



Education

Cannot Wait

Proposing a fund for education
in emergencies

May 2016



Overseas Development Institute

203 Blackfriars Road
London SE1 8NJ

Tel. +44 (0) 20 7922 0300

Fax. +44 (0) 20 7922 0399

E-mail: info@odi.org.uk

www.odi.org

[www.odi.org/facebook](https://www.facebook.com/odi.org)

[www.odi.org/twitter](https://twitter.com/odi.org)

Readers are encouraged to reproduce material from ODI Reports for their own publications, as long as they are not being sold commercially. As copyright holder, ODI requests due acknowledgement and a copy of the publication. For online use, we ask readers to link to the original resource on the ODI website. The views presented in this paper are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the views of ODI.

Suggested citation for this paper is Nicolai, S., et. al. 2016. Education Cannot Wait: proposing a fund for education in emergencies. London: ODI.

© Overseas Development Institute 2016. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial Licence (CC BY-NC 4.0).

Cover photo: Artwork on the wall outside a girls' school at a refugee camp in Jordan reads 'welcome.' Credit: Omar Chatriwala

Contents

Acronyms and abbreviations	5
Acknowledgments	6
Foreword	7
1. The case for a new approach	10
1.1 Need and opportunity	11
1.2. Theory of change	12
2. Proposed operational model	18
2.1 Governance	18
2.2 Acceleration Facility	19
2.3 Breakthrough Fund	21
3. Mobilising finance	23
4. Headline results	26
5. Consultation and country application	29
5.1 INEE consultation	29
5.2 Country case studies	30
6. Roadmap ahead	33
References	35

Figures

Case for an education crisis platform infographic	9
Figure 1: Theory of change for the education crisis platform	15
Figure 2: Operational model for the education crisis platform	20
Figure 3: Milestones for platform creation and scale-up	33

Tables

Table 1: Summary of systemic education response gaps	13
Table 2: Aims of the education crisis platform	14
Table 3: Outputs of the education crisis platform	17
Table 4: Outcomes of the education crisis platform	17
Table 5: Acceleration Facility potential support for activities	19
Table 6: Breakthrough fund potential support for activities	22
Table 7: Projected growth in funding to meet ambition	23
Table 8: Potential sources of new and additional funding	25
Table 9: Indicative headline results of the platform	27
Table 10: INEE consultation issues	30
Table 11: Possible focus areas for the education crisis platform in Lebanon	31
Table 12: Possible focus areas for the education crisis platform in South Sudan	32

Box

Box 1: Eligibility for support	22
---------------------------------------	-----------

Acronyms and abbreviations

CEO	Chief Executive Officer
CSR	Corporate Social Responsibility
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DFID	Department for International Development
EC	European Commission
EMIS	Education Management Information System
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GPE	Global Partnership for Education
HRP	Humanitarian Response Plan
IBRD	International Bank for Reconstruction and Development
IDP	Internally Displaced Person
INEE	Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies
INGO	International Non-Governmental Organisation
LEG	Local Education Group
MEHE	Ministry of Education and Higher Education
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
OCHA	Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
ODA	Official Development Assistance
ODI	Overseas Development Institute
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
PCRAFI	Pacific Catastrophe Risk Assessment and Finance Initiative
PHEIC	Public Health Emergency of International Concern
RACE	Reaching All Children with Education
SCCF	Special Climate Change Fund
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
SOP	Standard Operating Procedure
UK	United Kingdom
UN	United Nations
UNESCO	UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNGA	UN General Assembly
UNHCR	UN High Commissioner for Refugees
UNICEF	UN Children's Fund
UNRWA	UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestinian Refugees in the Near East
US	United States
USAID	US Agency for International Development
WFP	World Food Programme
WHO	World Health Organization

Acknowledgments

This proposal was prepared by an ODI-led project team with contributions made by a number of other stakeholders. The project team was led by Susan Nicolai, and included the following ODI staff: Romilly Greenhill, Sébastien Hine, Maria Ana Jalles D'Orey, Arran Magee, Andrew Rogerson, Joseph Wales and Leni Wild. Other team members included Jane Barry, George Durham, Laura Mapp and Mike Osberg, all of Linksbridge PLC; Chris Talbot and Steve Zyck as independent consultants; and Tyler Arnot from the Education Cluster Rapid Response Team. The work benefited from advice and review by

Christina Bennett, Marta Foresti, Pauline Rose and Kevin Watkins. Administrative support was provided by George Richards and Erin Shephard.

The work was commissioned by the UN Children's Fund (UNICEF) on behalf of a broad group, including the UN Special Envoy for Education, the Global Partnership for Education (GPE), governments, key donors and other stakeholders.¹ It has been financed by the UK's Department for International Development (DFID), the Government of Norway and the US Agency for International Development (USAID).

¹ The full Technical Strategy Group advising on this work consists of 19 governments, organisations and networks, with the Governments of Canada and the UK serving as co-chairs, Save the Children serving as secretariat and the following members: the Governments of Lebanon, Norway, South Sudan and the US, the Office of the UN Special Envoy for Education, the UN Children's Fund (UNICEF), the UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), Dubai Cares, the European Commission (EC), the Global Business Coalition for Education, the Global Compact on Learning Donor Network, the Global Partnership for Education (GPE), the Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE) and the World Bank.

Foreword

Last year governments around the world made an important promise to the world's children and young people. In adopting the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), they pledged to ensure that all of the world's girls and boys would complete free, equitable and quality primary and secondary education by 2030. However, without increased action and funding to reach and teach those affected by crises, the world will fall far short of that goal.

This paper outlines the potential operation of *Education Cannot Wait*, a fund designed to transform the global education sector for children affected by crises. It is about taking decisive action on behalf of children and young people in emergencies and protracted crises. It addresses one of the greatest development challenges of our day – that of restoring the hope and futures of new generations whose lives have been shattered by crises.

Why do we need a new mechanism to address an old problem? The facts tell their own story. 75 million children aged 3-18 years living in 35 crisis-affected countries are in the most desperate need of educational support. Within these same countries, there are 17 million school-age refugees, internally displaced, and other populations of concern. Some live in refugee camps while others are in host communities. A number are out of school, and girls are particularly disadvantaged. Many of these crises, such as the conflict in the east of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, are longstanding, keeping a generation or more of children out of school for the entirety of their education cycle. Elsewhere, six years into the Syrian conflict, more than 2 million still in the country are out of school, as are over half of the 1.4 million children and young people who have fled to neighbouring countries. Meanwhile, the war in Yemen is reversing that country's gains in education. And in Burundi, the Central African Republic and South Sudan armed conflict has forced millions of children and young people out of school with little prospect of return.

Conflict is not the only challenge. Nepal is struggling to rebuild an education infrastructure decimated by the 2014 earthquake; the Ebola crisis stalled economic progress for a number of West African economies; and 2.5 million are at risk of food insecurity in Central America due to El Niño related droughts. When poor countries and vulnerable people are hit by floods, droughts and storms, reversals in

education invariably follow. Infrastructure can be rebuilt, but a child denied the chance to attend school cannot recover the opportunities destroyed by a lost education.

Extraordinary efforts are already being made to respond to the education needs of children and young people affected by crises. Countries like Lebanon, Jordan and Turkey have opened their school systems to Syrian refugees. Donors and aid agencies like UNICEF and UNHCR are delivering education to millions of children and youth. Many non-governmental organisations are working, often under dangerous and arduous conditions, to maintain education in conflict zones. Education Clusters are coordinating efforts to respond in emergencies where declared by the UN Humanitarian Coordinator. The Global Partnership for Education (GPE) now provides significant financing for education in fragile and conflict affected countries. Yet the headline numbers speak for themselves. The current aid architecture is under-resourced and thus unable to support countries in fulfilling the right to education for millions of crisis-affected children.

Fixing the system will require more than piecemeal reform. The problems to be addressed are systemic. Consider first the issue of funding. Parents and children affected by emergencies and protracted crises consistently highlight the importance of education. Yet education accounts for a small fraction of humanitarian aid: in 2013 only 2% of funds from humanitarian appeals were directed to education. Moreover, while the displacement associated with armed conflict is long-term, most funding is provided through short-term humanitarian appeals. To put it bluntly, you cannot build an education system equipped to cope with a protracted crisis on the foundations of short-term – and unpredictable – appeals.

Other aspects of the aid architecture are poorly aligned with real world imperatives. The Syria crisis has highlighted the fault lines. The neighbouring states to which refugees have fled in such vast numbers are middle-income countries. For that reason they are not eligible for some of the more concessional overseas development assistance (ODA) lines, including the World Bank's International Development Assistance loans. Efforts have been made to raise the resources needed, including the recent Syria Donor's Conference – but progress on this has

been slow and in the meantime too many children have lost out on their education.

Beyond the humanitarian imperatives there are compelling reasons to act. Allowing the education of millions of children and youth to be cut short by conflict and other emergencies is not just ethically indefensible, it is economically ruinous. Equipped with the skills and knowledge that come with a quality education, crisis-affected children and young people are better able to seize economic opportunities and secure a decent livelihood when they grow up. They will become the doctors, teachers, architects and engineers that their countries need to build for the future. Investing in their education now offers the prospect of high social and economic returns. Unfortunately, the failure to invest will have the opposite effect. We know that many of Syria's refugee children and youth have been forced out of education and into destitution, child labour and early marriage. It is difficult to think of a starker form of injustice – or of an outcome further removed from the SDG promise.

There are wider reasons to invest now in an initiative that offers the hope of education. For many of the refugees and others now embarking on the hazardous journey to Europe, securing an education for their children is a top priority. Recent research consistently underscores this point. While investment in education for refugees and the displaced will not solve Europe's migration crisis, there is no viable solution that does not include support for education.

The *Education Cannot Wait* proposal is framed to deliver early, cost-effective results while building for the future. Rather than create a new institution and more fragmentation, it harnesses and weaves together the expertise, energy and capabilities of a range of actors. The two financing mechanisms – an Acceleration Facility and a Breakthrough Fund – provide clear added value. They will enable agencies to do more of what they currently do well, while mobilising and disbursing new funds and leveraging additional support. The flexibility built into the proposal will enable financing to be calibrated against the needs and circumstances of individual countries.

The financing proposed is relatively modest. By scaling up towards a funding target of at least US\$1.5 billion by 2020, as part of a 5-year funding target of \$3.85 billion,

the Platform could restore education opportunities to some 13.6 million children and young people – more than 18% of those in need – over the next 5 years, rising to reach 75 million affected by crises by 2030.

Built on extensive consultation and dialogue between agencies, the education crisis platform offers a way ahead. For new donors, philanthropists and private sector actors, the Platform provides a mechanism equipped to deliver demonstrated results through a governance structure that combines low transaction costs with effective fiduciary management. For existing donors to the sector, a facility that pools resources and expertise offers potential efficiency gains and an opportunity to reach more children and youth.

The education crisis platform has the potential to mobilise additional finance, galvanize new actors and make a difference to the lives of millions of children and young people. The World Humanitarian Summit provides an unprecedented opportunity to secure global agreement and new commitments. But real progress will depend on sustained political leadership and engagement. To address these issues we must work in partnership with crisis-affected countries and strengthen their capacity to ensure access to quality education for all girls, boys, and young people in emergencies and protracted crises.

Faced with a challenge on the scale addressed in this proposal and accompanying evidence paper, it is all too easy to forget the human face behind what is at stake. Statistics cannot capture the trauma and suffering experienced by children and youth caught up in conflicts or affected by humanitarian emergencies. Nor can they capture the power of the hope that comes with education. This proposal is about restoring hope. And it is about demonstrating that the governments who signed the 2030 pledge intend to keep their promise.



Kevin Watkins
Executive Director, ODI



Case for an education crisis platform

The need



The proposal

Hundreds of international, national and civil society actors have called for and fed into the design of a global platform to strengthen collective response and education in crises.

What will it do?

- Inspire political commitment
- Joint planning and response
- Generate and disburse new funding
- Strengthen capacity
- Improve accountability



How will it operate?

1. Acceleration Facility: Invests in existing actors to speed up education response
2. Breakthrough Fund: Country level engagement, including rapid response, multi-year support and dedicated pop-up funds

The next steps

Education Cannot Wait is launched at the World Humanitarian Summit in May 2016

Establish platform governance, a secretariat and initial support in select countries

Raise funds, for a total of \$3.85 billion by 2020

Year	Funding
YEAR 1	\$153 m
YEAR 5	\$1.5 bn

The Impact

More than 18% of crisis-affected children and young people have improved education opportunities, with all those affected reached by 2030 in line with SDG4 on education.



1. The case for a new approach

As we enter a new development era, ushered in by the introduction of the SDGs the world faces great opportunities and challenges. Recent decades have witnessed huge progress in human development, with strides made towards ending extreme poverty, a radical reduction in child and maternal mortality and increases in school enrolment in both development and humanitarian contexts. The gains in education have been impressive: the number of children and adolescents out of school has fallen by almost half since 2000, and an estimated 34 million more children and young people have attended school as a result of progress over the past 15 years (UNESCO, 2015).

However, too many of the world's children and young people – particularly those affected by emergencies and protracted crises – are being left behind, denied their rights and excluded from the benefits of development. 75 million children aged 3-18 years living in 35 crisis-affected countries are in the most desperate need of educational support.³ Within these same countries, there are over 17 million refugee, internally displaced and other populations of concern aged 3-18.⁴ Refugees are five times less likely to attend school than other children, with only 50% of refugee children enrolled in primary school and less than 25% of refugee youth enrolled in secondary.⁵ Girls are particularly disadvantaged, being 2.5 times more likely to be out of school than boys in countries affected by conflict.

Education quality and continuity of many of these children and young people have been severely impacted, often for multiple years. The chance to learn in these settings can be the difference between a future of exploitation and one of rebuilding. With each successive year of education lost, the human, social and economic costs rise exponentially – permanently leaving children,

families and communities in a desperate fight for survival. This struggle puts children and adolescents at risk of recruitment as child soldiers or labourers, early and forced marriages and other forms of sexual exploitation and trafficking.

In the face of chronic patterns of disruption and exclusion, ensuring education for these children and young people affected by emergencies and protracted crises requires a shift in global approaches and ambition, involving flexible, hybrid humanitarian and development approaches that can support service delivery in the midst of acute crises, fragile and recovery contexts.

This approach echoes broader calls encapsulated in SDG4 and coalescing around the World Humanitarian Summit in May 2016. The UN Secretary General's report *One Humanity: Shared Responsibility*, prepared for the Summit, calls for the international community to unite together to resolve differences, accept individual and collective responsibilities and confront the challenges of our time. The High Level Panel on Humanitarian Financing, in a major input to the Summit, highlights the need for shared responsibility to address root causes, a deeper and broader resource base for human action and improvements in the timeliness and efficiency of delivery.

This proposal for *Education Cannot Wait*, a new education crisis platform, shows how a new approach could transform the global education sectors, joining up governments, humanitarian actors and development efforts to deliver a more collaborative, agile and rapid response to fulfil the right to education of children and young people affected by crises.

3 The age range of 3-18 is used to delineate the target group for the Platform throughout this proposal. This has not been formally adopted as policy for the Platform, and there are stakeholders who would like to see beneficiaries across the life cycle, including 0-3 and over 18. Ages 3-18 were used here due to this being typical school age groups for pre-primary, primary and secondary schools, as well as target groups for related non-formal education efforts. With 462 million school-age children (3-18 years) living in 35 crisis-affected countries, this 75 million figure is an update from earlier calculations of 65 million children aged 3-15 whose education has been affected, and now includes those who are 16-18 years of age and UNDP 2015 data. This analysis was originally prepared for the Oslo Summit, and is drawn from UNICEF figures included in their Humanitarian Action for Children appeal, plus Nepal, for 2015 (Nicolai, et al., 2015).

4 Calculations of a total of 17.3 million refugee and internally displaced children and young people aged 3-18 were drawn from the UNHCR Mid-Year Trends 2015 (<http://www.unhcr.org/56701b969.html>) and the UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestinian Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) in Figures as of January 2015 (http://www.unrwa.org/sites/default/files/unrwa_in_figures_2015.pdf). UN population data from 2015 were used to estimate age groups for each country.

5 Data is based on unpublished analysis conducted by the UNHCR Education section of UNHCR education enrolment rates from 2014 compared to UIS figures: <http://allinschool.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/OutofSchoolChild-English-lg.png> as well as being drawn from OECD (2015).

It is the result of a rapid and intense process of research, consultation and design work involving hundreds of contributors.⁶

The proposed education crisis platform has been designed to respond to the extensive unmet education needs of children and young people affected by crises. This section goes over some of the problems inherent in education crisis responses as well as potential strategies to address them through a joint global initiative. It is presented as a theory of change, which pays attention to the set of needs at the national and global levels and specifically considers ways to increase political attention, unite and strengthen humanitarian–development efforts, provide new additional financing, build greater capacity for the sector and produce more relevant data and analysis to strengthen accountability.

1.1 Need and opportunity

What is the problem?

Some of the most egregious violations of the right to education around the world occur in contexts of conflict, natural disaster and other crises, such as health epidemics. Crises pose a serious threat to prospects of achieving the new SDG4 on education, which calls to *ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all*.

Emergencies and protracted crises currently disrupt and destroy education opportunities and quality for more than 75 million children and young people aged 3-18 around the world, violating their rights, increasing risk of marginalisation and raising psychosocial and protection concerns. Children and youth are among the hardest to reach, and frequently live in or are displaced to contexts where governments cannot – or will not – provide them with education services. To date, national and international responses have not been enough to adequately address education needs for crisis-affected children and young people. One can, however, imagine another way.

Why address this now?

- **The political momentum is right.** Following the failure to reach Millennium Development Goal and Education for All goals on education, the world must do better in

the SDG era. There is a new window of opportunity, with increased high-level political commitments to ensure access to quality education for all children and young people, leaving no one behind.

- **Bridging humanitarian and development action is urgent.** Interest in radically new approaches that join up humanitarian and development efforts is building in the lead-up to the World Humanitarian Summit. Governments, donors and civil society are increasingly united in their demand for new approaches, with a coalition of humanitarian and development actors coming together to build a collective case for action on education in emergencies and protracted crises.⁶
- **Financing conversations are opening up.** There is growing interest from new and established donors alike to explore joint and innovative mechanisms to finance education in crisis. A bold proposal on how to raise and channel new finance to the sector will be welcomed. There is space to include this call as part of the upcoming work of the *International Commission on Financing Global Education Opportunity*, which will set out priority actions on global education finance for the coming years.
- **Evidence shows education improves life chances and is highly prioritised by crisis-affected communities.** Education in emergencies and protracted crises is not just a donor-driven ideal: communities prioritise education, even in the world's worst crises. There is growing evidence that education in these situations can save lives and futures and that education equity could be a factor in reducing violence.⁸

Who is active in this space?

National governments are responsible for fulfilling the right to education within their borders. However, the extent to which national governments have sufficient capacity, resources, interest and influence varies widely across contexts. Domestic political will and resource mobilisation are key, but in many emergencies and protracted crises there is a need for international action to support the education response.

At country level, a diversity of national and international groups organise and support the education response when there is need. Coordination mechanisms vary, depending on the crisis:

6 Further details on the Platform's structure and approach will continue to be developed up to and beyond its planned launch at the World Humanitarian Summit, with an on-going commitment to review and revise as needed. This proposal builds on an accompanying evidence paper and an earlier background paper prepared for the Oslo Summit on Education for Development in July 2015.

7 This informal coalition is of particular importance. An increasingly mature sector on education in emergencies has the technical expertise, standards and tools to support response in crises. Those working on education in development have deep knowledge and experience in stable developing countries, and are increasingly active in fragile states. There is now a strong desire and readiness among those working within these two fields to work together in the world's toughest crises.

8 Evidence has recently been synthesised in the following: Burde, et al.,(2015); Nicolai and Hine (2015); Novelli et al. (2014); and Gladwell & Tanner (2014).

- **Government-led coordination groups**, typically led by the Ministry of Education, exist in many countries prior to a crisis with a broader mandate for coordinating aid and support to the sector. In addition to these groups, domestic leadership is often included and consulted for the below.
- **Education clusters** are active in emergencies declared by the relevant Humanitarian Coordinator, and coordinate the response by actors in-country. The UN Children's Fund (UNICEF) and Save the Children are global co-leads and often, but not always, take on this role at country level.
- **Refugee education coordination mechanisms** coordinate refugee operations under the mandate of UNHCR, given the particular international protection requirements for refugees.
- **Education in emergencies working groups** are active in both emergencies and protracted crises where neither the relevant Education Cluster or refugee education coordination mechanisms have a mandate to operate. These might be led by the government or by another agency that volunteers to coordinate.
- **Local education groups (LEGs)** coordinate education in development situations and can also address protracted crises needs. They are typically led by the government and supported by the UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), donors, or other organisations in areas such as (crisis-sensitive) education sector analysis and planning and capacity development.

Globally, organisations and groups supporting the above coordination efforts include the Global Education Cluster (led by UNICEF and Save the Children), UNHCR, the Inter-Agency Network on Education in Emergencies (INEE), GPE and UNESCO. Bilateral donors also coordinate together and through pooled funding arrangements in fragile and conflict-affected states. Each of these has particular mandates that span the range of humanitarian and development efforts. A number of other agencies are active in this global space, contributing to advocacy, policy and provision of education in crisis.

With such a myriad of actors largely working independently, significant gaps can appear across and between existing coordination mechanisms. The Platform

and its resources will help bring together and support these groups to deliver a more ambitious, joined-up response in line with national policy and plans in emergency contexts and beyond.

What are the obstacles?

A number of factors contribute to the interruption of education services during crises. Our analysis shows five key obstacles, at both national and global levels, that impede children and young people's education opportunities in crisis contexts. The obstacles identified here are largely at a system level and would necessitate collective effort to overcome.

1.2 Theory of change

In moving toward action, a theory of change has been constructed which further delineates the problem, outlines strategies to address it, introduces the concept behind the education crisis platform and illustrates the kinds of results it might achieve.

What can be done?

Over the past year, actors have begun to build consensus towards a new, collective way forward to support education in crisis response. The 2015 *Oslo Summit on Education for Development*, informed by Overseas Development Institute (ODI) research on this topic, identified and called for the creation of a joint global effort to mobilise collective action and significant funding for education in emergencies and protracted crises.⁹ Now, through review of evidence, consultation and joint discussion, a design for the creation of an education crisis platform that could begin to address the above obstacles is in place.

The proposal for an education crisis platform has emerged through the input of key actors and wide-ranging consultation. Proposed aims are laid out below in Table 2.

What will guide this effort?

The education crisis platform will be consistent with SDG4 and the Oslo Consolidated Principles for Education in Emergencies and Protracted Crises, which reaffirm the right to education and are based on a detailed analysis of a range of existing commitments and standards.¹⁰

9 Further information on the Oslo Summit can be found at <http://www.osloeducationssummit.no/>. Research prepared for the summit on this topic is consolidated in Nicolai et al. (2015).

10 Built on humanitarian principles of humanity, neutrality, impartiality and independence as laid out in UN General Assembly (UNGA) Resolution 46/182 (1991) and subsequent resolutions, the consolidated principles are further based on UNGA Resolution 64/290 on the Right to Education in Emergency Situations (2010); UN Security Council Resolution 1998 on Monitoring and Reporting Attacks on Schools and Hospitals (2011); the Core Humanitarian Standard on Quality and Accountability (2015); the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (2015); the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC) Principles for Good International Engagement in Fragile States (2007) and New Deal for Fragile States (2011); the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (2005) and the Accra Agenda for Action (2008); and the Principles and Good Practice of Humanitarian Donorship (2003). They draw particularly on INEE's Minimum Standards for Education: Preparedness, Response, Recovery (2010), which are officially recognised as the education companion guide to the Sphere Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards in Humanitarian Response (2011), as well as on the INEE Guiding Principles on Conflict Sensitivity (2013).

Table 1: Summary of systemic education response gaps

Obstacle	National response gaps	Global response gaps
Low priority and uneven attention to education across crises	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of focus on education in crisis leading to weak response and insufficient investment • Lack of sufficiently rigorous, detailed and funded contingency strategies, needs assessments and implementation plans that would guide actors and their donors at crisis onset • Certain groups, such as refugees or displaced, forgotten or excluded from education support in development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor prioritisation of education in the humanitarian system, with Humanitarian Coordinators and other leadership not well versed on emergency education needs • Uneven political engagement, with uneven donor support, resulting in what are known as ‘forgotten crises’
Interrupted education owing to the impact of crises and poor links across different actors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of involvement of national/local authorities in early planning, resulting in lack of ownership in response • Inadequate national capacity to consolidate plans across emergencies and longer-term crises, as well as to coordinate actors • Poor in-country coordination between clusters and development coordination • In refugee contexts, owing to structural barriers, refugee affairs ministries responsible for education may not collaborate with ministries of education • Unclear lines of responsibility for preparedness and disaster risk reduction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Breakdown between humanitarian and development actors in coordination, planning and financing modalities • Disjointed approaches and priorities for needs assessments and planning processes • Standard emergency appeals and responses not geared to likelihood of long-term stabilisation needs, resulting in lack of sustainable planning for and support to eventually protracted crises • Insufficient financing mechanisms that support both emergency response and systems building in single plan
Insufficient funding to cover all education needs across all crises	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overstretched domestic finance for education, exacerbated by inefficiencies and poor public financial management • Many countries do not build crisis response into their education sector strategic plans, and therefore lack links to budget planning processes and miss out on support by development donors to align to these national sector plans • Host governments frequently without financial or capacity resources to support education for refugees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Underfunded humanitarian appeals for education; less than 2% of humanitarian budget allocated to education • Unpredictable short-term funding disconnected from longer-term support • Reliance on traditional humanitarian donors, with difficulties in bringing in development donors to immediate crisis response • Lack of innovative finance mechanisms and dialogue with new and non-traditional potential donors
Inadequate capacity to lead and deliver education and recovery efforts, both nationally and internationally	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Few teachers, senior staff and administrators skilled in emergency response or coping with long-term crises • Insufficient finance capacity to engage sufficient additional staff • Poor early engagement of national/local authorities in education response, leading to disempowerment • Failed or destroyed supply and infrastructure systems • Education in emergencies and social cohesion not part of standardised teacher qualification training in crisis regions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pattern of short-term, and lack of predictability in, funding deployments • Lack of seniority and skills in deployable workforce • Stop-gap international support does not have time required to build capacity for national actors during crises, and frequently works in parallel for sake of efficiency • Limited number of agencies able to operate at scale • Agency mandates can exacerbate difficulties to finance multiyear education approaches in emergencies
Lack of real-time and up-to-date data and analysis to inform decisions on education response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authorities side-lined in design of assessment tools • Ineffective and at times parallel information systems, leaving gaps in data collection and analysis • Poor real-time, and regularity of, data collection, leaving in-country actors unclear on scale of crisis • Insufficient analysis of existing data and assessments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessments tools tend to be narrow, focusing on access and primary, rather than full range of, needs • Limited analysis, and ineffective use of data, makes it difficult to communicate priorities and needs • Dearth of research in this area and lack of application of lessons from existing research

Based on input from the INEE consultations, particular attention will be given to the following:

- national responsibility and mutual accountability to fulfil the right to education
- a focus on education quality, equity, inclusivity and relevance
- importance of creating protective, prepared and resilient education programmes and systems to ensure continued learning in the face of a crisis and bridge the humanitarian/development divide
- alignment with country plans with the aim of strengthening national education systems

Which crises will be eligible for assistance¹¹

- humanitarian crises, including slow- and rapid-onset natural disasters and conflicts, that trigger formal humanitarian system responses
- protracted crises that pose significant risks to children’s and young people’s access to education, whether or not a formal humanitarian response in the education sector has been activated or deactivated
- among the above, crises with large-scale refugee, internally displaced and affected host populations will receive particular consideration
- crises that occur in low income countries, as well as those in middle income countries that have limited recourse for financing an appropriate response

Who will be targeted in these crises?

The Platform will support access to continuous, equitable and inclusive quality education services for children and youth affected by emergencies and protracted crises, especially the most marginalised. There will be a specific push to reach the most vulnerable crisis-affected children and youth at early childhood, pre-primary, primary and secondary school levels, with additional efforts made to support non-formal education where relevant. While this

Table 2: Aims of the education crisis platform

Vision	A world where all children and youth affected by crises can learn free of cost, in safety and without fear in order to grow and reach their full potential.
Mission	To fulfil the right to free, inclusive and equitable quality education for children and youth affected by emergencies and protracted crises, especially the most marginalised, to ensure access to learning opportunities and improving the quality of education available.
Purpose	The purpose of a new education crisis platform is to generate greater shared political, operational and financial commitment to meet the educational needs of millions of children and young people affected by crises, with a focus on more agile, connected and faster response that spans the humanitarian–development continuum in order to build sustainable education systems.

proposal focuses on reaching children and young people aged 3-18, the possibility of supporting post-secondary education in particular countries should not be excluded.

The Platform will focus on children facing multiple discriminations – that is, those who are crisis-affected and denied access to education because they are refugees or displaced, because of their caste, class, ethnicity, age, gender, disability or other factors. Specific determinations regarding marginalised groups are best made at the country level.

What strategies will be used?

In parallel to the five prioritised obstacles, the Platform proposes five strategies to generate high-level attention to education in crises, unite humanitarian–development efforts, raise additional financing, strengthen capacities and generate better data for education response:

1. increase high-level attention with an aim towards greater equity of response, with an emphasis on the most vulnerable and reaching neglected crises

¹¹ While country-level allocation criteria will be refined during the education crisis platform’s start-up phase, the February 2016 Technical Strategy Group workshop identified broad agreement on some illustrative criteria for selecting focus countries. All countries currently facing acute emergencies and protracted crises will be eligible for initial review to determine whether the Platform’s support is needed, and what type of support package would be most effective. This includes natural disasters, conflict, disease outbreaks and complex emergencies (combinations of two or more crisis types). Emergency onset speed can be rapid or slow. All emergency contexts would also likely benefit from the Acceleration Facility, particularly in the early stage of the emergency. Country-specific support from the Breakthrough Fund will be prioritised based on levels of external funding (ODA and humanitarian funding per capita), proportion of affected children including host, internally displaced persons (IDPs) and refugees and an education risk severity ranking (the extent which the crisis has limited safe access to quality education). Future acute emergencies would be identified by some form of a trigger event, or alert, that would initiate a review to determine crisis eligibility. This could include, for example, a system-wide emergency level declaration, either through an IASC-level determination, a World Health Organization (WHO) declaration of a Public Health Emergency of International Concern (PHEIC), an operational agency-specific declaration (such as from UNHCR, the World Food Programme (WFP), UNICEF, Save the Children) or an alert raised through the Start Network. All funding allocations would be based on an assessment of current donor flows and domestic resources to determine the extent to which these could be redirected before the education crisis platform’s financial support could be accessed.

Figure 1: Theory of change for the education crisis platform

Problem statement

Emergencies and protracted crises currently disrupt and destroy education opportunities for more than 75 million children and young people around the world, violating their rights and increasing risk of marginalisation.

Platform purpose

Generate greater shared political, financial and operational commitment to meet the educational needs of millions of children and young people affected by crises.

Obstacles	Strategies		Platform structure and functions	Outputs	Outcomes	Impact
Low priority and uneven attention to education across crises	Increase high-level attention with an aim towards greater equity of response, with an emphasis on the most vulnerable		Inspire political commitment	Strengthened commitment by governments, donors and humanitarian and development actors increases proportion of affected children and youth receiving quality education	Quick, strategic, agile responses in place to support education needs in crises	<p>More than 18% of crisis-affected children and young people will have improved education opportunities appropriate for their age and ability by 2020, with all reached by 2030 in line with SDG4 on education.</p>
Not enough money to cover all education needs across crises, with particular gaps in 'forgotten emergencies'	Raise significant additional money and equitably channel across interventions that improve access, quality and protection		Joint planning and response	New acute crises result in joint multiyear, costed education plans, underpinned by improved coordination and national financing mechanisms with focus on long-term sustainability	Expanded access appropriate to affected populations, resulting in higher retention, transition and completion rates	
Interrupted education owing to impact of crises and poor links across actors	Unite humanitarian and development efforts in support of national response		Generate and disburse new funding	Substantial increase in generating and disbursing additional, predictable funds for education in crises	Improved learning outcomes achieved by affected groups	
Inadequate capacity to lead and deliver education and recovery efforts, both nationally and internationally	Strengthen individual and institutional capacity of those leading education efforts in crises and improve delivery systems		Strengthen capacity	National and global capacity to respond to and coordinate education crises is improved	Safe and conflict- and disaster-sensitive education available in crisis contexts	
Lack of data and analysis to inform decisions on education prioritisation, allocation and delivery	Develop and share knowledge with a focus on increasing awareness of need and evidence for high-quality interventions efforts in crises and improve delivery systems		Improve accountability	Real-time, quality data and analysis support education crisis advocacy, response planning, implementation and accountability as standard	Greater access and improved learning for the most marginalised	

2. raise significant additional money and channel across interventions that improve access, quality and protection
3. unite humanitarian and development efforts in support of national response
4. strengthen individual and institutional capacity of those leading education efforts in crises and improve delivery systems
5. develop and share knowledge with a focus on increasing awareness of need and evidence for effective interventions

What will the functions of the Platform be?

In line with the identified obstacles and strategies to improve education opportunities in the midst of and after crises, the education crisis platform will focus on the following five functions. These efforts will be delivered primarily through support to existing actors, including governments, international humanitarian and development agencies and national and local community-based organisations.

i. Inspire political commitment

Expand and extend political commitment among those willing and able to draw attention to and mobilise resources for education crises. Work at all political levels to support national governments on education response and to facilitate efficient ways of working across the humanitarian and development architecture. Advocate for and support actors involved in the development of national policy that specifically addresses issues related to education in crises affecting national and/or refugee populations. Develop tailored political mobilisation efforts for specific crises, which can work with agility, to connect the right stakeholders at the right point in time.

ii. Joint planning and response

Promote crisis-specific assessments and comprehensive sector-wide plans in order to link immediate and system-strengthening interventions, direct service delivery and government support, improving incentives and linking with existing actors. Rather than bringing in new systems, this would focus on improving the performance of existing coordination mechanisms and provide opportunities for greater benefits from and commitments to shared planning.

iii. Generate and disburse new funding

Mobilise and disburse additional funding and new investments, offering up-front and medium-term help to those responsible for providing, maintaining or reconstructing education, with an emphasis on sustainable initiatives to ensure the continuity of education. Establish a global finance facility, contributing to and leveraging additional resources for a linked set of country- or crisis-specific multi-donor funds, aiming to drive a step-change in the scale and quality of education response in crisis situations.

iv. Strengthen capacity

Invest in capacity-strengthening for response and recovery, working with partners to identify and fill capacity gaps in specific crises and supporting broader global efforts to increase capacity across the education sector. This may include support to strengthen national capacity; greater coherence across preparedness, assessment and planning, including emergency to development transition planning; and an increase in both response capacity and surge mechanisms to support national responses.

v. Improve accountability

Improve accountability and knowledge of ‘what works’ in these environments through investing in the collection and analysis of timely, disaggregated and accurate education-related data and information, working with partners to communicate needs, progress and investment opportunities. Strengthened data and accountability are vital to demonstrate results to all stakeholders. The Platform has the potential to become an accountability mechanism that does not just support and build capacity but also holds actors to account for what they spend and do against agreed approaches, including contextually relevant policy, standard operating procedures (SOPs) and minimum standards.

What will be the expected outputs?

The overall outputs of the platform are laid out in Table 3, with more detail provided in Section 5 below.

What outcomes will be measured?

The overall outcomes of the platform are laid out in Table 4, with more detail provided in Section 5 below.

What impact will be achieved?

More than 18% of crisis-affected children and young people will have improved education opportunities appropriate for their age and ability by 2020, with all reached by 2030 in line with SDG4 on education.

This will involve progressive efforts to scale up support over the first five years of the Platform to reach 13.6 million children and young people in the year 2020. Each year, the overall number of children and young people reached would increase, but this would not be measured cumulatively because of the likelihood of double counting. The number of crisis-affected children who have had their education opportunities most directly affected, currently estimated at 75 million, would be reached by 2030, both via direct support from the Platform and through engaged partners. Measurement methodology would need to include both direct and indirect support, and would be worked out in detail during the incubation phase of the initiative. See more on this in Section 5 below outlining indicative headline results.

Table 3: Outputs of the education crisis platform

Output 1: Political commitment	Strengthened commitment by governments, donors and humanitarian and development actors increases proportion of affected children and youth receiving quality education
Output 2: Planning and response	New acute crises result in joint multiyear, costed education plans, underpinned by improved coordination and national financing mechanisms with focus on long-term sustainability
Output 3: Financing	Substantial increase in generating and disbursing additional, predictable funds for education in crises
Output 4: Capacity	National and global capacity to respond to and coordinate education crises is improved
Output 5: Accountability	Real-time, quality data and analysis supports education crisis advocacy, response planning and implementation and accountability

Table 4: Outcomes of the education crisis platform

Outcome 1: Response time	Quick, strategic, agile responses in place to support education needs in crises
Outcome 2: Access	Expanded access appropriate to affected populations, resulting in higher retention, transition and completion rates
Outcome 3: Learning	Improved learning outcomes achieved by affected groups
Outcome 4: Protection	Safe and conflict- and disaster-sensitive education available in crisis contexts
Outcome 5: Equity	Greater access and improved learning for the most marginalised



Fatima, who left Syria in 2012, at school in Lebanon. Credit: UK Department for International Development

2. Proposed operational model

The creation of an education crisis platform will bring together key actors to form a powerful global alliance on behalf of children and young people whose education and learning are disrupted because of emergencies and protracted crises. The platform will adopt five overarching functions to address related obstacles, with activities supported through governance arrangements and a secretariat, providing incentives and mechanisms for (i) the development of global goods and other joint activities through an Acceleration Facility designed to support global and regional actors; and (ii) improved education delivery at a country level through a Breakthrough Fund, which will channel financial support to those active at a national level. A flexible and adaptable approach to both governance and operations will be essential, particularly during the incubation period, in order to ensure that lessons learned can inform Platform approaches moving forward.

2.1 Governance

Since the Oslo Summit in July 2015, a number of agencies, donors, affected governments, international non-governmental organisations (INGOs), private sector groups and political champions have pushed for a renewed approach to education in crises and provided technical input into the design of this proposal. While shared commitment provides an opportunity to benefit from the best collective efforts of stakeholders, a tightly focused governance and management structure will need to be mobilised rapidly for a start-up phase. Those arrangements should be further honed over and beyond the first year of operation. These structures will need to be transparent in both process and decision-making. At a global level, this should include the following groups:

High Level Committee

The High Level Committee will provide overall strategic direction for the Platform. It would comprise around 10-15 ‘principals’ of partner organisations, including heads of government and senior ministers from crisis-affected and donor countries, heads of multilateral agencies and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and private sector and private foundation chief executive officers (CEOs). Responsibilities would include approval of the Platform’s strategic plan, appointment of an interim Head of Secretariat and finalising hosting and permanent governance arrangements. Further, it would champion the work of the Platform; reach out to traditional, new and emerging donors; promote enhanced and improved capacity and coordination; and, where needed, promote context-specific solutions.

Executive Committee

An interim Executive Committee will be responsible for strategic direction of the education crisis platform, management and financial oversight. The Committee could be comprised of a maximum of 15 representatives of the following groups: crisis-affected governments (two representatives); bilateral donors (two); cluster co-leads Save the Children International and UNICEF; GPE; UNHCR; UNESCO; the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Assistance (OCHA); NGOs including international and local civil society organisations (two)¹²; the private sector and private foundations (two); and the ex-officio head of secretariat.¹³ Given the rapidly changing nature of crises, there will be a need within this group to set up a smaller body or specific process to make rapid decisions. The Committee’s role is to provide on-going oversight of the Platform, including responsibilities such as the draft strategic plan; decisions on funding allocations and budget; supporting efforts to strengthen coordination;

¹² The process for selection of civil society representation would best be developed through further input from this group. One suggestion has been that it is based on regional civil society representation.

¹³ The Executive Committee could be set up based on either a constituency or representative model, with the advantage of the first being that it brings in a greater range of actors, at least in principle, and that of the second in being more true to individual and organisational capacities. In either case, a standard term of 2-3 years on the Committee should be set out, with rotation in place to involve more actors.

and accountability and transparency in the establishment of a permanent structure.

Constituency forums

There would be the potential to have an expanded ‘friends of the Platform’ group to allow for greater participation and engagement by a larger number of stakeholders. INEE could serve this function or more specific groups – or processes to draw on existing groups – could be set up, e.g. two forums: (i) a civil society forum and (ii) a business community forum. Clarity on input routes and accountability for these forums would be needed.

Secretariat

The interim Secretariat will undertake the day-to-day administration of the Platform work plan. It will be hosted and administered within UNICEF in New York. Initially, the Secretariat would comprise staff covering the following functions: Head of Secretariat; officers responsible for managing the Acceleration Facility and Breakthrough Funds; donor relations; communications and advocacy; and administrative and logistics assistants. In addition to these roles, the Secretariat would be responsible for issues related to risk management, financial management, ethics and conflict of interest. Ideally, some members would be provided on secondment or provided through a hybrid set-up whereby some members of the Secretariat remain within their own organisations rather than transfer to UNICEF New York.

Country level governance and management will involve bringing together existing leadership and coordination groups as needed to make proposals and decisions regarding Platform support appropriate to the crisis.

2.2 Acceleration Facility

The Acceleration Facility will invest in existing actors to expand and extend collective work to deliver high-quality education services in crises. It will provide political weight and resources through the Platform, and encourage more joined-up and strengthened approaches available to the sector. It will also support the development of global goods to advance good practice and strengthen central collection data and evidence. The facility will support ‘upstream activities’ through Catalytic Support Grants, to enable actors with expertise in certain functions to work together and strengthen activities (for possibilities see Table 5, below). Global and regional stakeholders will be eligible for these grants, totalling an indicative 5% of the education crisis platform financing. Grants will support work along the following lines:

- high-level technical support and surge capacity to national government leadership on education response


- investment in building better practices and creation of global goods – that is, publications and guidelines based on actionable research
- core funding for existing education in emergencies mandate holders to expand efforts and improve the quality of their work, including the Education Cluster, UNHCR and INEE
- provision of a working-level platform that brings mandate holders and implementing agencies together to facilitate efficient ways of working together across humanitarian and development actors

Table 5: Acceleration Facility potential support for activities

	Indicative activities
Political commitment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • high-level advocacy for specific crises affecting education • strategic action to prioritise education in humanitarian and development spaces • support national political actors to set up an appropriate response architecture, including to coordinate the financial flows
Planning and response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • develop synergies and methodologies for comprehensive assessments • strengthen planning, supporting creation of costed response and multiyear plans • facilitate coordination between relevant groups, for example LEG–Cluster coordination • direct support or incentives to develop risk-informed response and preparedness
Financing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • develop and manage innovative financing efforts • establish entry points for different types of donors (private, individual, etc.) • develop pipelines enabling international organisations to link to national NGOs and community-based organisations providing education response
Capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • capacity-mapping to determine needs and gaps • predictable support for increased surge capacity and expert rosters • strengthen staffing for dedicated response coordination, both global and national responders • invest in technology solutions, building on internet and radio, that could support teaching and learning in crises with limited humanitarian access
Accountability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • strengthen data collection and analysis, develop real-time data methods and tools • support rigorous case studies and invest in conduct impact evaluations • set up feedback loops, using data for accountability globally, for affected populations, and for collectively agreed SOPs and improved approaches

Acceleration Facility value-added: providing political weight and resources to encourage more joined-up and strengthened approaches available to the sector.

Figure 2: Operational model for the education crisis platform¹⁴



¹⁴ The proportions of funding shown, with the Acceleration Facility at 5% and the Breakthrough Fund at 95%, are indicative and subject to funds raised as well as costings developed during the Platform’s incubation phase. In the early years of operation, the Acceleration Facility will require a minimum level of funding, regardless of the size of the Breakthrough Fund. However, as activities ramp up and increase global education sector effectiveness, proportional costs may need to be adjusted.

Support the development of global goods to advance good practice and serve as a repository of data and evidence.

2.3 Breakthrough Fund

The Breakthrough Fund will mobilise and disburse new funding, including both humanitarian and development funds, and spur investments for country-level delivery of education crisis response. It will offer both immediate and medium-term finance to those responsible for providing, maintaining and restoring education systems through rapid and predictable investment. The Fund will be designed to leverage additional monies, to protect against substitution and to support linked humanitarian and development interventions. It will also be designed to integrate easily with systems support already flowing to crisis countries through GPE and others (for possible activities, see Table 6, below).

As far as is possible, and depending on the country context, funds will be channelled through existing financing mechanisms. This might include topping up a humanitarian or refugee Strategic Response Plan, financing through a country-based pooled fund, a medium-term development fund or an addition to an existing GPE grant.

The Breakthrough Fund will make up as much as 95% (indicative and subject to further costing) of overall financing and will have three distinct parts:

i. Rapid response mechanism

This will provide immediate and quick support in a crisis, channelled through existing agencies. In order not to undermine the humanitarian appeals system, and to leverage increased funding through the usual channels, ‘top up’ grants will be made against a consolidated appeal, provided a certain benchmark of funding is already met for education. The rapid response mechanism would typically finance start-up costs, such as temporary access, essential supplies or contingency stocks, psychosocial support, information management or back-to-school campaigns. The Platform’s Executive Committee will need to be able to allocate funding quickly to existing actors – possibly looking at pre-accrediting certain agencies but also ensuring others included in the strategic humanitarian or refugee response plan are considered – against agreed criteria.

ii. Multi-year support window

This will allow funds to flow for up to five years against a rapidly agreed country plan that bridges and consolidates existing humanitarian, sector and other plans. Development of the plan, ideally within the first three months after an education crisis platform country-level engagement is initiated, would be supported by the enhanced Acceleration Facility, and detail how both formal and non-formal education will work to restore and build back better education services, financed through governments and through direct service delivery actors. The plan would be informed by a joint comprehensive needs assessment exercise, costed, and provide recommendations on the preferred modalities at country level through which to channel funds.¹⁵

Bringing key actors together behind a single plan will further improve coordination, with clusters, LEGs, and other groups working together, normally led by government. Streamlining planning exercises, strengthening coordination and detailing a limited number of entry points for external financing to support the overall response have the potential to reduce transaction costs and provide much-needed predictability of funding to governments and other implementing partners. Therefore, the plan should be integrated into existing national planning through the development or revision of an education sector plan or transitional education sector plan.

iii. Pop-up funds

This involves the capability to establish a ‘pop-up’ window that would allow funding to be directed during a crisis, either to a specific country or region or to a limited number of earmarked areas of the country plan. The advantage of the window is it provides a quick route to channel support from non-traditional donors, philanthropists and the private sector, which may not be able to provide contributions directly to an un-earmarked fund. It might also be used to channel funding towards the purchase of contingency supplies. The disadvantage to more tightly managed earmarked funding is the high level of transaction costs involved in establishing and monitoring donor-specific agreements. It is therefore proposed that a percentage (say 10%) of any funding channelled through a pop-up window be put into the overall Breakthrough Fund, alongside any normal administrative recovery rates.

15 In some countries, this process could be aligned with the re-purposing of a GPE or donor grant (thereby reducing the transaction costs of front-line agencies, which frequently find themselves having to write rapid donor proposals for development funds to be re-purposed). The multiyear plan would outline priority activities, including those that might not have been included in a traditional education sector plan, or transitional education plan, but might be necessary to accommodate shifting populations or further build the resilience of the education system after crisis (e.g. conditional cash transfers, teacher stipends, Education Management Information Systems (EMIS) that are sensitive to migration). The plan would also provide channels for financing direct service delivery by non-state actors where governments are unwilling or unable to reach the most affected children, such as refugees and IDPs.

Table 6: Breakthrough Fund potential support for activities

Indicative activities	
Political will	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • support country-specific political and fundraising strategies
Planning and response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • develop joint, costed assessments throughout crisis and recovery periods • prepare and implement high-quality, multiyear, costed plans • conduct risk/resilience analyses and planning • put in place contingency stocks and pre-positioning
Financing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • fund initial start-up early response costs • offer bench-marked matching funds for humanitarian appeals • contribute earmarked funds to humanitarian country-based pooled funds • prepare country-level cost modelling for response • offer backfilling GPE grants where appropriate
Capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • develop national capacity-building strategies, particularly at decentralised levels • invest in education in emergency teams or project management units in ministries
Accountability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • invest in linking up humanitarian data and crisis-sensitive Emergency Management Information Systems (EMIS) • strengthen initiatives to support accountability to affected populations

Breakthrough Fund value-add: At present there is no global pooled fund exclusively focused on education in emergencies and protracted crises (though the GPE Fund is a global pooled fund that has provided some support to these issues in a range of eligible countries). This fund will increase efficiency and return on investment by incentivising and leveraging existing financing. It will provide a way for a range of traditional and new donors to improve the response across a range of crises while pooling risks.

Box 1: Eligibility for support

Overall eligibility to receive Platform funding will be determined by the interim Executive Committee, managed by the Secretariat, and reviewed at regular intervals. It is foreseen that, while the Acceleration Facility will provide support to develop or better use global goods for all crisis-affected countries, the Breakthrough Fund will be focused on country level funding and triggered by the onset of an acute emergency or by limited progress in protracted crises and fragile states. A balanced approach will be made to ensure support to both acute and protracted emergencies, with priority given to contexts in which states are unable (or unwilling) to address the crisis. Other eligibility considerations could include under-funded crises (via official development assistance (ODA) and/or humanitarian appeals and pooled funds) and high proportions of affected children and young people. Both the Acceleration Facility and the Breakthrough Fund will be allocated especially where they can maximise cooperation and collective action. Institutional and organisational eligibility to receive support will be not only for international actors, but include fiduciary arrangements to enable national and local actors to access to funds.

3. Mobilising finance

The education crisis platform will scale up resource mobilisation over the first five years, commencing with an aim to raise approximately \$150 million in Year 1 and with an ambition to bring in funding at a level of \$1.5 billion in Year 5.¹⁶ This involves an overall 5 year fundraising ambition of \$3.85 billion. Further refinement of cost models and finance mobilisation strategies will need to be developed during incubation of the Platform, with an indicative ‘on-ramp’ for financing shown below.

The Platform’s resource mobilisation efforts will aim to transform the potential for delivering education in crises by bringing in new, untapped resources, rather than through the reallocation of existing funds. This introduces a ground-breaking approach to catalyse an all-inclusive range of sources and mechanisms to financing global education efforts. The Platform will both contribute to and draw from findings of the International Commission on Financing Global Education Opportunities to take on new ideas and proposals on raising financing from new sources.

To achieve this level of ambition, the education crisis platform will coordinate and deliver finance from existing aid donors and draw in new donors, including:

- new donors from countries that historically have not contributed directly to multilateral aid
- finance from the business and commercial sector
- finance from foundations
- philanthropy of public spirited individuals, including diaspora remittances

- high net worth individuals in regions interested in contributing to various crises¹⁷
- INGO, including faith-based group, contributions innovative financing

The platform could also seek to transition to longer-term financing opportunities and broker financing deals, including transitioning to GPE sector plans and International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) concessional buy-down and capital payoff plans.

The education crisis platform will incentivise this range of donors to increase financing to education in crises, with a focus on transparency and accountability, through five key work streams:

1. *building the investment case*: investing in research to document what works and what it costs in order to create **credible investment cases** that appeal to and inspire new and existing donors to bring education services to the most vulnerable children and young people in the world
2. *collective action*: **streamlining the current coordination architecture where possible and relevant**, and uniting global actors to ensure effective and efficient delivery of educational resources in humanitarian crises
3. *country-level solutions*: increasing cost-effectiveness and delivery efficiency at country level by developing clear, **country-specific funding strategies** backed by evidence for funding requirements, including education needs cost-modelling

Table 7: Projected growth in funding to meet ambition


	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Total children and young people targeted	1,360,000	3,400,000	6,120,000	9,520,000	13,600,000
Total funding required (\$)	\$153 million	\$383 million	\$689 million	\$1 billion	\$1.5 billion

¹⁶ Costing assumptions are based on updates to ODI calculations drawn from analysis prepared for the Oslo Summit. Key assumptions to this calculation include (i) recognition that cost per child is based on a standard set of education inputs commonly used in emergencies, but would vary considerably by country and context; (ii) total education cost across affected countries averaging at \$156 per child, with domestic resources on average contributing at least \$43 per child, and a resulting financing gap of \$113 per child; (iii) a ‘crisis premium’ that builds in between 20-40% additional costs to take into account crisis-specific logistics, security or protection costs, among others; and (iv) the fact that the education crisis platform should support, as an early priority, review of these and other global costings as well as development of country-specific cost models that would roll up to contribute to global estimates.

¹⁷ Ensuring a single place for new funding to flow to can build a simple and compelling case for channelling these resources via the platform for maximum efficiency.

4. *donor community-building*: expanding and connecting the education in crisis donor community by building effective relationships with core donors, mapping the potential donor landscape and identifying and solving financing bottlenecks globally and at country level (e.g. policy-level constraints restricting humanitarian and development flows)
5. *creating new pipelines and pathways*: focusing resource mobilisation efforts on opening up new pipelines and pathways for additional donors and private sector

actors to engage. Developing a methodology for ensuring additional financing flows is a priority for the Platform, with an emphasis on creative approaches, such as match-funding with philanthropic institutions, commodity tax levies, etc. See Table 8 for a list of potential sources of new and additional funding. During the Platform's strategic planning phase, these options will be assessed and prioritised and a plan to put them into practice will be established.



Teaching maths and science at a school in Wehplay, Nimba County, Liberia. Credit: Laura Elizabeth Pohl/Bread for the World

Table 8: Potential sources of new and additional funding

Source	Enabling pathways
Emerging donors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> engage with emerging donors already contributing to education sector to include crises in their strategies support emerging donors to offer in-kind and technical contributions, e.g. South–South knowledge exchange include non-Development Assistance Committee (DAC) sources of official finance for education, especially those (such as Arab donors, the Islamic Bank, Turkey, Brazil, Cuba and Venezuela) with substantial experience in education investments and/or in crises support from regional bodies (Economic Community of West African States, Southern African Development Community, Arab League, etc.)
Private sector	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> menu of pre-vetted charities to donate funds¹⁹ in-kind component that offers a coordinated mechanism for donors to provide quality in-kind donations, including material and technical inputs encourage private sector actors to expand current global education contributions to crisis-affected countries through corporate social responsibility (CSR) initiatives²⁰
Foundations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> offering of innovative and catalytic investment opportunities outreach to regional and family foundations
Domestic financing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> expenditure benchmarks for government commitment to education using GPE's 10% as a target
Innovative financing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> establishing matching impact funding mechanisms with governments, private sector actors and public contributions to incentivise \$1 per \$1 for donors diaspora remittances channels development bank financing, broker debt relief forgiveness crowd-funding approaches to engage public contributions direct, results-based cash transfers social impact bonds callable commitments insurance schemes²¹ micro levies (similar to UNITAID's airline tax levy model and UNITLIFE's extractive industry tax levy) imposition of a global financial transaction tax, leveraging resources for education

Operational implications: In order to ensure success of this resource mobilisation approach, the education crisis platform must have the flexibility and ability to take in un-earmarked funding for both the entire Platform and specific windows. In addition, given that the Platform is partly built on need for longer-term predictable funding,

multi-year pledges will be particularly desirable to ensure delivery of multi-year funding. During the Platform's strategy development and operational planning phase, an analysis will be conducted to outline approaches to assessing and managing fiduciary risk and ensuring financing due diligence, ethical standards and practices.

19 Principles and criteria will be developed during the Platform's start-up phase.

20 An estimated 13% of CSR is dedicated to the education sector (Dattani et al.,2015).

21 Past experiences of the Caribbean Catastrophe Risk Insurance Facility, the Pacific Catastrophe Risk Assessment and Finance Initiative (PCRAFI) and the Global Environment Facility's (GEF) Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF) will be reviewed to explore possibilities of synergy and to enable any new facility to ensure additionality of resources.

4. Headline results

Table 9 outlines the Platform’s possible headline results in terms of impact, outcomes and outputs, as well as an indicative set of five-year targets. Further analysis of desired results as well as of definitional issues for impact, outcomes and outputs, plus targets, is required. There is a need to think through outcome and output levels, as well as the connections between the two. Targets in particular will need to be reviewed against baselines, once these are

gathered. Additional work is also needed to develop a full results framework that includes indicators and means of verification. As highlighted through the INEE consultation and country case studies (see section 6, below), the global results framework should be relatively light, with space built in for contextualised results to be developed at the country level.



Students raise their hands to answer a class question, Kinshasa, DRC. Credit: Dominic Chavez/World Bank

Table 9: Indicative headline results of the Platform


Overall impact *More than 18% of crisis-affected children and young people will have improved education opportunities appropriate for their age and ability by 2020, with all reached by 2030 in line with SDG4 on education.*

Source	Enabling pathways	Indicative 5-year targets
Outcome 1: Response time	Quick, strategic, agile responses in place to support education needs in crises	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 75% of new crises have quality response plan in line with national policy within 4 weeks of emergency 75% of protracted crises have a high level consolidated response plan in line with national policy by Year 5 of the Platform's operations
Outcome 2: Access	Increase in children and young people affected by crises completing school	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5 million more children and youth completing school across all levels in crisis-affected contexts 50% of affected countries extend or amplify access to public pre-primary and secondary education for crisis-affected populations
Outcome 3: Quality	Improved education quality available to affected groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 13.6 million children benefit from better-quality education (through inputs on teacher training, textbooks, school infrastructure, learning assessments, etc.) Measureable increase in 'learning outcomes'
Outcome 4: Protection	Safe and conflict- and disaster-sensitive education available in crisis contexts in line with INEE Minimum Standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 50% of qualified teachers in crises fully trained in psychosocial support 50% increase in use of safe and conflict- and disaster-sensitive education curriculum
Outcome 5: Equity	Inclusive education reaches the most marginalised children and young people in crises	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 100% of supported education opportunities demonstrate increase in education for girls, disabled and those in remote locations
	Indicative outputs	Indicative 5-year targets
Output 1:	Strengthened commitment by all actors increases proportion of affected children and youth receiving quality education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 12 countries have access to crisis funding for education and expertise to guide response 20 countries monitoring sector activities of preparedness/response/recovery using commonly agreed minimum standards
Output 2: Planning and response	Joint, multiyear and costed education plans are in place, underpinned by improved coordination and national financing mechanisms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 35 integrated robust, costed, actionable emergency preparedness, response and recovery plans in line with national policy Links between country-level education coordination structures supported
Output 3: Financing	Substantial increase in additional, predictable and longer-term funding for education in crises	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least \$1.5 billion of additional funds disbursed in 2020 through new and existing actors for education crises through (i) Rapid Response Mechanism and (b) Multiyear Support Window (\$3.85 billion cumulative over first 5 years) Increase of 25% of education funds requested in appeals that are eventually funded In 5 years, 30% of aid flows for education in crises channelled to national actors At least 3 innovative financing and disbursement mechanisms piloted At least 5 non-traditional donors provide support
Output 4: Capacity	National and global capacity to respond to and coordinate education crises is improved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 20% increase in in number of crises using surge deployment for education 40% increase in national experts trained 50% of crisis countries include education in crisis and social cohesion modules as part of pre- and in-service teacher training programmes
Output 5: Accountability	Real-time data and analysis support education crisis advocacy, planning and implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Global baselines for key education crises indicators identified and collected 6 EMIS strengthened to serve increased preparedness and planning in crisis situations Evidence from 3 robust research efforts available (which could include experimental/quasi experimental evaluations)

Robust monitoring and evaluation in crisis and protracted contexts is vital to ensure accountability. It is also extremely difficult. Acute crises are fast-moving, complex environments with rapidly shifting education landscapes, and protracted crises offer their own challenges. The education crisis platform will address these by strengthening the sector's ability to collaborate with governments to collect, access and analyse quantitative and qualitative data and use this information for planning and programme adjustment. Data such as the above will also be key in strengthening advocacy and communication around education crisis needs more widely.

With regard to results reporting, given the likelihood of multiple beneficiaries in one context, grantees would be

expected to report results initially against their planned activities (e.g. in the humanitarian or refugee strategic response plan) but increasingly against a shared results framework linked to a country plan. A small number of standard indicators would be common across all countries to enable aggregate reporting for the overall results of the education crisis platform, and to support future investment cases and replenishment. The Secretariat or another entity would be tasked to monitor overall results and fiduciary performance and actively follow up on poor performance or misuse of funds, including provision of additional technical support or seeking repayment if necessary.



A refugee student writes notes in a makeshift classroom, South Sudanese refugee camp, Gambella, Ethiopia. Credit: Ayene/UNICEF 2014

5. Consultation and country application

The process of developing this proposal and designing the fund has included an element of consultation and country application. The first was to ensure a wide range of stakeholders had a chance to feed in reactions and ideas to the proposition. The second was to look more carefully at how the Platform might be operationalised at a country level. Findings from these efforts have shaped elements of the proposal and should continue to be considered in further development of the Platform.

5.1 INEE consultation

INEE led a global consultation from 19 January to 12 February 2016 in order to facilitate dialogue and collect inputs on plans for this new global initiative. It considered and provided feedback on an earlier draft outlining options for this proposal. The consultation highlighted areas of

strong consensus and questions related to the Platform's proposed conceptual framework, priority functions and scale, among other areas. Over 500 people worldwide participated in the consultation process.²²

The large majority of respondents supported the establishment of a common platform for education in emergencies and protracted crises, emphasising the need for an ambitious approach to reach the greatest number of children and youth. However, the consultation raised a number of key issues, many of which have influenced the shape of this proposal and others that may need further consideration in future development of the Platform (Table 10).

Furthermore, consultation participants expressed concern over their ability to provide in-depth responses while the Platform design remained in relative infancy.



One year on from Typhoon Yolanda hit, a new classroom is built, Leyte. Credit: Asian Development Bank

22 This included 315 people from a range of developing and developed countries participating in 11 in-country consultations and 192 individuals from 53 countries who responded to the online survey.

Table 10: INEE consultation issues

Key issues raised in INEE consultation	How addressed in current proposal
Need for greater ambition in numbers reached and targeting of wider range of age groups	The Platform is now set to reach more than 18% of crisis-affected children and young people by year 5 (approximately 13.6 million), with increased ambition reflected in continued scale-up to reach all those affected by 2030 through either direct support or partners' broader efforts. This proposal has expanded its focus age group to span 3-18 years, including a greater number of adolescents and youth. While need for education support to 0-3 year olds and over 18 young people and adults was called for, it was felt that this is impractical in the first stages of Platform operation, and could be reconsidered at a later date.
Consistency with guiding principles and international frameworks	This proposal has placed greater emphasis on rights-based approaches and brought the overall Platform aim in alignment with SDG4. The proposal highlights that the Oslo Consolidated Principles on Education in Emergencies and Protracted Crises were developed building on a foundation of relevant conventions and commitments such as those articulated by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Principles for Fragile States and INEE Minimum Standards.
Role of the Platform versus that of existing actors and need to ensure complementarity	The proposal now includes greater illustration of how the Platform will work through and strengthen existing actors. The full set of its 5 functions would be delivered through grants to existing actors provided through the Acceleration Facility and Breakthrough Fund. A small lean Secretariat will be in place to support existing actors in this work.
Bridging gaps between domestic education response alongside humanitarian and development efforts	The proposal highlights ways these divides could be brought together particularly through Function 2 on planning and response, supporting diverse actors to collaborate to deliver quality assessments and education response/sector plans. It also lays out funding support that would include both rapid response and a multiyear window, with clear links and continuity of focus between the two. This will need further attention, particularly as support is delivered at country level.
Generating new and additional funding in the current fiscal environment	Possible sources of finance are detailed in Section 4 on mobilising funding. Platform design includes specific focus on generating new and additional funding, including outreach to emerging donors and the private sector, as well as development of innovative finance approaches. Significant further work will be needed on this in terms of scoping and pursuing prospects, as well as ensuring that the Platform is attractive to the interests of different donors.
Specifics of the institutional and governance arrangements and the role of different actors	The proposal and the Technical Strategy Group emphasise the need for a democratic decision-making process within the Platform to avoid control by one, or a very limited number of, multilateral agencies or INGOs, and profile the positive role of civil society.
Clarity over the definitions with regard to operations, i.e. 'quality education', 'learning outcomes', 'equity' and 'the most marginalised'	No further detail is provided in the proposal but will need attention as part of the development of a full results framework. Terminology and results will need to be contextualised for each crisis as conditions, resources and actors vary so widely.
Concerns over issues of sustainability, with lack of explicit reference to proactive planning for handover to national authorities and partners	The results framework has been adjusted to reflect long-term, sustainable education goals for all crises as part of its alignment with SDG4. Sustainability will need further attention as grants begin to be made.

It is therefore recommended that further consultation be included in the upcoming phases of Platform development, with particular stress on the transparency of processes and solicitation of civil society contributions.

5.2 Country case studies

The ideas and concepts behind how an education crisis platform might operate were explored at country level through two country application visits to Lebanon and South Sudan. This was to better understand and illustrate how proposed approaches could be operational at the national level. During one-week missions, teams interviewed dozens of stakeholders, including

representatives from education line ministries, INGOs, local NGOs, civil society, UN agencies, respective affected communities and donors. Detailed case studies from these visits provide greater depth of analysis and are available as part of the accompanying Evidence Paper; highlights of how the Platform could focus its efforts at the national level in these two cases are captured below. Findings from these visits have both confirmed focus of the Platform in terms of functions, and further informed proposed shape and approaches.

While Lebanon and South Sudan represent two very different emergency contexts, some common themes emerged from the findings in both countries:

- Global and local advocacy are essential to **raise the profile of the criticality of education provision in emergencies**, not simply to redefine education to fit protection or life-saving criteria. This should be done in recognition that this will take the development of evidence through rigorous data collection and monitoring of Platform activities.
- **Flexible funding** is needed to (i) quickly respond to humanitarian need where education is underfunded; (ii) provide linkages between humanitarian and development funds to ensure resilience and transition; and (iii) be reprogrammed when necessary to respond to shifts in context – either from development to emergency or from emergency to recovery. **Pooled funds** should be considered as they have shown success in generating stronger collaborative approaches through joint planning.
- The Platform’s emphasis should be on **defining needy and target groups at the national level while avoiding prescription globally**. In some contexts, humanitarian funding covers the ‘most marginalised’ while little exists to make sustainable the inherently short-term funding that accompanies humanitarian action.
- Ample space must be given to **contextualise the Platform’s results framework at a national level**, defined by localised needs analysis in country-level planning processes such as the Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP), joint sector analysis or the national education sector plan. The Platform should provide dedicated **and expert support** to improve these processes and raise the profile of education through the Cluster, GPE and other global and country-level coordination mechanisms.

Lebanon is currently host to 1.5 million Syrian and over 300,000 Palestinian refugees and is confronted with multiple emergencies. The refugee crisis has led to economic instability and stresses on a domestic education system stretched far beyond capacity, which has been forced to redirect efforts from system-strengthening to providing greater access for large numbers of refugees.

South Sudan is a complex humanitarian emergency, with large swathes of the country controlled by opposition groups and in active conflict since 2013. Decades of war have resulted in some of the worst human development indicators in the world, particularly for education, where a young girl is more likely to die in childbirth than to complete secondary school.

Table 11: Possible focus areas for the education crisis platform in Lebanon

	Acceleration Facility	Breakthrough Fund
Political commitment	High-level advocacy to raise education needs of Syrian refugees in Lebanon on the global stage	Support Ministry of Education and Higher Education (MEHE) leadership in the management of the crisis response through longer-term funding of the Project Management Unit and other capacity-strengthening initiatives Support coordination of education implementers and groups, expanding commitment to and fulfilment of the objectives of the Reaching All Children with Education (RACE) II strategic plan
Planning and response	Global analysis on good practice during transition could be applied as the country moves from emergency to protracted crises, including adaptation of assessment and planning tools	Support MEHE to further develop RACE II strategic plan, ensuring this engages and supports a range of education actors working toward commonly agreed approaches
Financing	Develop evidence base on ‘demand-side’ issues that cause children to be out of school (e.g. lack of school transport, opportunity cost of school vs. work). This could include research on, e.g., on conditional cash transfer programmes	Provide longer-term predictable financing commitment for RACE II plan to ensure continuity in response. Pursue entry points for private sector actors to support gaps in Lebanese response (e.g. transportation services for Syrian refugees)
Capacity	Surge capacity to help further develop the RACE II education response plan and advise on making aid architecture more efficient	Enable MEHE and donors to invest in reforming existing Lebanese teacher management systems and to strengthen teachers’ capacity with professional development and continuous quality improvement Support accreditation processes for non-formal education programmes that can be used across regional crises (e.g. Syria and region)
Accountability	Develop and apply global methodology for costing of plans and their implementation	Fund further development of EMIS to provide more up-to-date data and cover both refugee and development contexts

Table 12: Possible focus areas for the education crisis platform in South Sudan


	Acceleration Facility	Breakthrough Fund
Political commitment	High-level advocacy to humanitarian leadership and government to regain focus on forgotten emergencies including those within affected countries on a subnational basis, used in South Sudan to seek solutions for education beyond areas of government control	Coordination formalised to regularly bring together humanitarian and development practitioners to build linkages and establish and review joint planning (e.g. through the Education Donor Group) With support from global champions, advocate with the government as well as the Humanitarian Country Team to establish and maintain the prioritisation of education through all phases of the emergency
Planning and response	Dedicated expert support provided to develop and improve needs analysis, response strategies and the local contextualisation of the results framework	Planning process to establish costed, multiyear strategy that links existing plans, including the HRP and the Education Strategic Plan. The strategy will cover all phases of emergency from immediate humanitarian response to systems development while also considering geographic areas neglected by both
Financing	Identification of innovative, additional and new sources of funding that can be shared with field-level practitioners	Flexible disbursement mechanism established to bridge humanitarian programming with medium- and long-term systems development. Should utilise project sheets from HRP to build sustainability into existing, needs-based humanitarian planning
	Procurement facility or procedures set up globally to ensure and support community-based organisation access to funds	Entry points established for national partners and civil society to access funding directly from the Platform for both response (6-12 months) and the building of institutional capacity (2-3 years)
Capacity	Human resources strategy developed for the provision and retention of high-capacity education staff in challenging operating environments such as South Sudan	Mandate for international partners to implement multiyear plans with and through local agencies recognising that implementation represents capacity-building
		Training on sector planning extended to Cluster/Education in Emergencies Working Group leads to establish synergy between humanitarian and sector strategy
Accountability	Harmonisation of indicators between Platform results matrix, GPE guidance and Education Cluster monitoring tools, as well as donor frameworks	Further establishment and reporting on expenditure benchmarks for government commitment to education using GPE 10% as a target
	Regularised documentation of successful cooperation and transition between humanitarian and development projects	Sustained funding and capacity support for EMIS to ensure data collection is regular, conflict-sensitive and equitable across all states

6. Roadmap ahead

A staged approach to platform operationalisation will be needed, moving from a start-up phase to greater focus on scaling up, and then to operating at a significant steady state.

While speed is essential in getting the Platform off the ground owing to the levels of need and desire to show impact, scale-up will need to be strategic and consultative.

Figure 3: Milestones for platform creation and scale-up



- **Years 1-2 (start-up):** In Years 1-2, interim governance and operational arrangements will be established, including criteria for making investment decisions. A significant focus in the first year will be to mobilise seed financing by tapping into the substantial interest from aid donors (traditional and new), private companies and philanthropists. The start-up period will include activating the Acceleration Facility and Rapid Response Mechanism under the Breakthrough Fund, as well as establishment of the pop-up fund facility. UNICEF will serve as host for the start-up phase, which will include steering a process to identify and transfer functions and finances to a permanent host.²³ In the first year, the Education in Crisis Platform will aim to reach 2 million children.
- **Years 3-5 (scaling-up):** A permanent hosting model for the Secretariat will be established. The Acceleration Facility will support work to assess how the Platform should be structured to make it possible for more donors to invest, among other priority activities. Innovative financing options under the Breakthrough Fund will be developed so as to attract investment from a wider range of donors. In this period, both the Acceleration Facility and the Breakthrough Fund will be active, with the aim of reaching 13.6 million children in Year 5.
- **Years 6-15 (at scale):** The platform will continue to mobilise significant additional financing and will add innovative financing mechanisms to its operating model. The Acceleration Facility and Breakthrough Fund will be fully operational. The platform should aim to reach 75 million children, the number most directly affected by crisis, in 2030, the final year of the SDGs.

²³ UNICEF has a track record of hosting partnership programmes and secretariats, each with separate identities and governance arrangements, which work on behalf of children for the realisation of their rights. At the request of informal political champions, UNICEF can quickly provide a temporary home for the Secretariat and act as Fund Custodian for the Platform start-up period. Its mandate, its close working relationship with other UN agencies and GPE and its ability to attract financing from the broadest range of donors and to disburse to a wide range of recipients at the global, regional and country levels informed this decision. UNICEF and partners acknowledge the need to include appropriate institutional, programmatic and financial firewalls during its temporary role to avoid conflicts of interest associated with UNICEF's mandate on education in emergencies at global and national levels.

References

- Burde, D. et al., (2015) What works to promote children's educational access, quality of learning, and wellbeing in crisis-affected contexts. Education Rigorous Literature Review. London: DFID.
- Dattani, P., et al. (2015) Business Backs Education: Creating a Baseline for Corporate CSR Spending on Global Education Initiatives
- Gladwell, C. & Tanner, L. (2014) Hear it from the Children: Why education in emergencies is critical. London and Oslo: Save the Children UK and Norwegian Refugee Council.
- High-Level Panel on Humanitarian Financing (2016) Too important to fail—addressing the humanitarian financing gap, Report to the UN Secretary-General (January 2016). Available at: <http://reliefweb.int/report/world/high-level-panel-humanitarian-financing-report-secretary-general-too-important-fail>
- Nicolai, S. and Hine, S. (2015) Investment for education in emergencies: a review of the evidence. London: ODI.
- Nicolai, S. et al. (2015) Education in emergencies and protracted crises: toward a strengthened response. London, ODI.
- Novelli M. et al. (2014) The political economy of education systems in conflict-affected contexts. Rigorous Literature Review. London: DFID
- OECD (2015) Immigrant Students at School: Easing the Journey towards Integration, OECD Reviews of Migrant Education, OECD Publishing, Paris.
- UN Secretary General (2016) One humanity: shared responsibility. Report of the Secretary-General for the World Humanitarian Summit, A/70/709 (2 February 2016).
- UNESCO (2015) Education for all 2000-2015: achievements and challenges. EFA Global Monitoring Report. Paris: UNESCO.



ODI is the UK's leading independent think tank on international development and humanitarian issues.

Readers are encouraged to reproduce material from ODI Reports for their own publications, as long as they are not being sold commercially. As copyright holder, ODI requests due acknowledgement and a copy of the publication. For online use, we ask readers to link to the original resource on the ODI website. The views presented in this paper are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the views of ODI.

© Overseas Development Institute 2016. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial Licence (CC BY-NC 4.0).

All ODI Reports are available from www.odi.org

Cover photo: Artwork on the wall outside a girls' school at a refugee camp in Jordan reads 'welcome.'
Credit: Omar Chatriwala

Overseas Development Institute
203 Blackfriars Road
London SE1 8NJ
Tel +44 (0)20 7922 0300
Fax +44 (0)20 7922 0399

odi.org