes, such as military and defence, which are seen to be more pressing, are more visible to the public and can be completed within a term of office. Military spending was particularly raised by countries suffering conflict, including Nigeria, Pakistan, and Yemen.
- Respondents in developing countries, particularly in Africa, raised the issue that some governments preferred to maintain a level of ignorance among their populations. When children, young people and adults have access to education, the combination of an increased awareness and understanding of their rights, with increased interest and will to participate in democracy, is perceived to be a risk to the political status quo.
- Some respondents felt that the current poor quality of education delivered and high unemployment rates among school graduates leads to disenchantment with the education system and, in turn leads to lower investment. This creates a downward spiral where poor investment leads to poor quality, which in turn leads to even lower investment.
- The benefits of an educated population, particularly to economic growth, are not well understood by some governments. A number of respondents cited that this had become ingrained due to the consistently low quality of education yielding poor results for learners.
- One response raised the issue that it is difficult for children to advocate for themselves, making it a challenge for them to demand their rights from politicians, and easy for politicians to ignore the fulfilment of these rights.

Donor and domestic financing challenges

Many respondents identified the sheer insufficiency of the overall pot of funding for essential services as the main reason for the lack of investment; in particular, the funding allocated to education was deemed insufficient for it to be classified as an ‘investment’, being used instead to maintain poor quality education systems.

- The insufficiency of the domestic budget overall means that even if developing country governments fulfil the commitment to spend 20% on education, they would still not achieve quality education for all. The overwhelming issue raised by GCE members and partners was the need for strong action on tax justice to increase the domestic financing base – this is illustrated throughout this response.
- However, the withdrawal of donors was also raised as a reason for the smaller overall pot; some attributed this to the global recession, and others to political selectiveness of donors. Middle income countries, with a high percentage of poor populations and tremendous educational challenges have particularly seen a loss of aid, which has occurred frequently without adequate planning for the transition period.
- Equally as important to respondents – from every region – was the short-term approach to funding modalities and mechanisms, which is a mismatch for quality education as a long-term goal. At the domestic level, investment in education to increase participation and develop infrastructure must span more than one funding cycle, and sufficient investments must be made year on year to maintain national education systems – but there is an unwillingness on the part of politicians to commit to such a long-term investment. At the donor level, particularly concerning the World Bank and other IFIs, funding modalities are increasingly project-based, short-term, and/or require evidence of return on investment. This makes it difficult for funding to be allocated or used for long-term investment in education systems.

- The ‘loudness’ of other sectors was also cited as a reason for the de-prioritisation of funding for education, and this is on both the donor and domestic sides. This argument is two-fold: firstly, that other sectors, particularly health, dominate in both donor and domestic financing debates; and secondly, that national media gives immediacy to other issues, such as security, over education or development assistance. In other sections respondents cited the need for more joined-up working between essential services sectors moving forward, but it was felt that sectors seem to be competing for funds, and the political infrastructure.
- Corruption was cited by several developing country respondents – both across a government, and within the education ministry and devolved local education agencies.

Contextual complexity

The issue of long-term conflict was raised, particularly in the Middle-East region, and the need for a different way of thinking and financing in fragile states. For states which endure years or decades of conflict, it was felt that both government and donor approaches to financing of public services need to take into account the inter-relatedness of these services, and results should be based on how the different sectors work together. While this issue can be translated to other, broader contexts, it was particularly raised by those in conflict situations. The failure to do this meant that each sector is fighting for funding, despite the inter-reliance of the health, education, and water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) sectors, for example; when this is the case, it is extremely challenging to provide basic services in contexts of conflict, which are constantly in flux.

The centralisation of funds was also seen as a serious challenge to the effectiveness of public services in conflict-affected countries. At the macro-level, some respondents stated that money would inevitably be channelled into military spending at the expense of education and other public services; at the micro-level, others noted that community-based management of public financing was necessary to maintain public services more reliably in ongoing conflicts.

Question 2. What do you think has been the biggest single obstacle to raising educational quality in developing countries? How can we overcome this obstacle?

Lack of sustained, long-term financing leads to poor quality

By far the biggest reason identified by the GCE membership was the insufficiency of sustained funding, particularly in regards to teacher training, salaries and ongoing support, but also to deliver and maintain adequate infrastructural elements such as buildings and learning materials. With over 90% of education budgets tied up in the provision of basics like teacher salaries and physical infrastructure, resources for delivering educational programmes of holistic quality – strong curricula, teaching and learning materials, play materials, textbooks, ongoing support for teachers, and other inputs necessary for delivering quality education – have largely been ignored. This was identified by respondents working in every region, representing national, regional and international organisations.

Related responses included poor policy-making and skewed priorities in some countries, led by a heavy focus on access in global education goals over the past fifteen years, leading to a lack of serious financing to raise quality; insufficient or complete lack of financing for continuing professional development (CPD) for teachers to update their skills and knowledge; and, critically, that financing for education overall has never been sufficient to fund the right to free education – in itself leading to poor quality education, or none at all, for the poorest. One respondent mentioned skewed financing priorities of donors, leading to large education aid allocations going to higher education, or imputed student costs. The Global Education Monitoring Report backed this up in its 2013 policy paper, noting that for each scholarship provided for a student to study at university in a developed country, hundreds of students in a developing country could receive basic education: *“one single scholarship for a Nepalese student in Japan, for example, could pay for 229 secondary school students in Nepal.”*¹

¹ <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0021/002199/219998E.pdf>

The Incheon Declaration of the 2015 World Education Forum defines quality education as one that *“fosters creativity and knowledge, and ensures the acquisition of the foundational skills of literacy and numeracy as well as analytical, problem-solving and other high-level cognitive, interpersonal and social skills. It also develops the skills, values and attitudes that enable citizens to lead healthy and fulfilled lives, make informed decisions, and respond to local and global challenges...”*² The Education 2030 Framework for Action further states: *“This requires relevant teaching and learning methods and content that meet the needs of all learners, taught by well-qualified, trained, adequately remunerated and motivated teachers, using appropriate pedagogical approaches and supported by appropriate information and communication technology (ICT), as well as the creation of safe, healthy, gender-responsive, inclusive and adequately resourced environments that facilitate learning.”*³

There was a strong sense that governments have failed to recognise that quality education is reliant on quality teaching, choosing instead to separate the different elements of education and pick and choose which to fund in a given budget cycle. This often leaves the teaching profession substantially – or even ruinously – underfunded; failing to address this will mean that the vision of true quality education, to which all governments have committed, will never be fulfilled.

Poor strategy, management and accountability

Many respondents felt strongly that a combination of non-holistic education strategies, poor planning and management of education services, weak institutional capacity of education departments, and a lack of transparency and accountability, has led to weak delivery of quality education on the ground.

Educational planning adopted by many member states is not conducive to delivering quality education. Education sector plans (and budgets) are often not prepared in a transparent and participative manner, are not reflective of real ground level realities and funds allotted are frequently not disbursed as per the plan. Education departments also frequently lack the capacity necessary to deliver on the mandate. Examples cited of poor management of education systems ranged from weak local-level implementation of national policy, to financial corruption – both of which could be addressed by strengthening transparency and accountability processes (notably by ensuring citizens are represented in decision-making and monitoring fora), and to some extent by improving data collection and analysis. Aid must fund technical and knowledge functions and strengthen institutional capacities.

Education strategies – particularly in the light of both SDG4 and the FFA – must be developed in contexts of inclusion, equity, and lifelong learning. The failure of some governments to do this has led to a lack of targeted funding to address the needs of disadvantaged groups, such as women and girls, and people with disabilities – deepening inequalities as other groups receive increased access to education. In the same vein, it was felt that approaches to pedagogy have not been developed with lifelong learning or inclusion in mind, and stronger education strategies with targeted funding for training and development could address this. A small number of respondents reiterated their concern that such weak education strategies were intentional, with the aim of maintaining a poorly-educated, therefore politically disengaged, population.

Lack of vision for public services

Building on the argument made in the previous response regarding inter-relatedness of sectors, some respondents felt that governments lacked vision in programmes for economic and social development by failing to recognise the interdependence of public services. Strong education systems cannot exist in a vacuum, and respondents felt that failures to address issues such as sanitation and health have led to weak school infrastructure and poor outcomes for students.

Recommendations to overcome these obstacles:

- The Education Financing Commission to reinforce to UN Member States and multilateral donors that long-term planning to finance updated teacher training, salaries, and ongoing professional development is critical to realising quality education.

² <https://en.unesco.org/world-education-forum-2015/incheon-declaration>

³ UNESCO (2015). *Incheon Declaration and Framework for Action: Towards inclusive and equitable quality education and lifelong learning for all*. Paris: UNESCO.

- Taxation is fundamental to increasing domestic resources, and the Commission should be a champion for tax justice.
- The Commission must support targeted financing to overcome inequitable access to and quality of education for disadvantaged groups.
- The Commission should champion the involvement of civil society in policy-making, monitoring and accountability, although it was also noted that there is limited civil society representation on the Commission itself.
- Good practice should be identified and shared, particularly to address access to quality education for hard-to-reach groups.
- The commission must reiterate the need for funding to support the building of state institutional capacity in order to deliver quality sector plans and eventually deliver universal quality public education.

Question 3: For those countries which have made the greatest improvements in education in recent years, what do you think have been the critical factors in their success?

Budget allocation to and in education

Unsurprisingly, the single biggest factor for success was identified as strong budget allocation to and in education. Specifically, 20% of domestic budget was seen as a minimum benchmark. At the same time, while the size of the budget is critical, it is also important to ensure that the investments are geared towards achieving a sustained impact on improving quality. Thus, within education budgets equitable emphasis should be placed on the major investments of the teaching profession and of infrastructure, but also going beyond these to include the whole array of inputs necessary to deliver quality education – with several responses identifying the provision of free education as the most critical infrastructural element. Once again, tax was identified as the key to increased domestic financing.

Consistent and coherent policy

Respondents also felt that governments which have clear, coherent and consistent policies for both national development and education were much more likely to succeed, particularly when those policies are maintained in the long term across several political cycles. To some extent this applies to donor countries too, in that donors must have clear objectives for development finance, and maintain bilateral and multilateral commitments until those objectives are realised. This, in turn, requires a process of social dialogue to ensure that these policies enjoy wide social acceptance, enabling education to emerge as an issue that enjoys consensus across party lines. Civil society has a clear role to play in this regard.

Strong education strategies, management and accountability

Again, a series of responses identified ways in which education systems could be strengthened across strategy, management and accountability:

- Holistic education strategies to develop inclusive education systems, which address the most disadvantaged learners – for example, approaches to girls’ education which address child marriage and school sanitation; mother-tongue curricula; appropriate pedagogy and curricula for different learners.
- Addressing all levels of education within the context of lifelong learning, including early childhood, primary and secondary, second-chance learning for young people, TVET, and adult education.
- Seeking and using good practice, or international benchmarking, for infrastructural aspects such as management and pedagogy.
- Serious efforts to end corruption – which must be supported by donor countries.
- Engagement of civil society in policy-making and monitoring.

Education as a right

Several respondents, particularly from Latin America and Asia, articulated that when education is acknowledged by the government as a human right, and when governments pursue policies which aim to realise this right, the likelihood of success is greatly increased – for all learners. The recognition of this right, however, needs to be backed by policies and mechanisms for social accountability and mechanisms for the enforcement of that right. These, in turn, require funding.

Question 4: How do you think education/school will look different in 2030? What implications does this have on the Commission's recommendations?

Any significant, positive change in education by 2030 is heavily reliant on the pre-conditions of increased funding and political will, on the parts of both donor and developing countries. Several respondents also identified how crucial it is for governments to learn from the experiences gained in trying to deliver the EFA agenda over the past fifteen years, while others also mentioned the fundamental pre-condition of political stability. Ultimately, there will be no change unless there is a change in attitude and financing – and that change must start now.

If funding and political will is sufficient (in order of popularity):

- Inclusion and quality are the focus of education strategies, resulting in better diversity, completion rates and learning outcomes.
- The right to education, the fulfilment of the individual and the exercise of citizenship are at the heart of education and lifelong learning provision, rather than economic development.
- Teacher training is stronger and continuing professional development is offered.
- Infrastructure is adequate and well-maintained.
- Education is a high quality public service, and centres of learning (not just schools) are bastions of governance, transparency, equality, critical thinking, and innovation.
- Technology has a stronger presence, particularly for learners with disabilities, but will not (and should not) replace teachers.
- Access to and quality of all levels of education is greatly increased, from early childhood onwards.
- Approach to pedagogy and learning is learner-centred, and not focused solely on school-based education.
- Citizens, learners and educators are involved in decision-making and monitoring.
- The educational gap between developing and developed countries is narrowed.

If funding and political will do not improve:

- Growth of private, for-profit actors in education, leading to the profit motif overriding the delivery of the right to education to all people. This in turn will lead to deeper inequality, segregation and social divisions as well as weaker democratic governance, which will not involve citizens in decision making. Reliance on such providers leads to large sections of the population not completing secondary education, further deepening existing social and economic inequalities, and increasing alienation of youth.
- Over-prevalence of technology at the expense of quality; some respondents noted that it should not be assumed that technology and its maintenance are cheaper than investing in teachers.
- Increase in equality and gender gaps.

Implications for the Commission

- Quality, inclusive education for all is possible with adequate financing, but the scale of the financial need should not be underestimated; sustained commitments are fundamental and these can only come from increasing the domestic resource base through taxation.
- The Commission must make a case for strengthening public education systems, and reiterate the commitment to 12 years of free education as laid down in the Framework for Action.
- Public resources, including those that come from international cooperation, should be delivered to public education, and not to private schools or to contract private provision of curriculum development, standardised material, teacher training, or other aspects of the pedagogical process.

Question 5: What will be the most important (new) sources of finance for global education over the next decades? How could these sources be harnessed?

While it was somewhat inevitable that the most popular response was ‘tax’, a variety of methods of tax collection were identified, alongside several other potential new mechanisms for increased financing, and better quality development assistance. A particular concern was raised by middle-income country respondents, however, in that development assistance has reduced dramatically, but education systems are not yet providing inclusive or quality education, and domestic resourcing is neither sustained nor sufficient.

Taxation

Tax was overwhelmingly named as the single biggest new source of funding for global education. Within this broad bracket, a variety of mechanisms for increasing domestic resources through taxation were named (in order of popularity):

- End tax incentives for existing and potential investors.
- End tax dodging by multinational companies (MNCs).
- Ring-fenced funding for education should be sought, including from income derived from the exploitation of natural resources and the extraction industries.

Respondents reiterated that the Commission should champion tax justice in its final report.

Donor financing

Multilateral agencies, emerging donor countries, and the private sector (including foundations) were all named as potential sources of income. Responses below are listed in order of popularity.

- Traditional donor countries to increase their allocations to education; it was noted that, since the Dakar Framework in 2000, donors had never achieved the benchmarks set for contributions to basic education, let alone to realise education for all.
- While ‘private companies should pay their fair share of taxes’ was a more popular response, several respondents suggested that private companies should make financial contributions, both to national budgets and to multilateral agencies, rather than ‘in-kind’ contributions.
- More and bigger pledges to the Global Partnership for Education.
- IFIs and development agencies to be more conscious of their role in enabling or promoting corrupt practices, including the toleration of repressive governments.
- Innovative financing is a distraction, and we should be wary of interpretations of ‘innovative’ as ‘new’: a sufficient increase to education financing can only come through tax justice.
- Donors (countries and private actors) should not repackage pledges from one forum to another: for example, a commitment made at the Syria Conference in January 2016 should not be repackaged and re-announced at the World Humanitarian Summit in May – such re-announcements should not be considered or counted as pledges.

Domestic financing: priorities and management

Distinct from taxation to increase the domestic resource base, several responses highlighted the potential for new and increased financing for education if measures to tackle existing problems were taken. These include tackling corruption, a reduction of military spending and re-allocation to education, and improving transparency, monitoring and accountability. In addition, respondents emphasised that governments should not outsource education to for-profit private actors – education should be the role of the state.

Question 6: What do you think are the biggest or most sustainable sources of funding for education?

This question was added by GCE in order to identify *sustainable* sources of new funding. While responses were broadly similar to those for Question 5, two clear patterns emerged: no respondent believed that donor funding was either the biggest or the most sustainable source of funding for education, and no respondent identified the private sector as offering a solution to sustainable funding.

Almost every respondent stated that domestic financing was the only serious sustainable source of funding for education. The only context in which ODA was identified as the most sustainable source was for countries affected by conflict.

Question 7: What do you think have been the challenges related to equity and inclusion in education? What can be done to overcome this obstacle and how can the Commission's recommendations address these issues?

Another question added by GCE, this sought specific responses on interventions that could be made to improve equity and inclusion – in line with the demands of GCE's Fund the Future campaign. Many responses indicated that the overall insufficiency of education budgets led to the neglect of minority groups, and several specific recommendations were made.

A particularly difficult issue to tackle was that of cultural and traditional beliefs and practices, which ingrain inequality in communities, particularly for women, girls, and disabled people. It was pointed out by some respondents that the costs of doing so are often lower than assumed: for example, the costs of making a new school building accessible to children with physical disabilities is thought to cost less than 1% of total construction costs (World Bank). The benefits of inclusive education policies for disadvantaged learners are much greater than narrow value for money assessments often allow for.

Targeted financing and abolition of fees

Students from remote regions and with a history of being marginalised tend to be discriminated against in terms of education financing—with fewer funds being allotted to their education. This discrimination is often reflected in poorer education and development outcomes of such students. All funding must redress, and not entrench existing inequalities.

To realise equitable education, these learners require additional support in order to develop to their full potential and overcome multiple layers of marginalisation, including intergenerational disadvantage. The lack of targeted investment to support disadvantaged groups and minorities was identified as the biggest obstacle to realising inclusive and equitable education. Equitable financing does not mean spending the same amount per learner: more must be spent by donors and developing country governments on the hardest learners to reach. Alongside this there was strong support for the abolition of school fees, and dismay at the emergence of low-fee private schools, which are perceived to be undoing the strides made in the past fifteen years to realise equitable, free access to school.

Funding for foundational change

Ensuring equity and overcoming inequality and disadvantage should be inherent objectives of inclusive educational systems. Educational policies must be put in place to that effect (including accompanying dimensions of planning, monitoring and data gathering) and these policies need to be backed by adequate and sustained funding. Spending must also take the form of support for teachers and changes to pedagogy and curricula. Many respondents noted that there is low overall capacity within existing education systems to support fully inclusive education, and that teacher training and continuing professional development (CPD) must give teachers the support and knowledge needed to work with learners with different needs. Similarly, traditional curricula and models of learning are not appropriate for every learner – not least of all due to teaching in languages other than the mother tongue.

Clear strategies are needed to address the multiplicity of barriers that prevent students from marginalised backgrounds from reaching their full potential. This includes funding interventions like after-school support, school meals, language intervention programmes that are needed to level the playing field. A strong investment in early childhood education programmes has been proven to have long-lasting impact in terms of enhancing student learning. At the same time, educational systems must also value diversity and that curricula, assessment processes and classrooms are responsive to the needs of learners from diverse linguistic, cultural and economic backgrounds. Children with disabilities likewise require necessary adaptation of the learning environments and specialised support for learners more complex disabilities. Two respondents raised the issue that for some disadvantaged

groups, the political infrastructure is not conducive to coherent, well-funded strategies to address marginalisation. For example, responsibility for disabled learners may be split between different government departments or local agencies, such as health and education; when funding is already limited, the lack of collaborative working may serve to further embed disadvantage.

The Commission's estimate of the financing needed for SDG 4 must allow for these costs, and it must use its influence to ensure appropriate consideration and investment are made at the national level.

This responsibility to ensure equity and inclusion lies with all education providers. A few respondents, however, felt that there was a specific need to ensure effective regulation in support of equity and inclusion in private schools to ensure that these do not discriminate on prohibited grounds.

Including community, and especially minority, groups in decision-making

It was noted that some governments fail to recognise minority groups as equal bearers of rights. More effort needs to be placed on engaging minority groups – and for children, this can also mean engaging their parents – and giving them a voice in decision-making fora. Formal processes for community participation in education need to be strengthened, with adequate investment made to ensure representative citizen participation in the education system at all levels – from the establishment of School Management Committees to the participation of civil society in Local Education Groups (LEGs) or other nationally defined governance structures.

Final Recommendations to the Commission

The vision of inclusive and equitable quality education and lifelong learning is shared by States and civil society alike, and it is an ambition which existed well before the adoption of the SDGs in September 2015. However, despite repeated pledges and commitments, neither donor nor domestic funding has ever been delivered at the level required to realise it. This is the single biggest lesson we should learn from the past fifteen years of the MDGs and the Education For All Goals.

The level of sustained funding that is required should not be underestimated; the reality is that no 'new' solution is going to present itself in the form of 'innovative' financing, or corporate social responsibility (and even this would mean financial rather than in-kind contributions) that will come close to the amount needed to make adequate investments to realise quality, inclusive education for all. Similarly, recommended spending levels in the Framework for Action, and estimates provided by the Global Education Monitoring Report, while useful minimum targets, should not be the limit of our ambition.

Based on the inputs of 60 national, regional and international civil society representative organisations, GCE makes the following recommendations to the Commission for inclusion in its final report:

- Domestic budgets are the long-term, sustainable route to financing quality education. The Commission must reiterate the existing benchmark that all member states invest a minimum of 6% of their GDP and 20% of their budget to education.
- For domestic budgets to be adequate to the task, taxation is fundamental, and the Commission should be a champion for tax justice by making strong recommendations on this, including supporting progressive and expanded domestic systems of taxation, closing loopholes which enable tax avoidance and evasion by the private sector and reviewing tax and royalty agreements in the natural resource sector. Consideration should also be given to ring-fencing funding from taxation for education. The Commission should also lend its voice to the push for putting a global taxation mechanism back on the agenda of the UN.
- While the long-term financial future for all education systems must be domestic budgets, we are not yet there. Existing donors must deliver at least 0.7% of GNP as ODA by 2020 and commit to spending at least 15-20% of all ODA to education; emerging donors must be encouraged to engage in the education sector for the SDG period. The Commission must likewise encourage donors to focus aid on supporting the fulfilment of equity targets and focus on countries with the greatest needs and financing gaps. Furthermore, ODA must be directed to strengthening public education systems.

- The Commission must reinforce that ensuring universal quality education cannot be achieved without adequate funding to ensure adequate numbers of professionally trained teachers, adequate and inclusive infrastructure, robust curricula, and good teaching and learning materials. Investment is particularly needed in good quality, relevant, and up-to-date teacher training; reliable and adequate salaries; and ongoing professional development.
- The Commission must reiterate the historic commitment towards delivering 12 years of free education, which includes upper secondary education, champion targeted financing to overcome inequitable access to and quality of education for disadvantaged groups – including adult learners – and promote policy reforms that value diversity.
- The Commission should champion transparent and accountable policy-making, sector planning and budgeting and that civil society should always have a formal role in these processes. The Commission should start by ensuring representative civil society has a voice in its own structures.
- The Commission must support a strengthened Global Partnership for Education (GPE), with the mandate to fund and support the full Education 2030 agenda. This includes lending its voice and influence to supporting future efforts on replenishment.

GCE is committed to campaigning for adequate and reliable funding for the realisation of quality, inclusive education for all. We fully support the work of the Commission to push forward this agenda, and look forward to working with the Commission in future to realise this shared ambition.

**International Commission on Financing Global Education Opportunity
 Global Consultation: Global Campaign for Education (GCE) Response
 Annex: List of Participating Organisations**

Responses sent following a consultation are marked with an asterisk.

| Organisation | Sub-national/National/ Regional/International | Location |
|---|--|-----------------|
| ACTIONAID | International | International |
| ADD International | International | International |
| Agenda Ciudadana por la Educación (ACED) | National | Costa Rica |
| ANCEFA (Anglophone) | Regional | Africa |
| ANCEFA (Francophone) | Regional | Africa |
| Arab Campaign for Education for All | Regional | Middle-East |
| Armenian Constitutional Right-Protective Centre (ACRPC) | National | Armenia |
| Asia South Pacific Association for Basic and Adult Education (ASPBAE), Philippines Office | Regional | Asia-Pacific |
| Asia South Pacific Association for Basic and Adult Education (ASPBAE), Australia Office | Regional | Asia-Pacific |
| Brazilian Campaign for the Right to Education | National | Brazil |
| Campaign for Education Forum | National | Lesotho |
| Campaign for Popular Education (CAMPE), President | National | Bangladesh |
| Campaign for Popular Education (CAMPE), Secretariat | National | Bangladesh |
| CBO-EPT (Coalition nationale du Bénin) | National | Bénin |
| Christoffel Blindenmission (CBM) International, Germany Office | International | International |
| Christoffel Blindenmission (CBM) International, Nigeria Office | International | International |
| Civil Society Action Coalition on Education for All (CSACEFA)* | National | Nigeria |

| | | |
|--|---------------|------------------------------|
| Civil Society Education Coalition | National | Malawi |
| Civil Society Network for Education Reforms (E-Net Philippines) | National | Philippines |
| Coalicion Colombiana por el Derecho a la Educacion | National | Colombia |
| Coalition ASO-EPT Niger | National | Niger |
| Coalition Camerounaise des Jeunes pour le Developpement (CCJD) | Sub-national | Cameroon |
| Coalition Education* | National | France |
| Coalition Nationale Education pour Tous | National | Sénégal |
| Coalition Nationale Malagasy pour l'EPT – CONAMEPT | National | Madagascar |
| Coalition Nationale pour l'Education Pour Tous du Burkina Faso | National | Burkina Faso |
| Coalition Nationale Togolaise pour l'Education pour Tous (CNT/EPT) | National | Togo |
| Colectivo de Educación para todas y todos de Guatemala | National | Guatemala |
| EFA Campaign Network The Gambia | National | The Gambia |
| FADE | National | Djibouti |
| Foro Dakar-Honduras | National | Honduras |
| Foro de Educación y Desarrollo Humano de la Iniciativa por Nicaragua | Nacional | Nicaragua |
| FOYERDENFANT+FEMME | Sub-national | Democratic Republic of Congo |
| GCE Network Norway* | National | United Kingdom |
| GCE UK* | National | United Kingdom |
| GCE US* | National | United States |
| Global Campaign for Education | International | International |
| Global March Against Child Labour | International | International |
| Handicap International | International | International |
| IDAY Bénin | National | Benin |
| IDAY Burkina Faso | National | Burkina Faso |

| | | |
|--|---------------|------------------------------|
| IDAY Burundi | National | BURUNDI |
| IDAY Cameroun | National | Cameroon |
| IDAY International | International | International |
| IDAY Nigeria | International | Nigeria |
| Incidencia Civil en la Educación | National | México |
| Innovative Forum for Community Development | National | Nepal |
| Le RONIER | Sub-national | TOGO |
| MEPT (Movimento de Educacao para Todos) | National | Mozambique |
| NGO Education Partnership | National | Cambodia |
| Pakistan Coalition for Education | National | Pakistan |
| Papua New Guinea Education Advocacy Network (PEAN) | National | Papua New Guinea |
| Reseau Mauritanien Education pour Tous | National | Mauritania |
| Rwanda Education for All Coalition (REFAC) | National | Rwanda |
| Save the Children | International | International |
| Society for Promotion of Education and Development- SPED | National | Nigeria |
| SUFD Secours d'Urgence des Femmes au Développement | National | Democratic Republic of Congo |
| Vietnam Association for Education for All | National | Vietnam |
| Women and Children Protection (WCP) | National | Democratic Republic of Congo |
| Yemen Network for EFA | National | Yemen |