

## Comments on EFA FTI Global and Regional Activities Program (GRA) Thematic Area: Financing

Janice Dolan  
Senior International Consultant  
CfBT Education Trust  
[JDolan@cfbt.com](mailto:JDolan@cfbt.com)

1. agree with UNICEF/Anda's comments and that it seems to be top-down. My main question when reading it was, **who is this for/to benefit?** Donors or governments? I assume the idea is that should support governments and that would need buy-in from governments to be successful, however it struck me as putting them under more pressure to deliver more for donors/ to get resources. Though I assume participating in, or improving these things is not tied to receiving support through the FTI (at least not yet!). Wording relating to this on activity one is a bit ambiguous (see point 4 below)!
2. the discussion on **geographical disparities** (bullet 3 on page 3) seems quite limited, focusing on urban-rural differences, but omitting discussion of provincial/regional disparities within countries. There was quite a bit of discussion on this in the latest GMR.
3. on some aspects of the activities things were the same/similar and I assume **need to be tailored to fit with the activity** a bit more. As Anda mentioned not sure on the value of some things like an international workshop and whether the best use of resources.
4. Out of all the activities - **activity one** seemed like it might have most potential to support countries however if the 'FTI partnership should ensure that all EFA FTI developing country partners can implement good reporting on financing flows', is there something in place that is going to ensure donors can deliver more predictable funding? The paper implies that activities 3 and 4 will look at improving predictability on aid levels to support countries but not sure they will go far enough or try to deal with individual donor issues (and don't think that is the intention). However, the scope of Activity 1 needs to be clarified. At the moment it seems very ambitious and goes beyond the stated focus on improving the quality of financial reporting. The motivations behind strengthening use of financial information and analysis within ESP development is commendable, but will require a significant focus on capacity development for analysis of data. In addition data on financing flows will need to be married with data on quality, access and management to make any assessment of the efficiency with which resources are allocated. EMIS isn't mentioned at all in relation to this activity.
5. **Activities 2-4** look more feasible and manageable however I wasn't convinced that activity 2 was really necessary or going to give information donors don't already know. There is already quite a lot of work that has been done on aid modalities and what works best in what context. Not sure what if anything this is going to add?
6. **Activity 3** on development of financing initiatives connected to results seemed useful, if this is an FTI commitment, as is probably a body of work where there is more learning to be done that could be usefully shared through a global partnership like the FTI.
7. **Civil Society** - papers background highlights key role of civil society in terms of dean for education, monitoring accountability. Whilst civil society is mentioned in most of the activities, there is nothing specific to support civil society? I am not sure support

through the CSEF is now considered adequate but a better balance of activities (and more manageable) might be three activities, with one focusing on supporting 3 key partners in FTI - donors, developing countries and civil society. In terms of what civil society would need would be around budget monitoring and carrying out actual activities (rather than just training) - again it may already be being carried out adequately!