

Nepal Education For All Program
Preparation Mission
June 3-18, 2003
Aide Memoire

I. Introduction

A joint mission took place from June 3 -18, 2003 to review progress on preparation of the proposed program for the next phase of the basic and primary education sub-sector (now called Nepal's Education For All Program, 2004-2009). Represented were MOES and DOE staff and advisors, MOF and MOLD staff, and staff and consultants from the World Bank, Danida, NORAD, Finland, Unicef, and JICA¹. Representatives from the European Commission attended in their capacity as this year's Donor Coordination Focal Point, and ADB as observers. The mission was undertaken, as decided during the March 2003 Joint Review Mission for the Basic and Primary Education Program (BPEP II), to have a working session to focus on moving the planning and appraisal process of the next phase. The objectives of the mission were to jointly assess progress on moving forward the Concept Paper presented in March to the program's Core Document, review the preliminary analysis of the costs of the proposed reforms, define any additional analysis which might be required to inform the strategies and priorities of the plan; and agree on a process that MOES/DOES would undertake for consultations or validation of the proposed education development strategy at the district, sub-district and school levels.

The mission began with a presentation of the draft Core Document by the MOES and DOE, with preliminary discussions on substance. Four separate teams comprised of MOES, DOE and donor partners then visited five districts in order to: (i) assess the status of basic and primary education program implementation; and (ii) assess the Core Document vis-à-vis district capacity and on-the-ground realities. On return, a workshop was held with the broader government and mission team to validate the diagnosis and findings of the district teams, and assess implications for moving forward in the appraisal process. The mission is grateful to all national and district officials, members of civil society, teachers, parents and students who made the mission so informative and productive.

II. Impressions from Field Visits: Opportunities and Challenges

Prior to going to the districts, the joint donor and government group met to develop Terms of Reference and a framework of observations/discussions. These emerged from careful assessment of the 2001/02 Midterm Review (MTR) findings, the draft Core Document, and detailed discussions on thematic areas supporting the objectives of Nepal's EFA program. In the field, and based on these discussions, the teams focused on

¹ Krishna Panday (ADB – Observer); Paivi Ahnen, Marja Mononen-Alltonen (Finland); Karsten Jensen, Min Bahadur Bista, Kishore K.C. (Denmark); Susan Durstan, Bimal Shrestha, Chakra Man Bishwakarma (ECECO); Haruko Kamei, Kenichi Tanaka, Krishna Pd. Lamsal, Yagya R. Pant (JICA); Marit Vedeld, Benete Nilson, Bob Smith (Norway); Suman Tuladhar, Chiharu Kondo (UNICEF); Susan Hirshberg, Rajendra Joshi, Carlos Rojas, Ashutosh Dubey, Gajendra Shrestha, John Middleton (World Bank)

three areas: What worked? What were the obstacles? What needs to happen to reach the stated objectives? Stakeholder perceptions on strengths and weaknesses of education delivery and BPEP II can be found in Annex I.

Team Members' Impressions: All four teams found good opportunities as well as challenges facing children, parents, teachers, School Management Committees (SMC), Resource Persons, and district officials. Among the opportunities which could be carried forward, teams identified the following attributes:

- A good foundation for development is present
- There are pockets of success
- The School Improvement Plan (SIP) process is engaging communities in school activities and awareness
- SIP has resulted in generating more use of local level resources in some schools
- Focus on quality by parents, teachers, SMCs and other community members is emerging
- A sense of ownership of schools by parents and teachers is being built
- There is some evidence of use of data for planning

But many challenges remain if Nepal is to achieve its Education for All objectives. Annex II contains specific findings in the areas of decentralized planning, quality, reaching marginalized or special focus groups, and cross-cutting issues such as capacity, the need for transparency and good governance, and developing a clearer definition of roles and accountabilities throughout the system.

In summary, challenges remain with regard to (i) fully empowering schools, communities, and teachers to have decision-making authority over use of resources, (ii) efficient flow of funds, (iii) extremes in the conceptual understanding of the role of the SMCs in managing schools, (iv) ensuring adequate teaching and learning in the classroom, the presence of basic inputs and capacities of teachers, and holistic planning for school improvement, (v) developing appropriate targeting mechanisms to reach the most difficult out-of-school and vulnerable children; and (vi) transparency in distribution of resources and information, and good governance. Flow of funds from the center to the district to the schools remains a large obstacle to implementing basic policies. In particular, funds for textbooks have not been released, only 50 percent of funds for School Improvement Plans (SIP) which go directly to schools have been released, and female teachers haven't been paid for several months. The new decentralized procedures for financing education appear to make sense in the way they flow down through the system. However, from the demand-side – or trying to make requests for funds from the DEO's perspective – the process has become cumbersome which results in delays of salaries to teachers and provision of basic inputs to schools.

The implementation environment has changed significantly since BPEP II was first designed with some positive changes such as:

- More focus on reform

- Open discussion about transparency and governance
- Push on decentralization

On the other hand, the implementation environment has become more fragile due to changes in the political context, internal conflict, declining economic growth, and the fact that local governments are not in place. Government may need to devise different strategies and scenarios taking these fragilities into account, such as political change and conflict.

III. Core Document: Relationship between Challenges and Proposed Program

The mission team has made a number of observations on the challenges identified in the Core Document.

Quality: The Core Document presents a clear vision of the education system in ten years, of the child, the school, to the community and the systems to support these. The strategies to achieve the vision include: (i) decentralization; (ii) developing norms and standards for measuring quality education; (iii) expanding Early Childhood Education (ECD); (iv) training teachers; and (v) creating a better teaching and learning atmosphere conducive to higher learning achievement. Related strategies include meeting the learning needs of all children and making the curriculum more relevant by allowing 20 percent of the content to be developed at the district and subdistrict level.

A major observation of the Core Document, Log Frame and Implementation Plan is the fact that there needs to be more consistency in the documents to support the desired outcomes and impact at the school level. As recommended by the MTR, a more holistic and school based approach which brings all the proposed elements together inside the school is required. For example, relevance and quality remain segregated components, and the document makes little attempt to elaborate on building capacity at all levels, from MOES to schools, for decentralization and monitoring for quality improvement. The MOES may like to align this with the Human Resource Development policy currently being finalized. Most importantly, the quality component appears “input” or supply-driven, rather than focusing on processes which would enhance teacher performance and student learning. For example, more specifics need to be added on how to develop norms and standards, how to diversify teaching techniques to meet the needs of all children, or how to make the curriculum more relevant. Recommendations for further elaboration in the proposal are included in Section V, Ways Forward.

Early Childhood Development (ECD) is highlighted as a strategy for both quality and access to primary education. Interventions include expanding the number of centers, matching grants to communities, and grants for quality. The justification for rapid and large expansion in light of the fact that some centers are not functioning well could be stronger. Furthermore, cross-sectoral linkages of ECD to cognitive development, nutrition, health and parental training could be developed with other line departments. This component needs more reflection on lessons learned to make it viable.

Finally, the Core Document focuses on the importance of teachers, their qualifications, deployment, attendance and capabilities for imparting content knowledge or assessing student progress. With the exception of “teacher training,” few inputs or processes for improving the situation of teachers are included in the proposed activities. A current issue is whether the role of the Teacher Service Commission should be limited to licensing, with schools being empowered to recruit and appoint teachers. Centralized recruitment of teachers is not consistent with the decentralization strategy. Furthermore, there is a plan to create additional teaching posts and provide additional financial support to hire substitute teachers where required. The MOES is also confronting the challenge of providing teachers to the estimated 1800 community-funded community schools. The policy for funding additional teachers needs to be agreed by HMG/N given the current cap on creating posts, combined with a plan for redeployment across all districts to ensure adequate distribution of posts. In this regard, the government may wish to assess the extent to which re-deployment of teachers from low enrollment to high enrollment schools could reduce the number of new posts required.

Access: Access in the document refers to both physical access and strategies for bringing all children into schools.

A. Marginalized/special focus groups: The Core Document highlights the importance of addressing the needs of disadvantaged groups in order to achieve EFA and Millennium Development Goals (MDG). It has an inclusive definition of disadvantaged or special focus groups which include dalits, girls, ethnic and linguistic minorities, children with disabilities, working children, children affected by conflict and children in remote and/or poor habitations. The mission urges that the government’s make inclusive education a core strategy for EFA. Successful pilots need to be assessed and plans for their incorporation and scaling up included in the Core Document.

The primary strategies for addressing these children’s and family needs in order to ensure their participation in the primary education system are (i) provision of scholarships, (ii) mobilization and awareness building; (iii) collaboration with NGOs, INGOs, and CBOs on scholarship programs, managing hostels, incentive programs, etc.; (iv) developing programs to target children affected by insurgency; (v) improving the learning environment to be more sensitive to the target groups’ needs, including a large physical construction and maintenance component; and (vi) establishing resource classes and assessment centers for students with special educational needs. The inputs and activities presented in the Logical Framework and Implementation Plan, however, only include scholarships, ten hostels, alternative schooling mechanisms, and civil works. Differentiated strategies to attract and retain these groups, including a variety of scholarship schemes, food for education and expanding both inclusive education and language of instruction pilots, and the monitoring mechanisms to ensure their effective participation, will need to be developed.

The Core Document also elaborates on regional disparities in NER, resources, and gender participation, yet fails to discuss how equitable distribution of resources will occur to

address these deficiencies. It is important that the program make a shift from “equity of inputs” by distributing resources from the center to districts with a prescribed formula, to a system of “equity of outcomes” which aims to bring the most difficult and under-resourced areas and groups up to the level of those which are performing better.

B. Physical Facilities and Maintenance: The Implementation Plan has considerable allocations to civil works for additional classrooms, furniture, major and minor repairs, and maintenance costs. However, the Core Document does not clearly describe how these are to be managed at all levels, distributed keeping equity in mind, or sustained. Nor does the document address the potential need for new schools. The role of local communities and schools must be emphasized for both construction and maintenance, and transparent distribution systems must be delineated from the center to the district to the VDCs.

Decentralized Management Structure: The Core Document states that decentralization is the main implementation strategy. But donors have not been asked to finance key mechanisms such as SIP and Community School grants. Nor does the Core Document provide any information regarding management arrangements at the district and resource center level. The Core Document does present a number of actions to be taken to build decentralized planning and management, including definition of roles and responsibilities. It would be helpful to have more details on the scope and phasing of these decentralization support activities, including the regulatory development and capacity building. When will these activities be completed? If they are to be completed during the life of the project, a number of questions will need to be addressed regarding management during the project start up period.. What are the roles and accountabilities of District Education Office, Resource Centers SMCs and head teachers? What is the schedule for establishing community schools? Which unit of administration will implement this program? Which unit will supervise? Which unit will design and implement capacity building packages? On what schedule? What is the schedule for expanding bottoms up planning? Strengthening SMC capacity and monitoring the SIP process of development and oversight? How will lessons from the first phase of BPEP II be taken into account? Decentralization must be seen as a social movement, not just a technical process.

Community Schools² and SIP: HMG/N is committed to decentralizing planning and management to the community level through the SMCs. To date, 86 schools have been transferred to direct management by SMCs. This process will be continuing with a goal of 8,000 schools by the end of the 10th Plan period (2007), of which 1,500 would initially be supported by the recently negotiated Community Schools Support Project (CSSP) financed by the World Bank. The teams in the field witnesses extremes in capacity and understanding of the SMCs, with some very strong and others quite unaware of what is expected of them. Under the CSSP, a baseline study and careful monitoring will be conducted to better understand the varying needs of communities. This will inform both the Community Schools, as well as the needs of all communities in the SIP process.



² “Community Schools” are defined as Government funded, community managed schools.

The SIP process is key to decentralized management and planning. The Core Document and relevant supporting documents will need to assess the strengths and weaknesses in the processes and capacities of schools and districts in using the tool effectively. Specifically, the following need to be addressed: (i) a clear definition of the role of the SIP in the broader context of meeting program objectives. Is it a tool for improving access, quality or management? (ii) more information shared and consultations with districts and communities to define the purpose of the SIP. Is it a mechanism for financing? Planning? Or is it a paper exercise?

Preliminary assessment of financing and sustainability: A team remained in Kathmandu to work on understanding the financial implications of the proposed program and its potential for sustainability with the relevant staff of the MOES and DOE. A simulation model was developed to estimate the cost of reform. First, targets were set for quality, access and resources for the education sector based on the Core Document and DOE figures. Second, the education finance model was used to determine the cost of additional resources required to meet the targets. Finally, the impact of the additional cost on the government budget was estimated and the financing gap identified.

The outcome of this preliminary exercise reveals that if the present level of education financing is maintained for primary, the sub-sector would run an annual deficit of about US\$36 million due to an increase in school-age population (baseline scenario). Raising non teacher-salary spending to 44.3 percent in the second scenario would result in an annual financing gap of US\$93 million, which declines to US\$86 million (third scenario) with a reduction in repetition rate. Even if the share of education budget would be increased to 18.5 percent (in total government budget) and the share of primary increased to 55 percent in the final scenario, the sub-sector would still run a deficit under different assumption about the growth rate of the economy. If the economy grows at 2 percent, the annual gap would come down to US\$ 83 million, while if the economy grows at 5 percent, the gap would be reduced to US\$ 71 million. If the economy grows annually at 7 percent, the deficit would be reduced to US\$ 63 million.

The simulations indicate that the current level of government financing would be barely able to cover salaries in the primary education sub-sector. It is quite probable that there would be a continued dependence on external resources for all non-salary expenditure such as basic operations and maintenance costs, teacher training, SIP financing and other pedagogic inputs. It may also be possible to gradually increase community contributions as the move to increase the number of community managed schools gains momentum. Overall, the program may not be fiscally sustainable despite the government's commitment of substantial resources towards the education sector. The slow growth of the economy, currently negative, is likely to further impede any substantial increase in future resources for the education sector. Combined with a potential rapid demand for an increase in recurrent expenditure associated with the expansion of the primary education sub-sector, it is highly probable that budgetary requirements for the education sector would call for continued donor support for the medium to long term.

.....

Links of proposed program to activities and costs: The Core Document, including the Log Frame, provides a comprehensive overview of HMG/N's EFA program which donors will be requested to support. Thus the costs that will be financed by donors will need to be allocated by objective and the component investments that will support achievement of the objectives. However, the team has found somewhat weak links between the objectives, proposed strategies, inputs, processes and costs. A stronger relationship among them is essential in order to appraise the program. An initial framework for consideration to do so may be found in Annex III, Table 1. This table seeks to align activities and costs with program objectives. This makes it possible to determine if the inputs planned for a given objective add up to a "holistic" strategy, and also to assess government priorities across objectives as measured by levels of funding. For example, the objectives, as in BPEP II, are to: (i) improve access for all children, especially socially, economically, ethnically or linguistically disadvantaged; (ii) improve the quality of teaching and learning, and the schooling environment; and (iii) strengthen education management and institutional development to improve service delivery. However, the strategies, components and inputs do not always have a direct bearing on these objectives which may require explanations as to how they would be implemented. The third objective of improving Management and Institutional Capacity Building is not included in the six components listed on page 11 of the Core Document, although there are activities embedded across the document.

Literacy and Non-formal education. Furthermore, the literacy and non-formal education programs are listed as a component and costed, but there has been little elaboration on lesson learned from the current programs, how they are functioning, how they relate to the overall program objectives, and how they will be managed and monitored. For equity purposes, it is essential that these programs are needs-based rather than initiated to meet quotas. Furthermore, the mission believes this activity could be implemented by entering into partnerships with NGOs and CBOs to ensure relevance to local communities. The mission endorses the principles with regard to literacy and non-formal education identified in the Core Document.

Table 1 has been built initially from the "Assumptions Behind Financial Projection" in the Core Document. In addition, we have reviewed the Log Frame to identify other investments that HMGN may wish donors to finance, but are not included in the "Assumptions." These include: (i) Literacy Campaigns; (ii) Language of Instruction strategies; (iii) Cultural Diversity; and (iv) Grants to Community Schools (with the exception of the 1,500 schools covered under the Community Schools Support Project). There may be other such investments.

Monitoring indicators: The Core Document has elaborated on outcome indicators to be monitored at the program's end, which are the 18 EFA indicators. However, process program indicators are still missing. For grasping the real situation of Nepal's education system, process indicators could be created to reflect the Nepalese context, both education and local government, and set intermediate benchmarks to be measured

annually. One possibility would be to develop a list of indicators based on selected EFA Fast Track Initiative (FTI) Indicators.³

Cross cutting issues: The Core Document articulates commendable principles to guide implementation and monitoring of the program including (i) pro-poor; (ii) decentralization; (iii) transparency and good governance; (iv) gender focus and (v) equity. It highlights the need for, *inter alia*, better flow of information from the center to the districts and schools, mobilization, forming community groups, developing appropriate regulatory frameworks, social auditing, better monitoring, media campaigns. However, the documents do not explicitly describe how these will be implemented or financed, who will be responsible, what training is required, or when it will be done. The mission suggests that MOES and the DOE consult across central level institutions, agencies and other ministries, and with all DEOs to request their input on developing specific strategies and accountabilities for implementing these principles.

Unanswered Issues: In addition to the above observations, the joint team found some areas which require clarification or for which there are no clear strategies, activities, or budget to support the stated intent. These include:

-
- Policies mentioned in core document which are not addressed in “components” or activities (e.g.: block grants, textbook choice, increased days and time on task, etc.).
 - Policies in place, but not yet effectively implemented (increasing female teachers, free textbooks).
 - How will public-CBO-NG- private partnerships be established, for what and why?
 - Policies which require agreement from the Ministries of Planning and Finance (additional teacher posts given cap on creation of posts).
 - Various activities are included in the Core Document with insufficient information on how they will contribute to quality, access and equity concerns (e.g. income generation, computers in schools, conflict and disaster fund, international training of teachers and other education officials).
 - What are donors being asked to finance and how? This requires an integrated table. The composition of the budget allocations on pages 24-26 are not clear: what items? A conceptual framework for integrating all public and donor financing for consideration is attached in Annex IV.
 - How are activities and the budget heads allocated to VDCs and VECs going to be distributed and implemented in their absence?
 - What is the role of the Regional Education Directorates? There is only budget for civil works, not management or monitoring.

³ These include government revenues as a proportion of GDP; share of education spending of the government recurrent budget; share of primary education of total recurrent spending on education; average teacher salary; pupil: teacher ratio; non-salary share of total recurrent spending on education for quality inputs and processes; average repetition rate.

- Are there alternative options for civil works in terms of school construction models which may be more locally appropriate, cost effective and low maintenance (while still being earthquake resistant)?

Miscellaneous recommendations:

- The composition and purpose of the Program Executive Board and Program Management Committee might be reviewed and assessed for impact and effectiveness in sub-sector coordination
- There should also be parallel or similar committees at the district level

IV. Critical Issues For Development Partners, To Be Determined

Donor financing modalities: Once the program is agreed, donor agencies, with their respective management, will need to agree amongst themselves and discuss with government, including MOES, Finance and Planning, various financing options. As indicated, there are several financing modes available. The mission welcomes the flexibility presented in the Core Document.

Cost assumptions: Donors require the spreadsheets to better understand the assumptions and aggregated cost basis. At present, it appears too centrally determined. Are they based on population? Disadvantage? District Education Plans? How are issues of equity taken into consideration?

Procurement and Financial Management: In order to simplify procurement procedures, the team proposes to review government's new rules and procedures.⁴ The paramount concern of all is to ease the cumbersome processing requirements and to use government's own systems to the extent possible. Financial Management processes to ensure transparent use of funds will also be assessed.

Harmonizing donor TA and other procedures: Donors have agreed to further discuss ways to continue working together in order to ensure coordinated financing and other input to the basic education sub-sector. A draft proposal on the mechanisms will be circulated and discussed prior to appraisal.

V. Way Forward

As stated above, the Core Document has a well articulated vision and strategy. It appears to contain elements to support good implementation of a system moving towards decentralization. However, the third objective of Building Management and Institutional Capacity needs to be separated and articulated better in order to develop a solid management and institutional development plan for program financing and implementation. If decentralization is a major vehicle for achieving EFA goals, the role of central agencies must change to support policy, financing, planning and monitoring of district level activities. The same is true at the district level. The mission understands

⁴ For IDA, this would include reviewing the extent to which the procedures have been adjusted taking last year's Country Procurement Assessment Review (CPAR) by the Bank.

that the HRD plan currently being finalized takes this into account. Furthermore, clear management roles and accountabilities need to be articulated for each component and activity. For example, who is responsible for distribution and monitoring of block grants? Who is responsible for resource mapping to ensure equity at the central, district and subdistrict level? How will these be monitored? Who is accountable for assessing the SIPs? Providing support to SMCs? Teachers? And so forth. The Core Document states that these will be done, there is no indication by when or by whom. In order to appraise the program, management roles and accountabilities will have to be articulated and assigned.

The mission requests that the MOES provide additional documentation to facilitate a speedy and effective appraisal and program launch. Details on additional information required for appraisal may be found in below. Local donor agencies are prepared to assist the MOES as requested and appropriate.

Before Appraisal

- On policies for teachers, MOES may clarify with the Ministries of Finance and Planning the issue of the creation of new teaching posts
- MOES should estimate the number of new teachers required by the EFA program assuming effective redeployment of teachers.
- Clarify policies not addressed in components (e.g. block grants, textbook choice, increased school days and time-on-task) as well as policies in place but not yet implemented (e.g. increased recruitment of female teachers, free textbooks)
- From further economic and financial analysis, develop alternative scenarios for financial sustainability
- Specify the procedure for improving the flow of funds from center to schools Create a plan for improving the flow of funds from center to schools
- Inform the donors regarding the inclusion of the community schools program in requests for donor support
- Prepare for the donors a detailed and disaggregated cost analysis for the program as a whole
- Develop a plan for allocation of donor financing following the format in Annex 4
- Provide additional justification for the following programs: income generation, computers in schools, conflict and disaster funds and international training of teachers/education officials
- Analyze lessons learned regarding SIP, inclusive education pilots, literacy, non-formal education, scholarships, construction, ECD, teacher training and monitoring and prepare appropriate strategies for improvement and expansion.
- Strengthen current processes for consultation with groups at risk, district officials, CBOs and NGOs to determine effectiveness of interventions so far and strategies for the future

Before Project Launch

- Articulate the phasing plan for transferring 8000 schools to community management
- Develop a scheme for Government supervision and monitoring of the program
- Create more appropriate benchmarks for ongoing monitoring of indicators
- Develop targeted strategies for scholarships, increased enrolment of disadvantaged groups, community mobilisation, use of M/T in instruction and ECD

- Review the existing textbook distribution arrangements and make necessary improvements.
- Define clearly the role of Regional Education Directorates in the program
- Review options for classroom construction to allow for local variations
- Develop a holistic strategy for improving the quality of classroom teaching and learning within the program to include basic needs of schools and clearly defined roles for RCs and RPs
- Develop new modalities for establishing partnerships with CBOs and NGOs in program planning, implementation and monitoring

Perceptions of Stakeholders on Strengths and Weaknesses of BPEP

Strengths

- Bringing “program” into the mainstream (establishing DOE, money through system)
- Capacity of staff built
- Infrastructure
- Introduction of participatory planning process
- Participation of communities up
- Awareness of the importance of quality
- Successes of some pilot initiatives

Weaknesses

- Too little impact at the class and school level
- Lack of transparency
- Too little information regarding distribution of resources, program objectives, policies and procedures)
- Too much centralized procurement
- Releases of funds and other resources delayed
- Governance of SMCs: not always “right minded people”
- Teacher qualifications, recruitment process
- Lack of follow-up to training and other activities

Challenges Facing Implementation of the Nepal Education For All Program 2004-09

Decentralization: General

- Continued issues with centralized planning and procurement, e.g.: facilities design expensive, not locally appropriate, inflexible for changing needs and multigrade context
- Flow of funds: “decentralized” has become complex, releases delayed, textbooks, SIP 50% funded, female teachers salaries, scholarships, etc
- SIP/Bottom-up Planning: schools engaged, but expectations not being met, need for support and training
- Need to understand what SIP means: funding? plan? paper exercise?
- SIP interpretation: Access, Quality, Management?

Decentralization: Transferred Community Schools

- Mixed understandings due to lack of information at school and district levels: extremes of capacity
- At school level, confusion about role of SMC, its governance and composition
- Insecurity among teachers
- Differentiated training and support requirements
- Incentive grants not delivered

Quality

- Wide range of definition of quality: good classroom, teacher, materials, success rate
- Funds for quality improvement used for physical facilities
- Too little feedback to schools and teachers on achievement
- Linear concept of quality which hampers a holistic effort in quality improvement: Quality of teaching and learning process not adequately emphasized
- Continued poor learning environment and teacher-centered instruction

Marginalized/Special Focus Groups

- Definition of ‘dalit’ and ‘disadvantaged’ missing at local level
- Not addressed fully: more than scholarships
- SMC and teaching force composition
- Questions about who is responsible for ensuring participation, attendance, mobilization of all
- Attitude of some teachers, headmasters, SMCs: teacher training does not address issues
- No real incentives to get children into schools

- Too little monitoring
- Lessons: need to analyze and scale up successes, eg: language of instruction, dalit involvement, gender, children with disabilities, working children

Indicative List of Cross-cutting Issues

- Transparency
- Need for consultation, ensuring understanding of expectations
- Flow of funds
- Decision-making processes for funding SIPs, distribution of resources and scholarships
- Selection of RPs
- Monitoring of resources not effective
- Known “corruption,” misuse of resources, which needs to be more fully addressed in the Core Document and during implementation

Roles and Accountabilities

- Common question: whose responsibility is it? Unanswered. Often different. Need for incentives.
- Less change than anticipated in gender dimensions
- Technical or Administrative responsibilities of DOE, DEO, RPs
- How is the program implemented in the absence of VDCs and VECs?

Table 1: Consolidation of Program Development Investments and Costs by Program Objectives (Note: inclusion in this Table does not imply donor approval)

Bold = in Core Document but not costed

Program Objectives	Activities	Quantity	Unit Cost (NRs)	Total Cost (NRs)
Ensuring Access and Equity	ECD expansion matching fund	?	30,000	
	ECD support to poorest districts	?	500,000	
	Scholarships for out of school children	?	500	
	Classroom rehabilitation	20,000	25,000	
	School environment improvement	7,500	50,000	
	School Maintenance Grants	25,000	11,000	
	Classroom construction	10,000	275,000	
	Hostel construction	10	10,000,000	
	Annual support for enrolled children with disabilities	Unit?	8,000	
	Parental education, annually each district	375	100,000	
	Motivators (1 per 4 schools), monthly	?	8,000	
	Relief for districts affected by conflict/disaster	?	100,000	
	Scholarships for enrolled disadvantaged students/HIV	375	8,000	
	Flexible schooling scholarships, annually	?	2,400	
	Alternative schooling scholarships, annually	?	2,400	
	Primary school nutrition program	?	?	
	Non-formal schooling scholarships	?	1,600	
	Income generation program, annually	5 years	12,500,000	
	Scholarships for poor and girls, annually	?	350	
	Community Learning Centers	205	80,000	
	Literacy campaigns			Total

Enhancing Quality and Relevance	ECD center quality grants Per child allocation, annually (to schools? Children?) Free textbooks, annually per child Teacher support material, annually Curriculum research, annually Per student assessment/activity grant Teacher certificate training, annually per teacher Teacher recurrent training, annually Teacher higher education, annually Grants to schools for computers, solar, library annually Teaching/learning materials, annually per child Local language instruction Cultural diversity	? ? ? ? 5 years ? 60,000 ? 4000 10,000 ?	5,000 200 100 100 5,000,000 75 20,000 2,000 200,000 150,000 10	total
Improving Efficiency and Institutional Capacity	Annual SIP/VEP and MIS preparation, each school DEO, RED and TRO offices construction DEO, RED and TRO furniture Resource Center construction RC furniture sets Annual central agency maintenance Operating costs Gender mainstreaming of educational personnel, annually Gender mainstreaming of teachers Annual planning and management training for VEC/SMC, per person Orientation/experienced sharing workshops for stakeholders International/national exchange program National/international degree program for managers, annually per manager International short-term training for managers, annually Grant to schools for supervision and monitoring, annually Grant to districts for research and innovation, annually Central research and development Grants to community schools SIP Grants	? 21 21 300 300 5 years 5 years 5 years 5 years 5 years 156,000 100,000 750 150 600 ? 375 5 years	1,500 10,000,000 ? 1,300,000 ? 3,000,000 20,000,000 500,000 2,000,000 3,000 500 50,000 1,000,000 200,000 700 100,000 1,000,000	total

Indicative Framework for Analyzing Expenditure and Financing Requirements**

Program Expenditure Needs	Financing of Expenditure																	
	HMG/N MOES	MOES and Other Line Ministries and 1.5% district revenue	Project Donors (Earmarked Funds)					Financing Gap = Expenditure Needs – (HMG/N + Project Donors Contributions)	Program Donors to Finance Gap (Program Support)									
			Donor A	Donor B	Donor C	Donor D	E		IDA	Donor A	Donor D	Donor Y						
I. Salaries	XXX																	
II. Non-salary recurrent	XXX																	
III. Development Program:	XXX																	
A. Textbooks	XXX		BBB															
B. Scholarships				CCC	DDD													
C. Civil Works		AAA																
D. Furniture		AAA		CCC														
E. Stationary																		
F. Toilets	XXX					DDD												
G. Water Supply	XXX			CCC	DDD													
H. Teacher Training				CCC														
I. Community Mobilization	XXX		BBB				EEE											
J. ECD		AAA	BBB				EEE											
K. Etc							EEE											
Total	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total											

** This does not assume what financing modalities will be used, i.e.: reimbursement on SOEs or disbursing a percentage of overall expenditure