



# General Assembly

Distr.: General  
23 July 2004

Original: English

---

## Fifty-ninth session

Item 117 of the provisional agenda\*

### Joint Inspection Unit

## **Report of the Joint Inspection Unit entitled “Achieving the universal primary education goal of the Millennium Declaration: new challenges for development cooperation**

### **Note by the Secretary-General**

#### **Addendum**

The Secretary-General has the honour to transmit, for the consideration of the members of the General Assembly, his comments, and those of the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination, on the report of the Joint Inspection Unit entitled “Achieving the universal primary education goal of the Millennium Declaration: new challenges for development cooperation (JIU/REP/2003/5).

---

\* A/59/150.

**Comments of the Secretary-General, and those of the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination, on the report of the Joint Inspection Unit entitled “Achieving the universal primary education goal of the Millennium Declaration: new challenges for development cooperation” (JIU/REP/2003/5)\***

*Summary*

The report of the Joint Inspection Unit entitled “Achieving the universal primary education goal of the Millennium Declaration: new challenges for development cooperation” is intended to complement the monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of the goals set in the United Nations Millennium Declaration in the field of education. It examines whether the necessary conditions are in place, or are likely to be forthcoming, that would enable the primary education goals of the Millennium Declaration to be achieved by the target date of 2015, including the elimination, by that date, of gender disparity in the access to all levels of education.

The report cautions that the Millennium Declaration goals on primary education may not be met by 2015, unless the international community fulfils its pledges at the World Education Forum in Dakar in 2000 to provide adequate resources, and Governments give the necessary priority to national education commensurate with their international commitments. It calls attention to the fact that while some countries have made progress, many others, particularly the least developed countries, are seriously off track. Apart from demonstrating the acute lack of funding, the report argues that the quality of partnership arrangements between the donor community and the developing countries will be a significant factor in the achievement of the primary education goals of the Millennium Declaration.

Members of the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination (CEB) appreciate the comprehensive information as well as the analytical value of the report, and note that it touches on a number of policy and programme issues that represent not only challenges and opportunities within the environment of the United Nations system, the public and private sectors and the donor community, but also real impediments to the achievement of the goal of universal primary education. While CEB members are in broad agreement with the findings and conclusions of the report, they find that some of the recommendations tend to be too broad, whereas others need clarification or refocusing. Nevertheless, from a system-wide perspective, CEB members endorse the need for greater cohesiveness and more sharing and learning among the organizations of the system, to ensure a truly concerted effort to achieve the education goals of the Millennium Declaration. They also find the report to be timely in raising the various issues concerning primary education in view of the forthcoming comprehensive review of the implementation of the Millennium Declaration by the General Assembly in 2005.

---

\* The report included the following notation on its inside cover: “The Inspectors examined the report in conformity with provisions outlined in paragraph 11.2 of the statute of the JIU and agreed that this report should be regarded as being issued under the sole responsibility of Inspector Doris Bertrand.”

## **I. Introduction**

1. The report of the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) entitled “Achieving the universal primary education goal of the Millennium Declaration: new challenges for development cooperation” (JIU/REP/2003/5) reviews the progress of global efforts, inter alia, by the concerned organizations of the United Nations system, in the implementation of the two goals on education among the Millennium Development Goals, namely, to “ensure that, by 2015, children everywhere, boys and girls alike, will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling” and to “eliminate gender disparity in primary and secondary education, preferably by 2005, and at all levels of education no later than 2015”. The report’s assessment of the implementation strategies for the education goals goes beyond a purely “economic” framework, includes the analysis of issues of equity as well as efficiency, and focuses on evidence-based policy development. It points to the 2005 gender parity goal as the first test of credibility of the international community, and falls back on the use of household survey data to complement administrative statistics.

## **II. Overall comments**

2. The members of the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination (CEB) appreciate the analytical value of the JIU report, the comprehensive information presented therein and the assessment of progress in the area of primary education from the different perspectives of the organizations of the United Nations system. They welcome the detailed study of the practical realities, the challenges and the difficulties of generating government commitment, realigning donor priorities and ensuring greater cooperation across the United Nations system for the implementation of the education goals of the United Nations Millennium Declaration (see General Assembly resolution 55/2).

3. CEB members generally concur with the main conclusion of the report that unless adequate funding is assured and the commitments of Governments at Dakar 2000 are delivered, the primary education goals of the Millennium Declaration may not be met. They agree that, on the part of the United Nations system, greater emphasis on inter-agency cohesion and coordination at the policy level would be indispensable to ensure that a truly concerted effort will be on the ground for the implementation of the primary education goals in the framework of the Millennium Declaration. In that connection, the report provides a good overview and inventory of the experience of the various organizations of the system that are pursuing the primary education goals.

4. In the view of CEB members, it is important to underscore the distinct contributions and the comparative advantages of the various organizations of the system in addressing universal primary education objectives, given the greatly varying relevance of the theme of primary education to individual organizations of the system. They point out that most, if not all, organizations of the United Nations system have some involvement in the broad sector of education, particularly if this includes vocational and technical training or higher education. However, in such a broader context, the problematique of policy formulation and development cooperation is very different and the range of issues considerably larger than when the focus is only on primary education. CEB members also note that the report makes no reference to the role of the regional commissions, and to the value of

comparability among developing regions (and not just among countries) in primary education.

5. CEB members note the frequent use of the generic term “education” in the body of the report and in some of the recommendations. In this regard, they observe that this could lead readers to think that the scope of the report might be broader than the one intended (as clearly stated in the executive summary and the introduction of the report) which was to address the practical problems encountered and possible solutions in the implementation of the international goals linked to primary education. Thus, it is not clear how the analysis and findings in the report could lead to valid assertions and recommendations, unless the use of the generic term “education” should always be taken to mean primary education.

6. The report was received with mixed reactions, and to aspects extending beyond the broad analytical framework, particularly as regards the seemingly open-ended scope of the study and the lack of focus of some of the recommendations. CEB members note, for example, the confusion that arises when the analysis of the process of implementation of the education goals of the Millennium Declaration, as well as some of the recommendations in the report, are extended to encompass broader issues, such as: monitoring the implementation of the Millennium Development Goals in general, the use of country exercises like the Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) and the common country assessments (CCAs), capacity-building in a general sense, improved aid modalities, enhanced financial flows to development, or effective poverty alleviation policies. As regards the last-mentioned issue, some members of CEB point out that, although improving education and alleviating poverty are interlinked and often treated as relevant components of integrated approaches, focusing on the overall goal of poverty eradication itself goes beyond the purpose of the report, making it rather unwieldy.

7. With respect to recommendations 2 (second part), 5, 7 (first part), 9 and 10, which extend into much broader conceptual aspects of international relations that are of great importance and topical interest, members of CEB feel that these fall outside the report’s intended scope and are unsubstantiated by its contents.

8. The report’s analysis of the role and limitations of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) vis-à-vis the Dakar Framework for Action on Education for All adopted at the World Education Forum<sup>1</sup> appears to be fair and rational. Yet, some of the critical observations and recommendations appear to be inconsistent. For instance, the report recognizes that the limitations of UNESCO in its lead role in EFA are due to “an obvious lack of resources which impacts on its field presence” (executive summary, para. I), yet this observation did not result in an appeal to increase those resources; instead, the report recommends seeking greater involvement of the wider United Nations system (the General Assembly, CEB, the Economic and Social Council, etc.) in EFA-related tasks. While this wider system involvement may add profile to EFA and help in better integrating it with the Millennium Development Goals, it could lead to a marginalization of the role of UNESCO rather than to a strengthening of its capacity for carrying out that role.

9. CEB members support the emphasis placed in the report on the urgent need to improve data on primary education, particularly for monitoring progress in a way that is comparable internationally. Some members of CEB point out that, in their experience, equal emphasis needs to be given to building national capacity to collect

as well as to utilize this type of information. Other members of CEB caution, however, that it is the ineffectiveness of institutions, particularly those concerned with the implementation of policy, as much as, if not more than, the lack of information alone, that explains the lack of progress. CEB members observe that certain processes are already under way to increase the quality of statistical data on primary education (as well as in the other areas covered by the Millennium Development Goals), and measures are being taken to strengthen capacities in various countries for data collection and monitoring. The report would have been more useful if examples of these efforts to improve education data had been developed to illustrate what seems to work and could be replicated, or to explain why some of the initiatives undertaken have not yielded anticipated outcomes.

10. CEB members also note that while the report highlights the need for monitoring and enhancing the quality of primary education, only a passing reference is made to the need for training of teachers, especially in countries that have lost skilled teachers to the scourge of HIV/AIDS.

11. While CEB members are generally satisfied with the emphasis placed in the report on gender perspectives of primary education, it is felt that this could be further strengthened, in particular in the context of specific recommendations. They strongly believe that gender-specific data could be critical for capturing the reality of girls' enrolment, retention and completion rates, as well as permit evaluation, monitoring and capacity-building efforts that elaborate gender perspectives. Furthermore, CEB notes that, inasmuch as girls' enrolment and retention rates are consistently lower than those of boys in the majority of countries, special attention needs to be paid to the underlying causes of this inequality, and recommendations should be proposed to develop actions, policies and strategies focusing on them.

12. As regards the out-of-school population, CEB members reiterate the importance of accurate information on the reasons that children fail to enrol, or drop out of school. Whatever the merits, or otherwise, of administrative data as the primary basis for determining certain key indicators of progress towards the goals of EFA (and the Millennium Development Goals, for that matter), it is clearly necessary to turn to other data sources, such as population-based surveys, for insight about the out-of-school population. In addition, recalling that many studies have concluded that at least 50 per cent of children out of school are from areas affected by conflict or crisis, the members of CEB stress that a major thrust of international efforts should be directed towards the education of children affected by crises or post-conflict situations, thus mainstreaming primary educational support in complex emergencies into international assistance programmes. Also, in the context of promoting peace and security for development, CEB members stress that education should be recognized as a core constituent of child protection, and that protection issues should be reflected in national primary education policies, as well as in the response strategies of the international community.

13. CEB members express concern that the report did not examine in detail the education programme being implemented by the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA), especially since this is a major investment costing some US\$ 180 million per year, involving over 650 schools and some 17,000 UNRWA employees, and serving some 500,000 pupils.

14. In addition, in the context of the work of both UNRWA and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), CEB members call for

greater advocacy to be directed towards Governments of countries hosting refugees to ensure that these countries meet their obligations as regards the education of refugees within their borders.

15. CEB members note that, although there is considerable emphasis in the report on increasing official development assistance (ODA) for primary education, emphasis is lacking on the efficient use of existing funds. They support the report's emphasis on the need to monitor the sustainability and effectiveness of those projects already on the ground, geared towards the achievement of the primary education goals of the Millennium Declaration. In addition, CEB members observe that the report could have presented a more balanced view of bilateral assistance, noting especially the positive initiatives undertaken, for example, by Nordic countries and the Department for International Development of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, to "untie" aid in the primary education sector. They also point out that more emphasis should have been given to the mobilization of private funds.

### III. Comments on recommendations

***Recommendation 1: UNESCO, its Executive Board and Director-General, are called upon to explore all possibilities for providing the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS) with more resources to improve further the quality of education data and enable increased investment in much needed in-country statistical capacity-building.***

***UIS should be encouraged to strengthen further its cooperation with all the institutions concerned with the collection of education data, foremost with the World Bank, the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Partnership In Statistics for Development in the Twenty-first Century (PARIS 21). They ought to undertake special efforts to arrive at a methodologically sound and reliable measure of primary completion in line with the Millennium Development Goal of universal primary completion (UPC) which would usefully complement enrolment data.***

***Completion rates, together with information regarding quality of education, would convey the gravity of the situation and of the scale of the problem, needed for accelerated remedial action*** (paras. 33-38, 77 and 135).

16. CEB members welcome the first part of this recommendation. They note, however, that since the UNESCO Institute for Statistics provides services not only to UNESCO but also to a broader group of international and bilateral organizations, the responsibility for the financing of the Institute's programmes should not be solely that of UNESCO.

17. As regards the second part of this recommendation, CEB members are of the view that the Institute's cooperation with the World Bank, UNICEF, OECD and PARIS 21 is already quite strong, and that the Institute is proactively seeking opportunities to work with the said organizations — involving them in planning, inviting them to become members of advisory committees, etc. They note that both UNICEF and the World Bank are among the key users of the Institute's data, and that the Bank collaborates with the Institute on various projects (for example,

through the World Bank's Development Grant Facility (DGF), and an agreement on the development of a proxy measure for completion rates). Moreover, CEB members highlight the fact that cooperation with OECD is one of the major components of the international joint undertakings and partnerships of the Institute.

18. As regards the third part of the recommendation concerning completion rates, CEB members are of the view that while these are a valuable complement to existing data, they are inadequate measures of both quality and efficiency. A wide range of data would be needed to obtain a balanced picture. In this connection, they note that the report fails to mention other data, for example, on class size or teacher qualifications, which help to highlight the complexity of the situation.

***Recommendation 2: The governing bodies of the various United Nations system organizations, programmes and funds should encourage the respective secretariats to report their aid activities to the Development Assistance Committee using the same format, definitions and classifications as those of the bilateral donors. This would provide a much needed global picture of aid efforts in support of the various Millennium Development Goals in general, and of EFA goals in particular, on a comparable basis. This should lead to the establishment of a robust set of data, crucially needed for EFA and Millennium Development Goal monitoring purposes.***

***In the same vein, the governing bodies of the various United Nations system organizations, programmes and funds should encourage the respective secretariats to provide them at regular intervals (at least every other year) with detailed information on how they contribute to the attainment of the various Millennium Development Goals, both as regards resource levels and categories of programme expenditure with particular emphasis on the aspect of lasting national capacity-building (paras. 42-44, 45 and 50).***

19. CEB members support the first part of this recommendation. Concerning the second part, CEB members point out that the Director-General of UNESCO includes information in his regular reports to the Executive Board on the Organization's contribution to the attainment of the Millennium Development Goals.

***Recommendation 3: In line with EFA goal 6, UNESCO, and its institutes in cooperation with other organizations such as UNICEF, should assist partner countries, upon request, in conducting assessments of learning achievements at the end of the national primary cycle and in increasing their monitoring capacity. These United Nations organizations should share knowledge, experience and lessons learned from the successful assessments undertaken. The aim in such undertakings should be to inform national policy makers, to work towards subregional, regional and cross-country comparability with a view to taking appropriate, and if necessary, corrective action. Solid knowledge of learning outcomes is necessary to improve quality of education (paras. 30-32, 75, 76, 113 and 135).***

20. While agreeing in principle with this recommendation, CEB members suggest that assessment of learning achievement should also be based on cross-nationally harmonized data on primary school achievement, which they consider important especially at the national level. They are also of the view that organizations of the United Nations system and other concerned entities should be encouraged to

conduct assessments at the end of the national primary cycle, as this will have immediate national policy relevance.

21. As regards the method used to assess learning achievement, some members of CEB express reservations about the use of test results for various reasons. First, usually what is tested is knowledge in science, mathematics and language which, while they are all important, do not reflect the broad scope of what constitutes quality education (for example, see the communiqué of the UNESCO Ministerial Round Table on Quality Education, October 2003). Second, the underlying assumption that there is agreement across countries on what constitutes quality education is debatable, as is the assumption that the tests are robust (across communities worldwide) or that they are correctly and consistently administered in all environments.

22. Some members of CEB could not agree with the assertion in the recommendation that “solid knowledge of learning outcomes is necessary to improve quality of education”. They believe that it is more logical to assert the reverse, namely, that solid knowledge of what constitutes quality education is what is needed for a better understanding of what learning outcomes should be desired, and how they should be measured.

***Recommendation 4: The General Assembly and the governing bodies of all the organizations working in education (such as the International Labour Organization, UNESCO, the United Nations Population Fund, UNHCR, UNICEF, the World Food Programme (WFP)) should ask them to intensify their cooperation in the field and increasingly consider joint monitoring and evaluation better to assess their respective contributions to the results obtained and the impact of their action. They should also recommend to the respective secretariats that they should always communicate and share information on plans for new technology prior to its introduction in order to ascertain whether additional use could render it more cost-effective. Such information exchange could usefully take place within the CEB framework. In particular, it might be useful to test the WFP ARGOS system to see whether it could take on additional tasks. This would usefully complement the activities of other United Nations system organizations concerned with education data collection (paras. 88-90, 93, 99 and 136).***

23. CEB members support, in principle, the idea of joint monitoring and evaluation of the contributions of United Nations system organizations, and the need for better communication and sharing of information among them, in regard to EFA and the Millennium Development Goals.

***Recommendation 5: With a view to increasing knowledge on empirical evidence of lessons learned, the General Assembly should task the United Nations Evaluation Group with exploring the feasibility of establishing a system-wide single platform, through which empirical evidence would be accessed by all development partners and to report to the Economic and Social Council, in charge of the review of operational activities for development, taking into account existing arrangements. This would constitute a contribution to furthering the implementation of the Millennium Declaration in general and the education and EFA goals in particular (paras. 19, 79, 113 and 137).***



24. While appreciating the intent of this recommendation, CEB members express concern that, apart from unknown cost implications, it would be necessary, first of all, to demonstrate the feasibility and cost-effectiveness of creating a single platform that could effectively integrate existing databases that are separately developed and maintained by the organizations of the system, in such a manner as would enable the pooling and sharing of information gathered from evaluations of primary educational programmes and projects supported by United Nations system organizations in developing countries. In any case, members of CEB point out that the organizations of the system are already in the process of organizing the reporting, compilation and analysis of primary education data in the context of the comprehensive review of the implementation of the Millennium Declaration in 2005.

***Recommendation 6: UNESCO, with its mandated role of coordinating EFA partners, should initiate the elaboration of a comprehensive review and evaluation strategy on the basis of a common methodology, on all activities undertaken to reach the EFA goals, such as flagship programmes, if not by all, then at least by the major external actors. This would contribute to the establishment of a much needed knowledge base on what works, why and how, and how successful interventions can be scaled up. This would also help to amend, if necessary, the “International strategy to put the Dakar Framework for Action on Education for All into operation” and provide input for the regional and international EFA evaluation conferences, planned for 2005 and 2010, respectively (paras. 19, 63-64, 68 and 138).***

25. This recommendation is acceptable, in principle. However, CEB members suggest that the proposed comprehensive review and evaluation of EFA strategies should profit from the relevant lessons learned from the experience of the EFA 2000 Assessment, which was a collaborative, inter-agency consultative forum on EFA (based in UNESCO), using expertise from organizations supporting EFA (the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), UNESCO, UNFPA, UNICEF and the World Bank). CEB members also note that the annual *EFA Global Monitoring Report* could provide a widely accessible knowledge base for EFA that can serve as a point of reference in the coordination of evaluation activities. They note that the reporting team maintains information linkages to the reporting systems for the *UNDP Human Development Report* and the *World Bank World Development Report* and other collaborative relationships such as the Millennium Development Project.

***Recommendation 7: The General Assembly and the respective governing bodies should encourage United Nations system organizations (funds, programmes and specialized agencies) to enhance interaction with the Bretton Woods institutions in the field, to implicate themselves very actively in the elaboration and implementation of country-owned Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) or equivalent processes, to improve them further to the benefit of partner countries and, in doing so, refrain from imposing separate processes on them. The linkages between the United Nations analytical planning documents, such as Common Country Assessments (CCAs) and United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks (UNDAFs) with PRSPs, national sustainable development strategies (NSDSs) or equivalent processes, should be further strengthened.***

*All organizations specifically concerned with education and active in the field should be strongly encouraged to implicate themselves even further in the elaboration of education-sector plans and to contribute to further improvement of the World Bank-led Fast-Track Initiative (FTI) as well as the Analytical Fast Track.*

26. As mentioned in the section on overall comments above, CEB members suggest that the first part of this recommendation should be clarified as to the issues addressed concerning the primary education goals of the Millennium Declaration. While PRSPs recognize the impact of education on poverty, some do so only through general policy statements as opposed to clear objectives, targets and priorities relating directly to primary education.

27. CEB members are agreeable, in principle, to the second part of the recommendation relating to the Fast-Track Initiative (FTI).

*Recommendation 8: The Economic and Social Council should decide to hold a “poverty reduction review meeting” in 2006 (or 2007) that would usefully inform the international community on progress made and help to take stock of lessons learned. It would be important to have all relevant stakeholders invited. Preparation should take place in the appropriate United Nations executive committees, created by the 1997 reform, as well as in the framework of CEB (para. 144).*

28. CEB members suggest that this recommendation (and para. 144 in the JIU report referring to it) proposing a “poverty reduction review meeting” in the Economic and Social Council in 2006 or 2007 should be further elaborated as regards the framework for the participation of the organizations of the United Nations system, and how this meeting would relate to the comprehensive review of the implementation of the Millennium Development Goals by the General Assembly in 2005.

*Recommendation 9: The General Assembly and the respective governing bodies should ask United Nations system organizations (funds, programmes and specialized agencies) and encourage bilateral donors to give increased attention to contributing to the building of macroeconomic, social and institutional as well as administrative capacities at different levels in the partner countries. This would not only strengthen partner countries’ ownership but also allow donors increasingly to channel aid through sector-wide approaches (SWAs) and budget support, which would reduce transaction costs and simplify administration. All aid projects should focus on creating and transmitting knowledge and conferring capacity on a sustainable basis. Aid projects should also be judged according to their contribution to durable in-country capacity-building; results indicators would have to reflect this. In recognizing the importance of capacity-building, the governing bodies of the United Nations system organizations concerned should monitor progress in this regard (paras. 130 and 145).*

29. CEB members note that this recommendation, and recommendation 10 below, should identify the specific issues addressed concerning capacity-building in the context of the United Nations system, and how such issues relate to aid coordination, on the one hand, and the achievement of the primary education goals of the Millennium Declaration, on the other hand.

**Recommendation 10: The Economic and Social Council, being concerned with the monitoring of operational activities for development in the United Nations system, should monitor and assess the quality of capacity-building activities, demanding relevant information from United Nations system organizations via the CEB secretariat to this effect (para. 145).**

30. The comments on recommendation 9 above also apply to this recommendation.

**Recommendation 11: The General Assembly should encourage bilateral donors to reconsider their sector allocations within ODA with a view to increasing considerably the share for education, half of which should be earmarked for primary/basic education. Particular attention should be paid to increasing aid efficiency (paras. 124, 131-132 and 146-147).**

31. This recommendation is acceptable, in principle.

**Recommendation 12: The General Assembly, which is in charge of Millennium Development Goal follow-up, should consider encouraging the extension of FTI as recommended in the report. The Director-General of UNESCO, convener of the High-level Group on EFA established by the Dakar Framework for Action, should transmit this recommendation to the Group with a view to initiating appropriate action. The lessons learned from the current World Bank-led FTI should be taken fully into account.**

**Such “country-specific education compacts” should be open to all least developed and low-income countries that are seriously committed to attaining the EFA goals and are currently off track in achieving them through their efforts alone. Such “country compacts” should ensure that the appropriate capacity-building and additional financing are forthcoming and that partner countries’ reform efforts are supported in a predictable way (paras. 118 and 148-151).**

32. CEB members note that this recommendation has already been carried out, in accordance with the decision taken at the FTI Partners’ Meeting in Oslo in November 2003 (extending the Fast-Track Initiative to all low-income countries) based on the communiqué of the second meeting of the High-level Group on EFA, held in Abuja in November 2002.

**Recommendation 13: CEB should examine the possibility of establishing an enlarged inter-agency working group, open to key partners, such as non-governmental organizations and foundations, with a view to preparing and organizing advocacy and fund-raising events in all countries along the lines recommended in the report. The departments of information and/or external relations of the various United Nations system organizations should be actively involved. Such events should aim at raising funds for education, and possibly for other Millennium Development Goals later on (para. 15).**

33. CEB members suggest that the concept of an “enlarged inter-agency working group, open to key partners” should be clarified in the context of existing inter-agency efforts in the education sector. On the face of it, an enlarged inter-agency working group may run the risk of duplicating the work of the High-level Group and the Working Group on EFA and the FTI Partners’ Group. As concerns fund-raising for education development, CEB members note that this is currently being

undertaken in the framework of existing multilateral and bilateral mechanisms, including OECD, the Group of Eight (G8) and FTI. Furthermore, they point out that organizing separate advocacy and fund-raising events for education in all countries would not appear to be desirable, given the costs and time involved.

***Recommendation 14: In monitoring the implementation of the Millennium Declaration, it is essential to explore new financing and funding avenues. The General Assembly should create a mechanism, such as a group of experts, drawn, inter alia, from the United Nations system and the Bretton Woods institutions to continue research on the new funding proposals of the report of the High-level Panel on Financing for Development (the Zedillo report) and to explore other avenues such as the International Finance Facility (IFF) and to keep the Assembly and the Economic and Social Council informed about tangible progress (paras. 130 and 156-160).***

34. While CEB members appreciate the need to increase funding support for the implementation of the primary education goals of the Millennium Declaration, they are of the view that the international community, in exploring new funding sources and avenues, should do so in a manner that does not compromise the effectiveness and impact of the existing mechanisms for coordination of EFA, especially at regional, subregional and country levels, and should be wary of creating new mechanisms or structures that place additional burdens on the capacities of developing-country Governments.

#### *Notes*

<sup>1</sup> See United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, *Final Report of the World Education Forum, Dakar, Senegal, 26-28 April 2000* (Paris, 2000).