Action Network for Early Childhood Development

Technical Consultation Report
New York, 27th – 28th June 2016

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: MAIN TAKE AWAYS

Background

An Action Network in support of Early Childhood Development (ECDAN) is being proposed to give every child a fair start to life.

Despite the continually burgeoning credible evidence in support of the early years and the inclusion of ECD in the Sustainable Development Goals, there have been shortfalls in the implementation and scale up of ECD programs. More political commitment and greater financial investment is needed to increase access to quality ECD services for caregivers and communities. A related challenge is limited public understanding of the importance of the first years of a child's life and little public demand for policies, programs and funding. Interest in early childhood development appears to be confined to scientific and technical circles, within which, while there are several players advocating for ECD, their voices and advocacy objectives are fragmented.

Urgent action is needed as millions of young children are being robbed of their childhoods and the opportunity to develop to their full potential and lead happy and productive lives.

Within the broader framework of Agenda 2030, UNICEF and the World Bank Group (WBG) convened a technical consultation, following a series of preparatory meetings with foundations and key advocacy moments, to help catalyze efforts to bring together governments and partners to achieve a set of concrete results for ECD.

- A 2-day technical consultation was held to define the results framework, core actions, country engagement, and structure for the ECD Action Network (ECDAN). It was attend by 80 participants from around the globe representing the major stakeholder groups and sectors engaged in ECD (See Annex 4 for list of participants).
- The discussions were rich, informative and engaged, culminating in the identification of areas of consensus, next steps, and issues that remained unresolved. However, the most important take away from the meeting was the high level of commitment expressed by participants across several areas of functions and in support of the ECDAN.

Consensus Areas

The ECDAN should address the main issues linked to scaling up quality ECD programmes to achieve results:

- Convene and coordinate agencies, alliances/networks at global, regional and country levels (convening and coordination function);

- Develop a common voice on ECD (advocacy and messaging function); and provide technical input to other alliances and ECD stakeholders at multiple levels including in countries;

- Prioritize engagement with parents and use of innovative approaches (potential niche area for the network);

- Create global goods (e.g. develop tools and standards of practice; use of innovation for scale, quality and efficiency; develop a go-to platform for sharing and access to information, tools, and data).

The Results Framework

The SDG objective, to *increase the percentage of children under 5 years of age who are developmentally on track in health, learning and psychosocial wellbeing* (indicator 4.2.1), was accepted with at least two

complementary targets 2.2 and 16.2. The results framework will be a global good generated by the Action Network and a significant anchor against which changes will be assessed. While the SDG targets will serve as the chapeau for the results framework, a set of more intermediate indicators, that would complement the SDG targets with additional process-related information, were accepted. The next steps will be setting up a Working Group/Task Force, which will lead the articulation and finalization of the results framework and the development of a Theory of Change for the ECDAN.

5 Core Actions

The proposed 5 core actions were accepted. For each action, the group specified what the ECDAN can do to support it. It was agreed that in the spirit of starting small, each action should focus on <u>one or two key things it will prioritize</u>

- *Action 1. Scale up of essential multi-sectoral interventions across development and humanitarian contexts*: The ECDAN can create a set of recommended and non-negotiable/essential multi-sectoral packages of interventions for both the first 1,000 days and the second 1,000 days, noting that for the second 1,000 days the recommendation would be broader than pre-primary. By creating this global good, the ECDAN will lead to better alignment among existing packages, give visibility to non-negotiable joint interventions that could serve as programmatic models, and thus address one of the key challenges to scaling up ECD. The packages would take into consideration contextually effective entry points, as that influences the scaling up approach, e.g., complementarity/coordination of services; integrated and/or additive models.

- *Action 2. Invest in and build capacity of the ECD workforce to deliver quality services*: The ECDAN can create systematic ways of leveraging and disseminating the assets of partners, and serve as a bridge to existing networks (e.g., EWEC, GPE, GPEV) in their efforts to build the capacity of the workforce in their respective sectors. The ECDAN could create a global good by defining the non-negotiables for basic requirements/qualifications for the ECD workforce.

- *Action 3. Strengthen national data and evidence on ECD*: The ECDAN can develop technical standards for global and national tools, promote the integration of data and the articulation between global/local data, including capacity building and technical support on data use for program improvement. The ECDAN can support national data platforms and also develop good practices exchange on how to strengthen national ECD measurement and monitoring.

- *Action 4. Leverage and allocate sustainable finance for equitable and affordable ECD services at the country level*: The ECDAN can lead the creation of a common framework for costing and strategic and analytical work needed to strengthen the role of innovative financing at the country level. The ECDAN could mobilize catalytic funding to then spur domestic finance.

- *Action 5. Advocacy (global & local)*: The ECDAN can create a common narrative (what is the unifying message across the SDG targets?), a series of messages and a campaign that could be used by the network and partners.

Country Engagement

The ECDAN should start small and build from there, working towards early wins. The ECDAN should map selected countries on the basis of planned and proposed investments/activities. The starting point for the engagement would be 3-5 countries where the Action Network could support multi-sectoral ECD programming, in conjunction with the World Bank 20 by 20 "Investing in the Early Years" initiative.

Structure of ECDAN

World Bank and UNICEF leadership was welcomed and the central role of WHO recognized. The founding principle for the ECDAN structure is that form will follow function. The overall structure of this Action Network should be light and nimble. A small Secretariat (with dedicated funding and staff) would be

needed to maintain the momentum and ensure coordination across the 5 actions and for country engagement.

Areas for further discussion

- Results framework is critical and requires further discussion in the short term; a Task Force should be assembled for this purpose.

- Refining the priorities under the 5 actions: a small Task Force will be needed for each action.

- While a small Secretariat is needed, its specific role, sources of funding and structure needs to be discussed with Action Network partners.

- The country engagement strategy needs to be better defined and aligned with the World Bank 20 by 20 "Investing in the Early Years" initiative.

Next Steps until December would include

- Expert Consultation Report (NYC meeting 27-28 June) to be circulated in *September.*

- 2 page Summary / Manifesto sent to all participants for endorsement in *September.*

- Mapping of countries where all partners are active/plan to be more active; a template can be developed and shared with all partners by early *September.*

- Consultations with countries over *September to October.*

- Task Forces for Results Framework and the 5 actions: issue a call for volunteers for one or two agency leads for each Task Force, in *September.* The products created by the task forces will promoting scaling up of quality programmes.

- Task Forces meet and produce a proposal that takes into consideration (i) the results of the consultations, (ii) the feedback/group work at the June 27-28 meeting, and (iii) results from consultations with country stakeholders; by *November.*

- Set up an interim small Secretariat to coordinate the next steps, led by a small executive group.

- Potential for a subsequent Action Network meeting to take stock of all the progress made across the task forces and to agree on key parameters and way forward in 2017, in *December/January.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Welcome & Opening Remarks

➢ Ted Chaiban (Director, Program Division, UNICEF)
➢ Amit Dar (Director, Strategy and Operations, Human Development Vice Presidency, World Bank)

Ted Chaiban and Amit Dar opened the meeting on behalf of their respective agencies, as co-conveners of this technical consultation. After welcoming participants and expressing enthusiasm for and commitment to the emerging Action Network, **Ted Chaiban** noted that the SDGs placed more emphasis on multi-stakeholder partnerships. Referring to existing partnerships in stunting and in social protection, he said, "when we all started rowing in the same direction, there was take-off." Ted recommended we keep the Action Network light in terms of global level infrastructure and focus on the country-level and existing mechanisms for delivery. He challenged participants to identify together the potential value-add of the Action Network, and how it might connect to existing work in nutrition, education, health and protection.

Amit Dar also expressed the World Bank enthusiasm for and commitment to the emerging Action Network, and the importance of the partnership with UNICEF. He noted that when World Bank President Jim Kim refers to 'stunting,' he is talking about much more than chronic malnutrition. He is talking about stunted brain development and about sub-optimal development across the physical, cognitive, and socio-emotional domains. Amit reinforced that the Action Network should be designed to complement existing partnerships and mechanisms, and push for a broad approach to ECD to ensure that all young children reach their full potential in life.

Overview of key issues and objectives for the meeting

➢ Pia Britto (Senior Advisor, Chief Early Childhood Development Section, UNICEF)
➢ Sophie Naudeau (Senior Education Specialist & Global Lead for ECD, World Bank)

Pia Britto laid out 4 challenges for taking ECD to scale in the SDG era, around which the technical consultation was constructed: (i) rally around a core set of results, (ii) define what actions we can take, at both the country and global levels, (iii) define a value proposition around how to engage with countries, (iv) start to think how we might organize ourselves (the 'how') around a framework for action. The ethos and intent of the meeting was to discuss those challenges in a collaborative manner, recognizing diversity in perspectives and individual agency agendas, yet at the same time working towards a higher collaborative ambition of accelerating results for the youngest children.

Sophie Naudeau reinforced 3 points from Ted and Amit's opening remarks: (i) this is not conceived as a UNICEF/World Bank partnership, but as a broad network, (ii) this meeting is one step in a process, (iii) coordination structures for the Action Network should not be heavy at the global level. Sophie reflected that success for her for the two days would be that everyone feels open in making contributions, that consensus is reached in some areas, and that we identify areas where we still need answers and collective work.

Results Framework for ECDAN

The overall vision over the next 15 years is to *increase the percentage of children under 5 years of age who are developmentally on track in health, learning and psychosocial wellbeing* (indicator 4.2.1). The Action Network aims to monitor and track actualization of this vision through a results framework (to be implemented over a 3 to 5 year period), which complements the existing partnerships and networks. This session included two presentations:

Options for Indicators and Estimated Baselines (World Bank)
This presentation provided the outline for the results framework with accompanying indicators and baseline targets. The results framework draws its inspiration from targets 2.2 (nutrition/stunting), 4.2 (education/ECD); and 16.2 (Child protection/end violence). While these targets are the chapeau for the results framework, it also links to more intermediate indicators that would complement the SDG targets with additional process-related information. The presentation also addressed key questions around reasons to focus on stunting, estimated progress that could be achieved, and estimated costs.

The proposed SDG targets and indicators are:
- Increase the percentage of children under 5 years of age who are developmentally on track in health, learning and psychosocial wellbeing (indicator 4.2.1).
    - Indicator: Percentage of parents and caregivers engaged in early stimulation and early learning activities at home.
    - Indicator: Percentage of children with access to at least one year of quality pre-primary education (1 year before official primary entry age).
- End all forms of malnutrition, including achieving by 2025 the internationally agreed targets on stunting and wasting in children under five years of age (Target 2.2).
    - Indicator: Percentage of children under-five stunted.
- End abuse, exploitation, trafficking and all forms of violence and torture against children (Target 16.2).
    - Indicator: Percentage of children aged 1-4 years who experienced any physical punishment and/or psychological aggression by caregivers in the past month.

The proposed supplementary indicators are:
- *Caregiver engagement in early stimulation, such as:*
    - Percentage of children age 36-59 months with whom an adult has engaged in four or more activities to promote learning and school readiness in the last 3 days.
- *Availability of services, such as*:
    - Percentage of families with children under 5 that have access to social safety net programs.
- *Financing for ECD, such as*:
    - Government expenditure on pre-primary as a percentage of GDP.

Linkages with SDG target development process (UNICEF)
Given the chapeau of the SDG targets and indicators, a complementary presentation was made on the SDG indicator framework, with specific reference to 4.2, as the apex target for the Action Network. The aim of this presentation was to provide background on the interagency process and expert group engaged in the SDG indicator development and selection process, share updates on the current status of the indicator framework and inclusion of 4.2.1, and provide information on additional indicators that could be used to support the targets proposed in the results framework. The presentation also provided detailed information on the development process of the ECDI in the MICS, country support for tracking and progress towards achieving results.

The plenary discussion raised a number of important perspectives:

- Clearer definitions of the indicators: there is a need to define 'developmentally on track' for the Action Network's agenda; the definition of pre-primary needs to be standardized internationally (through the outcome indicator?); parenting and childcare programs, not just pre-primary, need to be included.

- Alignment among indicators in the results framework: For example, stunting as an indicator is being measured in almost every country and there is a demand for it and stunting maps onto children's development and cognition.

- Inclusion of all populations: need to include children with developmental delays/disabilities; prioritize efforts to include younger children (age span of 0-3 years); better attention to children in humanitarian contexts, such as refugee children.

- Setting technical standards for quality of data: There was acknowledgement that more work needs to be done on collecting quality data (e.g. on primary care); and how can the Action Network increase the number of countries collecting quality data by providing technical assistance etc.; need to test and validate indicators to strengthen capacity building and data collection considering that it is not recommended to change the indicator in the middle of a goal; in setting technical standards it will be important to consider what is feasible to measure right now? What is relevant to measure? (From country and global perspectives) What work is required to measure?

- Additional indicators on process and inputs: identifying key interventions and monitoring them should be a part of the results framework (e.g. breastfeeding, parenting programs); Other indicators to consider: sector specific workforce capacity (e.g. training); supervisor quality, rigorous standards; think in terms of supply and demand side for indicators of each of the 5 Actions. These indicators also link to Action 3 on national data and evidence platforms.

The Results Framework will be a global good generated by the Action Network and a significant anchor against which changes will be assessed. The next steps will be setting up a Working Group/Task Force who will lead the articulation and finalization of the results framework and the development of a Theory of Change for the ECDAN.

ECDAN and Related Strategies and Networks

Given the objective of the Action Network is to link with other existing partnerships and networks to achieve results for children, the goal of this session, moderated by **Shaheen Kassim-Lakha** (Director of International Programs, Conrad N. Hilton Foundation) was to leverage the linkages and learn from the experiences of these networks. The panelists, **Meera Shekar**, Global Lead for Nutrition at the World Bank, speaking on SUN, **Etienne Franca**, Advocacy & Communications, Every Woman Every Child, **Sarah Stevenson**, Consultant, Global Partnership to End Violence against Children, and **Maniza Ntekim** (Senior Program Officer, OSF, speaking on GPE from the floor) shared key lessons learned by their organizations/initiatives, particularly with respect to stakeholder/ country level engagement and governance. The session also enabled an understanding of the potential synergies between the Action Network and the above-mentioned initiatives.

Main highlights of the session:

Nutrition Initiatives
Lessons learned:
- It takes time to build these kind of initiatives (e.g. SUN was able to reach 57 countries after 6 years).

- It is key to put countries at the heart of the strategy and bring together key stakeholders (e.g. donors; CSOs; private sector; academia, networks).

- GFF and Power of Nutrition are good examples of innovative financing mechanisms that aim to leverage resources in order to support the nutrition agenda.

Potential synergies with the Action Network:
- Advocacy space ('whole child' approach).

- Policy dialogue at country level in order to bring the same messages to different sectors; "co-locate" programs that leverage all the different workforces available.

EWEC:
Lessons learned:
- Countries already have their own agendas – we should learn from what governments consider important.

- Balancing views (government agencies with their own agendas and funding). The movement created a neutral platform for more synergic cost effective work.

- Keep organizational structure light.

- Link with the other strategies for integrated messaging, and insert messages at programmatic and advocacy level (make it more simple to convey SDG agendas).

- Advocacy can be the way to integrate all the action areas.

Potential synergies with the Action Network:
- The Action Network can help EWEC to push the Thrive agenda.

- The Action Network could support efforts to build the capacity of the workforce in the respective sectors, in order to ensure that they include ECD concepts/key messages in their trainings. This approach could be the bridge between the Action Network and other related initiatives.

Global Partnership to End Violence – GPEV:
Lessons learned:
- It is important to have a lean and nimble governance structure (e.g. this initiative has 2 co-chairs UNICEF/ WHO – hosted by secondment).

- It is helpful to obtain expert advice on how to set up the right governance structure. GPEV set up a rolling Board and an Executive Committee, and working groups with exact delivery timeline.

- The country selection process adhered to the principle of universality. It created a 'Pathfinder Countries' engagement strategy (including set criteria, and requiring assignment of a focal point to work on a country level plan/letter of intent from a relevant Ministry).

- The initiative provides technical guidance and support to 'Pathfinder Countries' (e.g. inspire package).

- SDG 16.2 helped to mobilize political will, while the results framework will help to mobilize funding and engage with 'Pathfinder Countries.'

Potential synergies with the Action Network:

- The GPEV is very keen to link to other related initiatives such as the Action Network, in order to achieve their impact level results. Parenting as a strategy represents the common space between the ECD Action Network and GPEV.

Examples of innovative approaches to support multi-stakeholder initiatives:
As explained by Maniza Ntekim, a group of foundations (e.g. OSF, Elma, Dubai Cares, etc.) have recently come together in order to boost the Global Partnership for Education's capacity to deliver results on early

learning (e.g. research on 'what works', technical support to countries that want to add early learning into their grant applications, advocacy activities with bilateral members). We hope that lessons learned from this initiative will be shared with the ECDAN and linkages created in the near future.

5 Actions of ECDAN

Presentation

Peter Colenso (Senior Consultant) facilitated this session, given his key involvement and guidance of the consultative process.

To achieve the results, 5 core actions are being proposed:
- Scale up of essential multi-sectoral interventions across development and humanitarian contexts.

- Invest in and build capacity of the ECD workforce to deliver quality services.

- Strengthen national data and evidence on ECD.

- Leverage and allocate sustainable finance for equitable and affordable ECD services at the country level.

- Advocacy (global & local).

These actions have emerged as a result of the review of the challenges of going to scale with ECD. The 5 actions were endorsed during a preparatory meeting with foundations, with a clear recommendation to detail them through technical consultations.

To operationalize the core actions a two stage technical consultative process was designed.
- *Stage 1:* Consultations (May - June) facilitated by Peter Colenso supported by Ghadeer Tarazi, 30 ECD experts were interviewed. These experts were identified through a nomination process using criteria of representation from the stakeholder groups, a range of ECD engaged organizations, the Global North and South and expertise across the 5 actions. The consultations consisted of approximately 45 minute long Skype calls that covered a series of semi-structured questions, which were shared prior to the calls. These experts are part of the Technical Advisory Committee for the Early Childhood Development Action Network (names of experts and questions attached in Annex 5).
- *Stage 2*: Technical Consultation Meeting June 27-28, 2016, New York.

Peter Colenso presented an overview of the Expert Consultation (report attached). His presentation focused particularly on the 5 Actions and was based on the report pre-circulated to participants. Participant feedback is recorded in the report of the Working Group Discussions below.

Working Group Discussions and Conclusions

Pia Britto summarized the main conclusions of the Working Groups on the 5 Actions as follows, by highlighting the areas of agreement or consensus, gaps in our current understanding, and the value added of the Action Network.

- Action 1. Scale up of essential multi-sectoral interventions across development and humanitarian contexts:

There were a few areas of need identified by the group work that included – a better alignment on packages of interventions, given that several of them are already being implemented and/or supported by partners. One key gap area identified was packaging interventions or adapting packages for

humanitarian contexts. Also noted was the need for greater innovation to increase the effectiveness of the packages, so they could change the reality for young children and families. Participants highlighted the need to identify contextually effective entry points. In some countries the scaling up approach might be based on complementarity/coordination of services, while in other countries integrated and/or additive models might be more appropriate. The group also pointed out the need to prioritize engagement with parents, in order to address this important programmatic gap (which could be a key 'niche area' for the network). The parental engagement strategy should be evidence-based and promote the use of technology and innovation.

What the ECDAN can do is create a set of recommended and non-negotiable/essential interventions for both the first 1,000 days and the second 1,000 days, noting that for the second 1,000 days the recommendation would be broader than pre-primary. The global good produced by the ECDAN on the non-negotiable interventions would be presented at the level of principles and programmatic components taking into consideration that local adaptations would be needed. By creating this global good, the ECDAN will give visibility to the programmatic models, and thus address one of the key challenges to scaling up ECD. The global good on programmatic intervention packages should align with the results framework. Additional products could include guidance on key messages, resources on models and tools, and recommendations on implementation coordination or integration, to use with governments and implementing partners.

- Action 2. Invest in and build capacity of the ECD workforce to deliver quality services:

In order to address workforce issues, it was agreed that a multi-sectoral approach is needed. It is important to explore linkages with other sectors to find common ground, as was also discussed in the Related Initiatives and Strategies session.

One of the main areas that was highlighted as needing further discussion was the definition of ECD workforce (who are its members? should parents and volunteers be included? If not, how could we support their efforts?). Participants expressed the need to ensure that the ECD workforce definition includes frontline staff, managers and supervisors. The group also acknowledged the need to advocate for higher levels of investments by highlighting the linkages between workforce issues and quality outcomes.

Also shared were the assets being created by several organizations in terms of tools/guidance notes, knowledge hubs, capacity building modules, and mapping exercises related to workforce issues (e.g. R4D, ISSA, ILO, OECD, UNESCO, WBG, OSF).

What the ECDAN can do is create systematic ways of leveraging and disseminating the above-mentioned assets, and identifying other relevant initiatives, to promote capacity development. The ECDAN could also serve as a bridge to existing networks (e.g., EWEC, GPE, GPVE) in their efforts to build the capacity of the workforce in their respective sectors. The unique role of the ECDAN would be to ensure that they include ECD concepts/key messages in their trainings. The ECDAN could create a global good by defining the non-negotiables for basic requirements/qualifications for the ECD workforce.

- Action 3. Strengthen national data and evidence on ECD:

There was emerging consensus on the functions of a national data platform including: a repository of tools; advocacy using data for increasing investment; and capacity building and technical support on data use for program improvement and policy change (e.g. creation of score cards summarizing key pieces of data, case studies on effective use of data, and quality standards for data).

The group identified the need to articulate more clearly the alignment between global and local data, while differentiating the purposes at each of the levels. With regards to global monitoring, the focus should be on 4.2.1 and strengthening ECDI and other tools to measure it; ensuring that tools capture the appropriate age groups for the indicator and that the items are validated. While over 50 countries collect data using ECDI, there is a need to expand the number of countries that collect data on 4.2.1, which may require incentivization. With regards to national level monitoring, it is key to ensure that data is useful and directly linked to service improvement or policy revision ('actionable data'). It is also important to promote the integration of data (i.e. key to understand where the data resides).

What the ECDAN can do is set technical standards for global and national tools, as well as set up a system for sharing and mapping data available (which could be used by policy makers but also researchers). The ECDAN can support national data platforms and also develop good practices exchange on how to strengthen national ECD measurement and monitoring.

- Action 4. Leverage and allocate sustainable finance for equitable and affordable ECD services at the country level:

The group highlighted that the financing discussion has to be linked to the intervention packages (i.e. identify the services that need to be costed and financed). ECD service delivery gaps (per sector) should be taken into account in order to estimate costs and needed investment. It is essential to ensure that new resources are mobilized, but also that existing resources are spent efficiently end effectively. Likewise, it is necessary to improve the coordination of external financing in order to jointly identify gaps and avoid disjointed efforts.

Many organizations are currently creating, piloting and using costing tools. It would be helpful to find synergies among these initiatives, and support governments in their efforts to conduct this kind of costing studies (e.g. technical support on quality assurance and contracting of related services).

What the ECDAN can do is lead the creation of a common framework for costing. It could also lead the strategic and analytical work needed to strengthen the role of innovative financing at the country level. This could be done in coordination with other related initiatives, such as GPE, EWEC and GFF (to take forward the thrive agenda). Finally, the Action Network could mobilize catalytic funding to then spur domestic finance.

- Action 5. Advocacy (global and local):

Advocacy and communication asks/messages should be tailored to each audience, and explain the 'how' and 'why' of ECD (e.g. decision makers should be asked to increase public investment; parents should be provided with information about the importance of quality ECD services in order to increase demand; countries affected by conflict should understand how ECD can contribute to peaceful societies). Country scorecards could be created in order to illustrate progress against the set results framework/targets.

What the ECDAN can do is create a common narrative (what is the unifying message across the SDG targets?), a series of messages and an unbranded campaign that could be used by the network and partners. Communication agencies in target countries should be involved.

Overview of Country Engagement Framework
Presentations
➢ Pia Britto (Senior Advisor, Chief Early Childhood Development Section, UNICEF)
➢ Sophie Naudeau (Senior Education Specialist & Global Lead for ECD, World Bank)

> ➢ Amanda Devercelli (Senior Education Specialist & Program Manager for the Early Learning Partnership)

Pia Britto outlined that country engagement must be <u>country-led</u>, and that it would be possible to see a <u>typology of country engagement</u> that categorized countries along something like the following lines: (i) technical assistance (which includes capacity building and program guidance), (ii) technical assistance + program financing, (iii) technical assistance + program financing + deep dive in selected program areas. Pia said that UNICEF had created a basic <u>country diagnostic</u> for this type of approach. UNICEF was seeing a <u>big growth in ECD programming</u>, and sees scope for additional resources to be raised for ECD.

Sophie Naudeau and **Amanda Devercelli** described the <u>role</u> of the World Bank; what it is good at (e.g. working at the country level; lending money) and what it may be less well structured and resourced to lead (e.g. global coordination). They outlined emerging thinking from the World Bank on <u>an Investing in the Early Years initiative, which will be the Bank's operational contribution to the Action Network</u> (i.e. identifying approximately 20 countries for scaled up investments in the early years with World Bank support by 2020). Prioritization of countries could be on the basis of: need / vulnerability; country demand /leadership; and World Bank Group operational opportunities. It was made clear both that these potential 20 countries should not be seen as the sole Action Network countries (they would rather be where the World Bank Group could scale up its operations in support of the Action Network), and also that these potential 20 countries would not be the only countries receiving World Bank support for ECD (there would be many other countries with significant support from the World Bank for ECD). Amanda had 4 additional reflections on how the World Bank might work within the Action Network: (i) mapping partners and plans to identify synergies, (ii) creating opportunities at the country level, rather than having an 'in/out' list of eligible countries, (iii) coordination on policy dialogue and programming in-country, and (iv) coordination on technical assistance.

The following points were raised in plenary, before embarking on group discussions:

- The two biggest successes in child health in recent years have been in child survival and in prevention of mother-to-child transmission of HIV / AIDS (PMTCT); these were in part driven by significant new <u>bilateral</u> resources, particularly the <u>U.S.</u>, and by a strategy of <u>concentrated resources and partnership</u>; therefore bilaterals, particularly the U.S., need to part of the Action Network.

- The expectation is that each ECDAN partner will map countries where they are ready to engage and then the Action Network can identify overlaps and establish a country-level coordinating agency that will help organize joint work to advance the 5 Actions.

- In response to a question of how the <u>World Bank</u> might fund <u>advocacy</u>, the World Bank clarified that World Bank funds go directly to countries who decide what to do with their funds; as such the World Bank may not be best placed to fund advocacy at the country level, but could support global advocacy.

- Around <u>87m children < 5 have only ever seen conflict</u>; there is a need to support these children and consider the principles of early childhood development in the new context of emergency/refugee situations that are becoming chronic. We need to think about how an integrated approach of ECD can be implemented in the realities of emergency, and how networks/partnerships (such as the Action Network) can offer support and solutions. The Action Network can be instrumental in targeting opportunity for 'building back better' (e.g. mental health building after a crisis) and linking with other network such as the Early Childhood Peace Building Consortium.

- The Network should adopt as a key principle the recognition of families and children as agents of change who can lead communities towards <u>peace.</u>

Summary Points from Working Group Discussions

The main issues raised in the group discussions are summarized below:

- Currently there is no such multisectoral network for ECD. So the value added/niche of the Action Network needs to be well defined, for example will its focus be <u>families and parents</u>? In most places childcare is concentrated among friends and family, and generally close by, if possible. Emphasizing childcare and access to integrated programs argues for a community-based approach.

- At country level, there needs to be an inclusive process which includes building on <u>existing networks</u> and having clear <u>lines of business</u> for the Action Network (e.g. knowledge management, guidelines/standards, articulation of global vs. national indicators, advocacy for both increasing awareness of families/caregivers and influencing policy, technical support and financing).

- Most countries have almost completed the process of <u>SDG alignment, the ECDAN should take this and the political context into consideration in delineating strategies for country engagement. The urgency of action at country level was underscored.</u>

- <u>The ECDAN will have to be clear on the function</u> and <u>mechanisms of engagement</u> at country level. Open questions include whether the focus is multisectoral ECD and who decides on priorities (countries or the Action Network)? <u>In defining country engagement the ECDAN could function as a network</u> (knowledge sharing, dissemination) or a <u>coalition</u> (focus on single goal of action). It was noted that coordination should not be considered the end result of this network. Achieve <u>better outcomes for children should remain the vision.</u>

- The issues around cross sectorality were addressed in several points, including: requiring <u>cross-sectoral analysis</u> to define what the needs are for scaling up; <u>opportunistic</u> strategies that look for entry points to make a difference; strengthening <u>community-based approaches, which are inherently cross-sectoral</u>; adopting a systematic approach in determining what areas should be <u>targeted</u> – there are some areas where it makes sense to coordinate, some where it doesn't. The ECDAN should focus on spaces where there are clear <u>efficiencies</u> of working together.

- With respect to scope, a suggestion was that the ECDAN should <u>focus on 3-5 countries</u> initially, where impact can be visible and significant; then map according to partners' capabilities, e.g. what is UNICEF doing for advocacy, World Bank for finance, etc. In other words, <u>start small and experiment</u> in a number of countries in order to determine what shape/direction this initiative might take (based on assessment of results/outcomes and what works). However there was also discomfort with a top-down selection of countries. Some experts proposed that selection processes should be explored that go beyond priority countries, to include even <u>country self-selection.</u>

- <u>Regional networks</u> are important and valuable; they have a lot of experience/information/ capability and can help plan and prioritize within countries.

Please refer to Annexes 1 and 2 for the list of questions addressed by each Working Group.

Structure: Framework for Action Network
Presentation
Joan Lombardi introduced the Working Group Discussions on a possible 'Framework for Action' and next steps. Joan noted that the Action Network was an <u>historic opportunity</u> to collaborate for ECD outcomes.

In addition to the 5 Actions, Joan noted a range of possible functions of the Action Network that had emerged from the meeting thus far, including: governance and coordination; developing a plan; technical assistance; tracking results; information sharing; fundraising; advocacy. Working Groups were invited to: (i) picture the Action Network one year from now and envisage its structure and functions, (ii) identify the 4-5 most important next steps, and (iii) express why you are excited about the Network, and what concerns you might have.

Summary Points from Working Group Discussions
The main issues raised in the group discussions are as follows:

- Form should follow function. The structure of the ECDAN should follow from clarity on its mission and functions. The name, key principles and coordination mechanisms need to be defined so there is a common understanding of the purpose of the ECDAN.

- ECDAN should be about bringing in energy and elevating ECD.

- The governance of the ECDAN needs a secretariat, which should be independent from institutions, with capacity and funding. The Secretariat should provide coordination of the efforts across the various partners. Task force/working groups are needed to take forward the work on the actions, results framework, and country engagement. ECDAN should consider a strong virtual presence for communication.

- Organizations should make a commitment of what they can contribute.

- Concerns were raised that the World Bank and UNICEF would dominate the ECDAN, but there was also interest in both organizations playing a key role. The ECDAN needs to find a balance between Sector / Thematic collaboration vs. starting with the child. There is also a risk of lowest common denominator setting the ambition.

- The governance of the ECDAN needs to be clear on how it will build on and collaborate with existing networks (e.g., SUN).

- The network could explore adopting a different name, using the term Early Years (instead of ECD)

- The following word cloud illustrates the answers given by participants to the question 'why are you excited about the network?').

ANNEX 1

Working Group Discussions on 5 Actions

Group 1: Scale up of essential multi-sectoral interventions across development & humanitarian contexts

Participants: Elena McEwan (CRS); Gorana Džudža Jakovljević (Novak Djokovic Foundation); Peter Hynes (World Vision International); Pablo Duran (PAHO); Mavis Owusu-Gyamfi (Power of Nutrition); Leslie Elder (World Bank); Rima Salah (Early Childhood Peace Consortium); Ana Nieto (UNICEF); Jeanette Betancourt (Sesame Workshop); Gilles Bergeron (Sackler Institute for Nutrition Sciences); Pablo Stansbery (UNICEF); Tressa Johnson (ELMA); Lucy Bassett (World Bank); Sweta Shah (INEE); Patrizia Fracassi (SUN)

Questions for Working Group:
1. Are countries ready to scale up ECD services?
2. What 'packages of interventions' exist, and are they defined, communicated and operationalized in an effective way?
3. How should we decide on implementation, i.e. which sector leads, entry points?
4. What about equity?
5. What assets exist? Which agencies can the ECDAN draw upon?
6. What is the scope for working on cross-country / global public goods?
7. Ideas for next steps - that help define the functions of the Action Network vis-a-vis this action.
8. What can this group add?

Group 2: Invest in and build capacity of the ECD workforce to deliver quality services

Participants: Aster Haregot (AfECN); Chunmei Li (Johnson&Johnson); Liana Ghent (ISSA); Ghassan Issa (ARC); Alia Nankoe (World Bank); Paige Harrigan (Save the Children); Noshin Khan (Teacher's Resource Centre); Yoshie Kaga (UNESCO); Melissa Kelly (ARNEC) ; Amanda Devercelli (World Bank); Kofi Marfo (Aga Khan University); Mark Roland (R4D); Alejandro Acosta (CINDE); Laura Addati (ILO); Deepa Grover (UNICEF)

Questions for Working Group:
1. Who is the ECD Workforce?
2. What analytical and diagnostic tools do we have to understand the issue and inform policy and programming?
3. How should we strengthen the workforce?
4. What assets exist? Which agencies can the ECDAN draw upon?

Group 3: Strengthen national data and evidence on ECD

Participants: Linda Richter (University of Witwatersrand); Stephen Lye (Institute for Human Development, UoT); Maureen Black (University of Maryland); Sophie Naudeau (World Bank); Abbie Raikes (MELQO); Hiro Yoshikawa (SDSN); Michelle Gaffey (SickKids); Shaheen Kassim-Lakha (Hilton Foundation); Tarun Dua (WHO); Ivelina Borisova (UNICEF)

Questions for Working Group:
1. What data do we need?
2. How should we collect data? What data platforms exist?
3. What kind of evidence do we need?
4. How do we generate evidence and improve its dissemination and uptake?
5. What assets exist? Which agencies can the ECDAN draw upon?

6. What is the scope for working on cross-country / global public goods?
7. Ideas for next steps - that help define the functions of the Action Network vis-a-vis this action.

Group 4: Leverage & allocate sustainable finance for equitable affordable ECD services at the country level

Participants: Mariavittoria Ballotta (UNICEF); Ted Chaiban (UNICEF); Robin Horn (CIFF); Lucy Sullivan (1000 Days); Lak Chinta (Attollo SE); Anugraha Palan (World Bank); Sarah Dunn (The Power of Nutrition); Joan Lombardi (BvL Foundation); Tamar Atinc (Brookings Institute); Peter Colenso; Anne Provo (World Bank); Amit Dar (World Bank)

Questions for Working Group:
1. What tools exist for costing, cost-effectiveness and cost-benefit analysis?
2. How can we increase domestic public expenditure?
3. How should we work with the 'private sector'?
4. How can we increase aid and other international financial flows?
5. What assets exist? Which agencies can the ECDAN draw upon?
6. What is the scope for working on cross-country / global public goods?
7. Ideas for next steps - that help define the functions of the Action Network vis-a-vis this action.

Group 5: Advocacy

Participants: Karlee Silver (Grand Challenges Canada); Sheila Manji (Aga Khan Development Network); Sara Watson (ReadyNation); Etienne Franca (Every Woman Every Child); Patricia da Camara (World Bank); Maniza Ntekim (Open Society Foundation); Carolyn Reynolds (World Bank); Eliana Drakopoulos (UNICEF); Mirjam Schoening (LEGO Foundation); Jean Mckenzie (Mattel); Sajin Varghese (Mattel); Alicia Marin (UNICEF); Penelope Lewis (World Bank)

Questions for Working Group:
1. What should the advocacy messages be?
2. Who should be targeted for advocacy?
3. How should we do advocacy?
4. What can we learn from other global initiatives?
5. What assets exist? Which agencies can the ECDAN draw upon?
6. What is the scope for working on cross-country / global public goods?
7. Ideas for next steps - that help define the functions of the Action Network vis-a-vis this action.

ANNEX 2

Working Group Discussions on Country Engagement Framework

Question for Group 1:
Moderator: *Hirokazu Yoshikawa (SDSN)*
Rapporteur: *Rima Salah (Early Childhood Peace Consortium)*

1. What would be the value added for countries/ What could the network provide to countries that want to join the network?

Questions for Groups 2 & 3:
Group 2 *Moderator:* *Alejandro Acosta (CINDE)*   **Group 3** *Moderator:* *Mavis Owusu-Gyamfi (Power of*
     Rapporteur: *Melissa Kelly (ARNEC)*   *Nutrition)*
                                                                                   Rapporteur: *Maniza Ntekim (Open Society*
                                                                                   Foundations)

1. What would the Action Network look like at the country level?
2. Who are the key partners that need to be engaged?
3. Who needs to be engaged to operationalize the actions of the network?

Questions for Group 4:
Moderator: *Tressa Johnson (ELMA Philanthropies)*
Rapporteur: *Ivelina Borisova (UNICEF)*

1. Can we flesh out further the global results framework?
2. If time permits, share ideas for how to adapt/ translate it to the country level.

ANNEX 3

Working Group Discussions on Framework for Action Network

Questions for all groups:
Group 1 *Moderator:* *Lynette Okengo (AfECN)*   **Group 2** *Moderator:* *Mirjam Schoening (LEGO*
     Rapporteur: *Peter Hynes (World Vision*   *Foundation)*
     International)   *Rapporteur:* *Sweta Shah (INEE)*

Group 3 *Moderator:* *Noshin Khan (Teacher's*   **Group 4** *Moderator:* *Kofi Marfo (Aga Khan*
     Resource Centre)   *University)*
     Rapporteur: *Liana Ghent (ISSA)*   *Rapporteur:* *Patrizia Fracassi (SUN)*

1. Picture it. Imagine it is a year from now; what does the architecture/ governance of the Action Network look like in a country and the global level? Main function?
2. What are the most important 4-5 next steps? How can you build on existing activities?
3. Find a few words about why you are excited about this. Any concerns?

ANNEX 4

List of Participants

Abbie Raikes	MELQO
Alejandro Acosta	CINDE
Alia Nankoe	World Bank
Alicia Marin	UNICEF
Amanda Devercelli	World Bank
Amit Dar	World Bank
Ana Nieto	UNICEF
Anne Marie Provo	World Bank
Anugraha Palan	World Bank
Aster Haregot	AfECN
Carolyn Reynolds	World Bank
Chunmei Li	Johnson & Johnson
Dane Mcqueen	United Arab Emirates Mission
Deepa Grover	UNICEF
Divya Lata	Consultative Group for Early Childhood Development
Elena McEwan	Catholic Relief Services
Eliana Drakopoulos	UNICEF
Etienne Franca	Every Woman Every Child
France Begin	UNICEF
Ghassan Issa	Arab Resource Collective
Gilles Bergeron	The Sackler Institute for Nutrition Science
Gorana Džudža Jakovljević	Novak Djokovic Foundation
Hirokazu Yoshikawa	Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN)
Hiroyuki Hattori	UNICEF
Ivelina Borisova	UNICEF
Jean Mckenzie	Mattel
Jeanette Betancourt	Sesame Workshop
Jingqing Chai	UNICEF
Joan Lombardi	Bernard van Leer Foundation
Jordan Naidoo	UNESCO
Karlee Silver	Grand Challenges Canada
Kerrie Proulx	Global Partnership for Education (GPE)
Kimber Bogard	National Academy of Medicine
Kofi Marfo	Aga Khan University
Lak Chinta	Attollo SE
Laura Addati	ILO
Leslie Elder	World Bank
Liana Ghent	ISSA
Linda Richter	University of the Witwatersrand
Lucy Bassett	World Bank

Lucy Sullivan	1000 Days
Lynette Okengo	AfECN
Maie Ayoub	Moderator
Maniza Ntekim	Open Society Foundations
Mariavittoria Ballotta	UNICEF
Mark Roland	Results for Development (R4D)
Maureen Black	University of Maryland
Mavis Owusu-Gyamfi	The Power of Nutrition
Meera Shekar	World Bank
Melissa Kelly	ARNEC
Michelle Gaffey	The Hospital for Sick Children (SickKids)
Mirjam Schoening	LEGO Foundation
Noshin Khan	Teachers Recourse Centre
Pablo Duran	Pan American Health Organization
Pablo Stansbery	UNICEF
Paige Harrigan	Save the Children
Patricia da Camara	World Bank
Patrizia Fracssi	SUN
Penelope Lewis	World Bank
Peter Colenso	Senior Consultant
Peter Hynes	World Vision International
Pia Britto	UNICEF
Rima Salah	Early Childhood Peace Consortium
Robin Horn	Children's Investment Fund Foundation
Sajin Varghese	Mattel
Sara Poehlman	Save the Childern
Sara Watson	ReadyNation
Sarah Dunn	The Power of Nutrition
Sarah Klaus	Open Society Foundations
Sarah Stevenson	Global Partnership to End Violence Against Children
Shaheen Kassim-Lakha	Conrad N. Hilton Foundation
Sheila Manji	Aga Khan Development Network
Sophie Naudeau	World Bank
Stephen Lye	Institute for Human Development, UoT
Susana Sottoli	UNICEF
Sweta Shah	INEE
Tamar Atinc	Brookings Institution
Tarun Dua	WHO
Ted Chaiban	UNICEF
Tim Thomas	Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation
Tressa Johnson	ELMA Philanthropies Services
Turgay Unalan	UNICEF
Yoshie Kaga	UNESCO

ANNEX 5

Technical Advisory Committee

Tamar Atinc	Brookings Institution
Lynnette Okengo	Africa Early Childhood Network
Jordan Naidoo	UNESCO
Sara Poehlman	Save the Children
Lisa Bohmer	Hilton Foundation
Robin Horn	Children Investment Fund Foundation
Abbie Raikes	MELQO
Linda Richter	University of the Witwatersrand
Melissa Kelly	ChildFund International
Claudia Cappa	UNICEF
Jingqing Chai	UNICEF
Tressa Johnson	ELMA Philanthropies Services
Joan Lombardi	Bernard van Leer Foundation
Sheila Manji	Aga Khan Development Network
Alexandra Rocha & Kerrie Proulx	Global Partnership for Education
Noreen Prendiville	UNICEF, Uganda office
Bernadette Daelmans	WHO
Rana Flowers	UNICEF, China office
Divya Lata	Consultative Group for ECD
Alejandro Acosta	International Centre for Education and Human Development (CINDE)
Andrew Claypole	Office of the SRSG on Violence against Children
Martin Short	The Power of Nutrition
Kofi Marfo	Aga Khan University
Oliver Liang	International Labour Organization (ILO)
Ghassan Issa	Arab Resource Collective
Mark Roland	Results 4 Development
Patrizia Fracassi	Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN)
Liana Ghent	International Step by Step Association (ISSA)
Maya Soonarane	Ministry of Education and Human Resources (Mauritius)
Nana Taona Kuo	Every Woman Every Child

Interview Questions

Q1. Are you aware of the proposed ECD Action Network and have you formed any views to date?

Q2. I would like to go through each of the proposed 5 Actions and ask your top line views on how they might be designed and implemented, including reflecting on: (i) required conditions for implementation, (ii) inter-relation with other actions, (iii) global and national aspects of each pillar:

    2.1 Scale up of essential multi-sectoral interventions across development & humanitarian contexts

2.2   Invest in and build capacity of the ECD workforce to deliver quality services

2.3   Strengthen national data and evidence on ECD

2.4   Leverage & allocate sustainable finance for equitable & affordable ECD services at the country level

2.5   Advocacy (global + local = GLOCAL)

Q.3   What do think your organization could bring to the ECD Action Network (including specific contributions and resources that your organization has developed)?

Q.4   Do you have any suggestions on the kind of governance structure that could be adopted in order to advance the work of this ECD Action Network?

Q.5   Are there any other comments you would like to make?

Attachments:
Technical Advisory Committee for the Early Childhood Development Action Network Report
Concept Note

ANNEX 6

Attachments:
Agenda for Action Network Meeting, 27th – 28th June 2016