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Action Document for Strengthening Indigenous Provision of Education in Ethnic Areas of Myanmar

**INFORMATION FOR POTENTIAL GRANT APPLICANTS**

**WORK PROGRAMME FOR GRANTS**

This document constitutes the work programme for grants in the sense of Article 110(2) of the Financial Regulation in the following sections concerning calls for proposals: 5.3.1 Grants – call for proposals "Strengthening Indigenous Provision of Education in Ethnic Areas of Myanmar" (direct management).

| 2. Zone benefiting from the action/location | Myanmar/Burma. The action shall be carried out in protracted conflict and post conflict areas, currently including the following states and regions: Kayin, Mon, Shan, Kachin, Chin, Kayah, Tanintharyi, Bago and Sagaing in Myanmar/Burma. It may be extended to include Rakhine (see footnote 16). The tentative location where the project team will be based is Pyin Oo Lwin (Mandalay Region). |
| 3. Programming document | Addendum No 1 to the Multiannual Indicative Programme (2014-2020) for Myanmar/Burma¹ |
| 4. Sector of concentration/thematic area | Education DEV. Aid: YES² |
| 5. Amounts concerned | Total estimated cost: EUR 21 052 631 Total amount of EU budget contribution: EUR 20 000 000 This action is co-financed by potential grant beneficiaries for an indicative amount of EUR 1 052 631 |
| 6. Aid | Project Modality |

¹ C(2018)4741 of 20 July 2018
² Official Development Aid is administered with the promotion of the economic development and welfare of developing countries as its main objective.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>modality(ies) &amp; implementation modality(ies)</th>
<th>Direct management – grants – call for proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 a) DAC code(s)</td>
<td>15230 Post conflict – peace-building / 15160 Human Rights / 11130 Teacher Training / 11220 Basic Primary Education / 11230 Basic Life skills for youth and adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Main Delivery Channel</td>
<td>20000 – Non-Governmental Organisations and Civil Society</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. Markers (from CRIS DAC form)</th>
<th>General policy objective</th>
<th>Not targeted</th>
<th>Significant objective</th>
<th>Main objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation development/good governance</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid to environment</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender equality (including Women In Development)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Development</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reproductive, Maternal, New born and child health</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RIO Convention markers</th>
<th>Not targeted</th>
<th>Significant objective</th>
<th>Main objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biological diversity</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combat desertification</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate change mitigation</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate change adaptation</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9. Global Public Goods and Challenges (GPGC) thematic flagship</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10. Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)</th>
<th>Main: SDG16 - Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development // Secondary: SDG 4 - Quality Education; SDG 1 - No poverty; SDG 5 - Gender equality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**SUMMARY**

The action will support indigenous providers of education to deliver a high-quality education that drives improvements in learning outcomes for indigenous boys and girls. The EU support will promote the convergence of government education policy delivery with indigenous education service delivery. Through this action, the European Union (EU) will: (i) foster inclusion of different ethnic and minority groups in the process of nation building, (ii) address inequities in education provision and performance, (iii) model an effective conflict sensitive approach to supporting the education sector, and (iv) demonstrate that a balanced commitment to government and non-government providers is possible and necessary during this transition period. The overall objective of this action is to contribute to a peaceful inclusive society for sustainable development in Myanmar/Burma.

This action complements the EU Education Sector Reform Contract (ESRC) "Enhancing the education and skills base in Myanmar" action and ensures a conflict-sensitive and balanced EU support to education provision in Myanmar/Burma. Sector budget support to the Ministry of Education (MoE), through the ESRC, and support to indigenous providers of education, through this action, will improve the quality and expand the reach of both government and indigenous education...
s services. The alignment and equivalency between government and non-government education systems will be strengthened. This action fosters dialogue, cooperation and collaboration between the MoE and indigenous providers of education in support of the country’s objective of "leaving no child behind", the achievement of MoE’s National Education Strategic Plan targets, and national peace building efforts.

The action builds on an ECHO-funded project, which enabled 12,534\(^3\) indigenous\(^4\) boys and girls access to education in some of the most remote conflict affected areas. In line with the humanitarian-development nexus, it will prioritise quality and sustainability dimensions and measure the impact of the intervention on learning outcomes and school retention for indigenous boys and girls. It will strengthen existing services and target communities without education services, Internally Displaced Persons (IDP) camps and villages, and those where services are not meeting children’s learning and educational needs. The action will identify and develop relevant education programmes that address the learning needs of older out of school boys and girls as well as illiterate women, and will seek to partner with women and youth groups to support community outreach. It will seek to improve the quality and standards across indigenous provision of education by strengthening and unifying existing providers.

Due to the current fragility of indigenous services provision, the action will contribute financial and technical resources to sustain and expand education services; improve the quality of education; and build stronger alignment and complementarity with government education reforms, such as teacher education and qualifications, curriculum and performance, while also addressing issues unique to indigenous children, such as student transfer to government schools, student recognition of prior learning and mother tongue based multi lingual education (MTB-MLE). The evidence generated by the action will strongly position the EU for a well-informed policy dialogue with the MoE on these issues, which will be leveraged by the political and policy dialogue associated with the ESRC. Importantly, the action will provide much needed policy advocacy support to indigenous providers so that they can collectively engage directly in productive policy dialogue with the government.

1 CONTEXT

1.1 Sector/Country/Regional context/Thematic area

Myanmar/Burma is home to 135 officially recognised ethnic groups with over a hundred different languages. About two thirds speak the national language, Myanmar/Burmese, which is the language spoken by the ethnic majority, the Bamar people. Following independence 70 years ago, the country plunged into civil war and was ruled by a Military regime for 60 years. Since 2010, Myanmar/Burma has embarked on an ambitious range of political, economic and administrative reforms. Since 2016, a civilian government has taken over from the Military and has continued the process of democratic transition, including further social and economic reforms, and has made the ongoing peace process a top priority. The signing of the Nationwide Ceasefire Agreement (NCA, 2015) by some (although not all) ethnic armed groups (EAGs) are important events but fragility and conflicts continue, particularly in Rakhine, Kachin and Shan states. The peace process has stalled, threatening the country’s tenuous democratic transition and peacebuilding efforts.

The education sector in Myanmar/Burma is highly diverse and is heavily marred by the country’s complex and long history of conflict. Until very recently, there was chronic underinvestment in

\(^3\) ADRA (2018) Endline for CASE project, March 2018

\(^4\) ‘Indigenous’ is used in relation to minority ethnic education providers in preference to ‘ethnic’ as this is the term the indigenous providers of education prefer to use. ‘Ethnic’ is still used in the Action Document when referencing regions or areas under ethnic control and when representing the views of government or other actors.
education support and the government education system was highly centralised. Prior to 2015, the Ministry of Education (MoE) mandated the sole use of Myanmar/Burmese as the language of instruction, prohibited the teaching of ethnic languages and used a standardised curriculum that did not reflect local contexts or ethnic minority cultures. Hence, government education has long been perceived by many ethnic nationality groups as a tool for assimilating non-Bamar populations and a key driver of conflict. In contrast, indigenous providers of education, some of which predate the colonial period, have developed and defined their own systems based on culture, ethnicity and language origins. Indigenous providers of education have played a significant role in providing access to culturally relevant quality education for indigenous children, particularly during the country’s long period of civil war. During the 1960s-80s, several EAGs carved out independent micro-states with their own quasi governments, and departments to oversee service provision were established. Several EAGs continue to maintain territorial control over areas of the country. The status and future of EAGs governance regimes and basic service delivery systems will constitute a key issue in the ongoing peace process and political dialogue.

Education service provision in Myanmar/Burma falls within the humanitarian-development nexus, particularly in areas affected by conflict and recovering from conflict. It calls for a greater emphasis on strengthening local capacities, sustaining indigenous provision and promoting inclusive governance at the national and state level. This would address long standing grievances and a key driver of conflict and hence would support, rather than hinder, the democratic transition and progress in the peace process. To this end, the action builds on a previous ECHO-funded project, which supported the Rural Indigenous Sustainable Education (RISE) network of indigenous providers of education to expand their reach to 120 communities that previously had no access to education services, bringing 12,534 out of school boys and girls into school. The continuity of assistance from humanitarian aid to development will ensure indigenous providers of education can sustain and strengthen their services, improve the quality of education and learning outcomes, and support and engage with the MoE collectively and more effectively in policy dialogue on the national education reform agenda.

1.1.1 Public Policy Assessment and EU Policy Framework

From the outset of the transition in 2011, and more concretely since 2016, the EU swiftly responded to political changes and provided strong support to encourage reforms. The Council conclusions on the EU strategy with Myanmar/Burma, adopted in June 2016\(^5\), sets out the framework for EU’s support to the ongoing reforms in Myanmar/Burma. In the Council conclusions on Myanmar/Burma of February 2018\(^6\), the EU and Member States reconfirmed their strong engagement to support the country’s democratic transition, peace and national reconciliation, and inclusive socio-economic development, and reiterated their readiness to continue support to ongoing reforms, specifically in the education sector.

The action takes forward the Council conclusions on Indigenous Peoples of May 2017\(^7\) and the Joint Staff Working Document "Implementing EU External Policy on Indigenous Peoples\(^8\)’, which highlight the need to strengthen EU’s support to indigenous peoples and boost their capacity to control their own social, economic and cultural development to advance democracy and human rights. It also takes forward the Council conclusions on operationalising the humanitarian and development nexus, adopted in May 2017\(^9\), for which Myanmar/Burma is a pilot country. It also supports implementation
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of the May 2018 European Commission’s Communication on Education in Emergencies and Protracted Crises to promote safe, inclusive and quality learning for children in such contexts. The action is in line with the EU policy priorities PEOPLE and PEACE, as well as PROSPERITY. Other EU frameworks relevant to this action are the 2017 European Consensus on Development, the Gender Action Plan (GAP) 2016-2012, and the European Commission Staff Working Document "More and better education in developing countries".

The government has identified education and poverty alleviation as key drivers to support the democratic and peace-building processes, and to achieve the national goal of becoming a Middle-Income Country by 2030. The recent Myanmar Sustainable Development Plan (MSDP) is firmly aligned to the SDGs, and this action relates in particular to MSDP Goal 1: Peace, National Reconciliation, Security & Good Governance, and Goal 4: Human Resources & Social Development for a 21st Century Society.

The NCA commits all sides to holding political dialogue aimed at forming a federal, democratic union; recognises the authority of EAGs in their respective areas, including in the field of education; and provides for international assistance in these fields. The NCA interim arrangements emphasise the need for cooperation between the EAGs and the government in basic service delivery until a full peace settlement is achieved. Decentralisation of education speaks to the heart of indigenous providers of education desire for an inclusive education sector that upholds the rights of ethnic minorities and promotes inclusive economic growth. The National Education Law (NEL, 2014 and NEL amendment 2015) provides the legal framework for education while the National Education Strategic Plan (NESP) 2016-21 sets out sector-wide education reforms aimed at improving equitable access to quality education for all children. Both the NEL and the NESP recognise to an extent the need for support to diverse education opportunities respecting the ethnic diversity of the country. According to the NEL a key objective of national education is 'To develop union spirit and to create citizens who respect, value, preserve and develop all the ethnic groups' languages, literatures, culture, arts, traditions, and historical heritage'. The NEL mandates 'help to open classes to develop the ethnic groups' literature, language, culture, arts and traditions'. It also highlights that at the 'basic education level, ethnic languages can be used together with Myanmar language as the classroom language' (i.e. to explain when ethnic students do not understand), but falls short of authorising their use as the language of instruction, which is a key demand of indigenous providers of education. The NESP education sector reform priorities include 'support and promotion of ethnic languages and cultures, including for primary-age ethnic children who speak different languages', and aims to 'prioritize the needs of schools in less developed areas to make education more accessible to all'. Importantly, the NESP recognises that the MoE is not the sole provider of education services in the country and that 'an important factor in the successful implementation of the basic education reforms is the extent to which they are mainstreamed in other organisations involved in basic education provision, such as [...] schools managed under ethnic education systems.' It foresees the development of 'a partnership mechanism to support the participation of different education service providers in basic education reforms.' However, both the NEL and NESP

fail to provide details on how these objectives will be implemented and achieved. Nevertheless, this opens an unprecedented space for supporting and facilitating engagement by both sides on the transition to a diverse but coherent and equitable education system. However, this remains highly sensitive politically given persistent distrust on both sides. It is therefore critical to apply a conflict sensitive approach to effectively contribute to peace and reconciliation through supporting indigenous providers of education to collectively develop a unified and sufficiently strong position from which to negotiate their engagement with the MoE.

To this end, the action aims to foster positive collaboration between government and indigenous providers of education through supporting and strengthening their education services and building their collective policy advocacy capacity so that they can constructively negotiate on key education reforms issues and the terms of their potential partnership with the government system. This will ultimately ensure that education in Myanmar/Burma can reach and meet the needs of all children and that functional links between government and indigenous systems are established so that they both contribute to Myanmar/Burma’s education targets, democratic transition and peace and reconciliation efforts.

1.1.2 Stakeholder analysis

It is estimated that over a quarter of education services in Myanmar/Burma are provided by either indigenous providers, the monastic system or faith-based organisations. Indigenous providers of education include the education departments of EAGs, as well as indigenous community-based organisations. They provide education services in non-government-controlled areas, as well as in many mixed administration and government-controlled areas where government education services have recently been established but often remain weak and under-resourced. Where government education services exist in conflict and post conflict affected areas, they remain inaccessible for many indigenous children as they lack linguistic and cultural relevance. Indigenous providers therefore fill critical gaps in education provision. In 2017, 14 existing indigenous providers of education collectively served 343,649 children in 4,009 schools staffed by 21,846 teachers in remote and conflict-affected areas across 9 states and regions of Myanmar/Burma (Kayin, Mon, Shan, Chin, Kachin, Kayah, Tanintharyi, Bago and Sagaing). While their size and reach vary greatly, as well as the quality of their education services, they have proven resilient to local conflict dynamics and reach some of Myanmar/Burma’s most marginalized and disadvantaged children. However, a further 719,674 children (aged 5-18) are estimated to be out of school (OOS) in the geographical areas reached by indigenous providers of education.

Participation in open dialogue is fundamental to this action. The RISE network of 10 indigenous providers of education have consulted with EAGs, local authorities, community teachers and their local communities and collected preliminary data on the out of school children (OOSC) population in their respective areas. Formal consultations with the RISE network and development partners (DPs) have been undertaken to inform the design of this action. These key stakeholders have repeatedly affirmed their desire for and commitment to improving access to quality basic education.

The MoE aims to dramatically increase access to basic education, in line with the NEL and the government’s commitment to leaving no child behind. The government recognises that universal access to quality basic education is fundamental to reducing poverty, addressing equity and achieving national social-economic development goals. Ceasefires and increases in government spending on education have allowed MoE to reach new populations. However, recent MoE expansion of government education services has not yet included conflict-sensitive consultations, sometimes exacerbating long-standing conflicts over the status of indigenous education systems and jeopardizing confidence in the ceasefires. Some indigenous providers of education and local communities perceive that the government is using ceasefires to expand its authority into previously autonomous areas, including through building schools and providing teachers who do not speak the
local ethnic language, and that international aid is supporting this without considering the impact of their support on peace and conflict dynamics. Distrust remains, even of the new government (particularly the Union level), as ethnic communities and political leaders feel that they are not yet being genuinely consulted and do not yet receive the support or funding necessary to facilitate inclusive community development in ethnic areas.

Nevertheless, indigenous providers of education are gradually building positive relationships with state and township government education authorities to improve coordination of education services in post-conflict and conflict affected areas. Some indigenous providers of education, such as the Mon National Education Committee (MNEC) and the Karen Education Department (KED), now regularly attend Education State Coordination Group meetings hosted by government State Education Departments. While such cases, thus far, are an exception, they can serve as examples of good practice. At the other extreme, particularly where conflict persists (e.g. Kachin), indigenous providers are still unwilling to collaborate with government systems. Strengthening engagement and coordination between indigenous providers of education and government education authorities at all levels is a key component of this action and is critical to building greater trust and collaboration, which is instrumental to local and national peace building efforts. Some indigenous providers have affirmed their willingness to engage in policy dialogue with the MoE. They recognise that to achieve government recognition and receive government funding for their education services they must work towards greater alignment and equivalency with the government system and strengthen cooperation and collaboration with the MoE.

MoE is, and will remain, the largest provider of education services and is the lead Ministry for all education sector reforms under the NESP, which recognises the need to create partnerships and mainstream education reforms within indigenous provision of education to achieve universal basic education. This offers an unprecedented opportunity to support progressive engagement between both sides. However, the ability and willingness of the new government and the MoE to meaningfully act on the NEL and NESP commitments that relate to ethnic education and to take a more conflict-sensitive approach has yet to be demonstrated. The government is yet to make progress in engaging most indigenous providers of education at the Union level, and in addressing key grievances such as the language of instruction, contrary to advances made by the previous administration in these two critical areas.

While complex education reform issues, such as the desire of indigenous providers for a national MTB-MLE system, will take time to resolve, the willingness of the MoE to address the education needs of the significant OOSC population offers opportunities to promote and support greater engagement and collaboration on both sides. Hence, supporting the indigenous providers to engage with the MoE on government-led priority initiatives for OOSC will help build mutual understanding and cooperation and pave the way for further engagement on more complex reform issues. As the relationship matures, negotiation between the MoE and indigenous providers will become more possible.

The Ministry of Border Affairs is potentially another stakeholder. However, its educational reach is limited to a few schools and technical and vocational training centres, and one university producing a limited number of teachers. As this Ministry is headed by the Military, its potential involvement in the action will have to be carefully assessed, given persistent distrust between EAGs and the Military. The applied education policy is under the auspices of MoE in any case.

The action will directly complement the EU "Enhancing the education and skills base in Myanmar" education sector reform contract (ESRC) (ACA/2018/039-665) by supporting indigenous providers of education to effectively strengthen the quality and standards across their education provision, build stronger alignment and complementarity with government education reforms, develop capacities for joint advocacy on issues unique to indigenous children and strengthen engagement
with the MoE to negotiate their role in the future national education system. Strengthening their position and voice in policy dialogue with the MoE can best be achieved through strengthening coordination and collaboration among them. Key stakeholders and beneficiaries of the action therefore include the 10 active members of the RISE network, and potentially other indigenous providers of education, who will be supported to expand access and improve the quality of basic education services in their respective geographical areas. Local teachers and children from community schools, OOSC, parents, local communities in remote villages, returning refugees and IDP camps and villages throughout post-conflict and conflict affected areas in target areas across the 9 states and regions mentioned above\(^\text{17}\) are the final beneficiaries of the action. Local and state government education authorities and the MoE are critical stakeholders to the action for engagement in key education reform processes. Strengthening the capacity of indigenous providers to effectively participate in dialogue opportunities with government education authorities at all levels is a key component of the action.

### 1.1.3 Priority areas for support/problem analysis

Despite progress with enrolment and completion in government-led primary education, decades of underinvestment, conflict and poverty have stymied progress in ethnic areas. In many areas, schools are not available at all or only for a limited number of primary grades. Where schools are available, accessibility is often limited by weather, distance and terrain, in particular for younger children, those with disability and for girls, due to security concerns. Higher levels of poverty in these areas, often exacerbated by conflict, reduce the affordability and accessibility of education. A further barrier is the level of acceptability and relevance of the limited government education available as it does not meet local needs and demand, when there is a linguistic, cultural and religious divergence between communities and schools. Consequently, early dropout and high rates of OOSC persist in ethnic areas, much higher than the national average. Based on the 2015 education census, illiterate households are mainly a rural and ethnic phenomenon, especially in Chin (10.7 %), Kayin (17.1 %) and Shan (24.9 %) States. Data on education outcomes show that 63% of conflict-affected townships score below the national average on a composite education sub-index.

While there is gender parity in education at the national level, participation rates and learning outcomes vary for girls and boys in the lowest economic quintile, and in conflict-affected areas. The gender gap in adult literacy rates is pronounced in rural areas (men: 90.7; women: 83.8) and widens with increasing age, with over a quarter of women (27.3%) aged over 30 years reported as having never attended school compared to 17.2% of men. Poverty, child labour, patriarchal cultural norms and the lack of relevant quality education continue to create gender disparities with girls dropping out of school earlier and at a greater rate than boys. For those children who complete no higher than grade 2, almost two thirds (63.1%) were girls and a little over a third (36.9%) were boys, showing that fewer girls go on to higher levels of education. The educational imbalance is reversed at higher levels of education, with more than half (54.7%) of those who progress to grade 12 or higher being girls. Furthermore, at least 47% of primary aged children with disability do not attend school (more disabled boys are out of school than girls), with insufficient resources, lack of pedagogical support (learning materials and teaching specialists), lack of co-ordination and effective linkages between
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\(^{17}\) Although an ethnic area, the situation in Rakhine State is different since there are no "indigenous providers of education". Education services are provided through the government system, alongside religious (monastic, madrasah) schools. Support to education in Rakhine State, including for IDPs, is and will be provided through the EU "Quality Basic Education Programme", through the Peace III action (ACA/2017/039-980), and through the EU "Enhancing the education and skills base in Myanmar" action (ACA/2018/039-665) which will support nationwide reform of the government education system. In case indigenous providers of education that will partner with the action identify the possibility of supporting remote conflict affected communities without education services in Rakhine State, particularly northern Rakhine State, this could be supported through the action.
special education schools and basic education school and lack of data on children with disabilities all being cited as significant barriers for children with disabilities.

The experiences of indigenous children as they progress through schooling highlight critical policy gaps that require redress. Whilst MTB-MLE is promoted by indigenous providers in community schools it is not consistently applied and the government has yet to approve a standardised approach to MTB-MLE in government schools. Indigenous providers promote MTB-MLE (not bilingual education) due to the multiplicity of languages and the value they place on maintaining their mother tongue. As many as 30% of all rural school children will not have heard the Myanmar/Burmese language before entering school.\(^{18}\) Meanwhile, an estimated 70% of teachers working in government schools in ethnic areas are unable to speak the local language or dialect. Children’s Myanmar-language competence is particularly low in communities that have lived primarily under the governance of EAGs and thus separate from mainstream Myanmar/Burma society\(^{19}\). In Myanmar/Burma, indigenous providers start children’s education in their mother tongue. The national or dominant language (e.g. Myanmar/Burmese) is then introduced as a second language in early grades, but it does not become the medium of instruction until the students are sufficiently familiar with it.\(^{20}\) This approach enables children to develop a firm foundation in their first language. In ethnic areas where community ethnic schools dominate, the mother tongue continues to be the medium of instruction throughout primary school. The ethnic language is taught as a subject as is Myanmar/Burmese (and English) usually from Grade 2 or 3.

Furthermore, while the NEL includes a provision to 'make arrangements to enable students to transfer between government schools and other schools according to designated standards', there is no formal framework as yet for the transfer of students from community schools supported by indigenous providers to government schools: while some local arrangements allow students to sit the government exam or to take a placement test, non-native speakers of the Myanmar/Burmese language are at a huge disadvantage because the examination is in Myanmar/Burmese and English. The placement test is based on the national curriculum, which is viewed by indigenous communities as distinctly Bamar-centric\(^{21}\) and often utilise Bamar and Buddhist concepts and experiences that may not be encountered in other parts of the country\(^{22}\). For many indigenous children, this means that they are unable to continue their education, since post primary services from indigenous providers of education are very limited. Whilst the NESP acknowledges the importance of recognition of student’s prior learning, the policy to support its consistent implementation has yet to be developed. The action will support the indigenous providers in developing their first and second language learning programmes. This will be valuable, as it will support student transfer and education continuity as formal student transfer systems are developed between the ethnic and government education systems.

The government does not officially recognise community teachers from indigenous providers of education. While teacher accreditation is a key reform agenda under the NESP, dialogue with indigenous providers of education has not begun. The MoE Comprehensive Teacher Education Framework and Teacher Competency Framework, designed to inform the professionalization of teachers, has yet to integrate or consider the perspectives and unique qualities indigenous community teachers bring to the country.


\(^{19}\) Jolliffe, K (2016) Strength in Diversity: Towards Universal Education in Myanmar’s ethnic areas, (Asia Foundation)


\(^{22}\) Ibidem 19
Conflict, remoteness and resource scarcity have starved many indigenous providers of the valuable long-term investment needed to strengthen provision. As DPs have increasingly normalised relations with the government and turned to supporting the MoE, the availability of external funding to most indigenous providers of education has become unstable and has decreased significantly. Resources barely stretch beyond maintenance, leaving most providers without the necessary frameworks and policies to guide effective teaching and learning. Most report that their energy is spent on sourcing vital funding for teacher stipends rather than on initiatives that would strengthen quality in service provision.

The erosion of many indigenous education services in Myanmar/Burma is happening at a pervasive rate. The expansion of government services in ethnic areas is being undertaken without proper conflict sensitive consideration of the damage this potentially causes to local providers and the learning outcomes of indigenous children. Community teachers are being displaced by newly recruited daily wage government teachers, local language teaching is being compromised, and indigenous children are struggling to adapt to Myanmar/Burmese as the language of instruction, which is contributing to early drop out. These losses are significant. When 70,000 daily wage teachers were deployed over the period of 2015-2016 to increase the government teaching force, indigenous providers of education reported that 30% of daily wage teachers deployed to their areas left their post within one year. This directly impacted 50,000 children who experienced significant disruption in their education or dropped out of school. Many indigenous providers have suffered significant losses to their oversight of community schools with community schools now managed under a mixed administration arrangement.

Despite the challenges faced by indigenous providers of education, they have many strengths, in particular: their ability to reach the most remote and marginalised populations; their resilience to local conflict dynamics; their experience in providing mother-tongue based and multilingual education; their value, relevance and legitimacy in the eyes of communities; and their potential to play a role in the longer-term rebuilding of social cohesion. Undermining the capacity of indigenous providers risks further excluding marginalised children from access to education, heightening local tensions and fuelling further concerns over the peace process. Considering the likely lengthy period before a comprehensive political settlement, support from the international community, to both government and indigenous education provision, is essential to meet the immediate needs of children and communities in ethnic areas and to demonstrate that peace can lead to positive improvements in community development.

## 2 Risks and Assumptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risks</th>
<th>Risk level (H/M/L)</th>
<th>Mitigating measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political:</strong> The peace process fails and has serious repercussions on the government’s current decentralisation processes and a federal system is rejected by the government, the Parliament and the military.</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A commitment to the federal concept is part of the NCA. Nevertheless, the form, and extent, of any federal system is likely to be highly contentious, will take significant time to negotiate, and will ultimately require Constitutional change (an area where the military holds veto power). The ability of external actors to efficiently mitigate political risks is relatively limited. The action seeks to support the peace process and the federal concept by supporting engagement of indigenous providers with MoE and progress towards decentralisation of education service provision. Furthermore, peacebuilding and reconciliation will be promoted in this action’s support to teachers and students where peace, non-violence, tolerance and respect for diversity will be...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The government does not prioritise peace over economic development and continues the expansion of government services in contested ethnic areas and areas not under their control.

**Strategic:** The positive relationship between indigenous providers deteriorates and they are unable to find common ground in relation to government education sector reforms.

Donor strategy favours particular providers over others and causes fragmentation in the network, eroding the possibility of unification.

**Economic:** The MoE does not establish partnerships with indigenous providers of education as foreseen in the NESP and government funding does not become available to sustain indigenous education provision.

Funding to indigenous providers of education favours particular providers over others and undermines the financial stability and capacity of indigenous providers, particularly smaller groups that do not have a diverse funding base.

**Operational:** The weak financial and technical capacity of indigenous providers leads to issues in financial compliance and weak monitoring and evaluation processes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>The action</strong></th>
<th><strong>H</strong></th>
<th><strong>M</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>integrated into life skills curriculum for OOS youth, women’s literacy classes and in the content of teacher education programs under wellbeing and pedagogy modules. This action complements efforts under the IAQE project and ESRC to support the MoE to engage in policy dialogue and create a partnership with indigenous providers of education by directly supporting constructive engagement with the MoE. This will help ensure that any further expansion of government education is done in a more consultative and conflict sensitive manner and that the MoE recognises and harnesses the significant contribution of indigenous service providers in helping meet national education targets. The action also seeks to engage DPs in coordinating efforts in ethnic areas and as a way of ensuring service expansion does not negatively impact indigenous communities and the peace process.</td>
<td>The action specifically supports existing networks of indigenous providers of education and fosters inclusion of new members to mitigate risks of fragmentation, support and promote unity, and create and harness joint policy advocacy efforts with the MoE. An existing network (RISE) has expressed their willingness to engage in education reform processes currently underway and the action seeks to ensure inclusivity and a conflict sensitive do-no-harm approach to the provision of international assistance. The coordination platform supported under this action will enable DPs to harmonise efforts in ethnic areas and encourage balanced support to indigenous providers.</td>
<td>The action supports the engagement of indigenous providers of education with the World Bank Inclusive Access and Quality Education (IAQE) program and the DP coordinating mechanism to support the identification of sustainable funding models, including through government resource allocation. The action specifically supports the network of indigenous providers of education and provides space for the inclusion of new members to mitigate risks of lack of funding leading to the collapse of indigenous provision of education. This approach ensures inclusivity and a conflict sensitive do-no-harm approach to the provision of international assistance and promotes inclusive development practices and the harmonisation of support. The EU will select an implementing partner with the necessary level of trust and capacity to support the institutional development of indigenous providers of education. The indigenous providers of education have a proven track record of being highly resilient and responsive to...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conflict escalates/resumes in indigenous providers areas to the extent that access to selected communities is disrupted. While the resumption and/or escalation of conflict may necessitate revisions to the objectives of the action and implementation plans it is envisaged that partners will maintain some operational capacity to deliver education services in their areas. Partners will be supported to operationalize alternative strategies if conflict resumes/escalates in their areas.

**Developmental:** Appropriate pathways for OOS boys and girls and illiterate women are not available.

Lack of commitment to disability and gender inclusion and gender and disability sensitive outcomes further marginalise women and persons with disabilities.

The action will leverage the work undertaken by the EU and other DPs to support the MoE to establish alternative education pathways for OOSC and illiterate women, including NFE and TVET, and will support indigenous providers of education to adapt these education opportunities for indigenous OOSC. Furthermore, engagement with women and youth civil society organisations (CSOs) will be fostered to promote linkages and partnerships for the implementation of alternative education options for OOSC illiterate women.

Conflict dynamics and social norms have led to disability and gender inequities in education outcomes of boys and girls and children with disabilities, with more than 47% of children with disabilities being OOS; more males than women are employed as mobile teacher trainers and more women than men work as community teachers. Mitigating measures include: ensuring that all education data collected is disaggregated by gender and where possible disability; conducting a gender and disability inclusion analysis of community schools; training Teacher Trainers and school leaders on gender and disability sensitisation and mainstreaming; including gender and disability inclusion strategies and pedagogy practice in preservice and in-service teacher education programmes; and developing gender and disability inclusion organisational policies. Furthermore, strategies and approaches to address the education needs of OOSC will specifically identify and address the barriers faced by both girls and boys and children with disabilities; teacher training materials and curricula will be de-stereotyped; and women’s organisations will be engaged to support women’s literacy and empowerment, and a gender balance in the recruitment of indigenous education provider staff at all levels will be promoted.

**Assumptions**

- The on-going process of political, economic and administrative reforms continues.
- Progress in the national peace process will continue, culminating in an agreement that will, among other things, establish a federal union that will recognise the role of the basic service departments of the EAGs in a decentralised federal system.
- The MoE remains committed to the implementation of the NESP 2016-21.
- The government will continue to cooperate constructively with DPs allowing education reforms to progress effectively and efficiently with international funding and support for the reforms.
- Both government and DPs continue to adhere to the Development Assistance Policy.
LESSONS LEARNT, COMPLEMENTARITY AND CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES

3.1 Lessons learnt

There is substantial global evidence in both developed and developing countries of the challenges faced by national education systems to adequately support indigenous and ethnic minority children. This is due to the remoteness of many ethnic communities, the significant poverty profile and the complex multi-lingual/multi-cultural contexts where many indigenous and ethnic minority children live. These children often find it challenging to adapt to a standardised national curriculum that is foreign to their traditional way of knowing and does not include content that acknowledges their history or culture. High dropout and poor performance often typify the experiences of many indigenous children in national government systems. It is also a very challenging environment for non-indigenous teachers to work within. Coupled with the ‘culture shock’, the intermittent quality of services and the physical isolation of such communities, non-indigenous teachers do not stay long. As a result, indigenous and ethnic minority children often face significant disruption to their education when teacher absenteeism is high. International experience shows that diverse systems are especially important in multi-cultural and multi-lingual societies. In Myanmar/Burma, non-state (ethnic, faith-based, community) schools play an important role by complementing state education in underserved areas and for the most disadvantaged children. Studies show that they are culturally resonant and more responsive to local needs, particularly when they recruit teachers from the local community, and existing non-state and state collaborative arrangements at local level can provide good practice examples.

International engagement with indigenous providers of education over the past decades show weaknesses in how conflict sensitivity is understood and applied in ethnic areas of Myanmar/Burma. Dialogue with indigenous providers of education has highlighted some key learnings.

1. **Spend time to build trust and a positive relationship with indigenous providers of education.** Forming a relationship with them takes time and trust is essential. External organisations are generally viewed with suspicion due to a long history of exclusion and non-engagement in national education reforms. Spending time and participating in open, honest and genuine dialogue, and using culturally sensitive language is critical.

2. **Empower indigenous providers of education.** Recognise and respect their in-depth knowledge of local needs, their expertise, their bonds with communities, and their outreach capacity. Do not by-pass them. Involve them (genuinely) in the design of the implementation strategy, in the selection of the implementing partner(s), and in the governance and monitoring mechanisms (e.g. Steering Committee). Acknowledge their limited capacities and priority needs and adopt flexible procedures while developing their capacities.

3. **Avoid actions that can cause fragmentation.** Consulting one group and not another or giving information to different groups at different times erodes confidence, leads to misunderstandings and creates divisions between those who have been consulted and those who have not. Avoid competitive funding mechanisms which inevitably favour the strongest indigenous providers over smaller ones with less capacities. Recognise and support their willingness and efforts to work collaboratively and equitably.

4. **Development assistance can exacerbate conflict.** Assistance frequently distorts social relations, entrenches inequalities and can allow some groups to benefit to the detriment of others. Many local indigenous communities prioritise security over development and are deeply suspicious of development delivered by the government.

---

5. **Acknowledge heterogeneity within and between indigenous providers of education.** Diversity is a positive feature of indigenous providers of education in Myanmar/Burma and it needs to be promoted.

6. **Ensure adequate (and up to date) understanding of the (conflict) context through conflict analysis from an indigenous perspective and continued monitoring of developments.** Without a sound understanding of specific dynamics in each of the ethnically controlled areas and within and between indigenous providers of education, there is a risk of doing harm or of failing to seize opportunities to foster social cohesion and promote genuine peace building.

7. **Strengthening systems cannot be done in the absence of maintenance.** Unlike government education systems which are financed through tax revenues and bilateral and multilateral funding, indigenous systems of education, particularly when they exist outside the government system, do not have access to sustainable funding to pay for the basics of provision, such as teacher salaries and learning materials. Donors often prefer to fund system strengthening without the foresight to understand how the basics are being financed.

The ECHO-funded project has contributed to develop strategies to rapidly train and deploy teachers to communities without education services, alongside sensitisation of communities on the importance of education, which proved very effective in reaching OOSC and keeping them in school once enrolled. By working through the RISE network, it has effectively contributed to strengthening coordination among indigenous providers of education and has reinforced their interest in developing common quality standards, directions and positions, establishing a stepping-stone for their collective engagement with the MoE on education reforms. This project has however been constrained by the humanitarian nature of ECHO’s support, which limited the scope of activities, the duration, and was missing the dialogue with government on education policy in the affected areas. In line with the humanitarian-development nexus, this action will continue to support indigenous providers of education in sustaining and expanding their services, reaching another level by focusing on improving quality and learning outcomes and developing capacities for joint advocacy and positive engagement with the MoE. This action will also seek to identify and develop sustainable funding modalities for indigenous providers of education beyond this funding period. Key to this will be to promote partnerships with MoE, in direct complementarity with the Inclusive Access and Quality Education (IAQE) project (see 3.2). This is politically sensitive however, given persistent distrust between government and EAGs and the slow pace of the peace process, and hence partnerships may take time to materialise.

### 3.2 Complementarity, synergy and donor coordination

The action operationalises the humanitarian-development nexus by directly building on and leveraging the relationships built through the EUR 1.01 million ECHO-funded project (2016-2018). To ensure maintenance of education services that were supported by ECHO, the "EU Peace Support in Myanmar/Burma - PEACE III" (ACA/2017/039-980) action is supporting a transition phase which will also serve to prepare for the longer-term support of this action.

Synergies with the MoE IAQE project, managed by the World Bank (WB) and funded by the Global Partnership for Education (GPE), an International Development Association (IDA) loan, and by the EU for Public Financial Management (PFM) system strengthening (under the "Enhancing the education and skills base in Myanmar" (ACA/2018/039-665) action) have been developed in close collaboration with the WB. A core component of the IAQE project is to drive forward the development of the NESP partnership mechanism between MoE and indigenous providers of education through: the development of a roadmap to establish a minimum and coherent education framework; the implementation of selected initiatives/pilots for partnership; and the establishment of innovative funding arrangements for partnership. The action will provide much needed policy advocacy capacity development for indigenous providers, while strengthening coordination among
them, to ensure that they are fully prepared and supported to engage in constructive dialogue with the MoE. This will provide the foundation from which indigenous providers of education can then engage with the MoE on potential joint programme and funding pilot initiatives with the MoE, directly supporting and contributing to the successful implementation of the IAQE project.

Furthermore, the action complements, and will be closely coordinated and possibly cooperate with, the Myanmar Education Consortium’s (MEC) support to three of the largest EAG-affiliated indigenous providers of education (Karen Education Department (KED), the Kachin Independence Organisation Education Department (KIOED) and the Mon National Education Committee (MNEC)), funded by Australia, Denmark and the United Kingdom currently through Save the Children. The MEC strategy focuses on system strengthening and works bilaterally with the monastic system and some selected established indigenous education systems (providing support for education service delivery, institutional strengthening, and advocacy and policy engagement). This action takes a complementary approach, since it focuses on promoting unity and strengthening coordination between indigenous providers of education and enabling support to smaller providers, with a view to raising quality and standards across all the indigenous providers of education and ensuring greater alignment with the government education system.

The action also complements ongoing support to indigenous providers of education supported by other DPs, including: 1) the "Strengthening Equity, Access and Quality in Education" project, implemented by ECHO and DEVCO’s (transition phase) implementing partner, ADRA, and funded by NORAD with a new phase of funding in preparation; and 2) the recent USAID funded "Advancing Community Empowerment in Southeast Myanmar" project, which aims to empower communities to access the services they need and will work through yet to be selected indigenous providers of education.

Although political sensitivity remains, growing openness and freedom to discuss work undertaken in ethnic areas has allowed the recent establishment of an "Education in Ethnic States and Regions (ESSR)" group, which will be the platform for coordination and dialogue between organisations supporting education in ethnic areas. Co-led by ADRA and MEC, it involves the main partners working in these areas (Save the Children, PACT, World Education, World Vision, VSO, UNICEF etc.) and key donors and, in the longer term, should involve indigenous providers of education. This platform will be a key instrument to avoid duplication of efforts, address gaps and improve support for service providers. It will also help ensuring coordinated advocacy and common messaging, and strengthening alignment across programmes and partners in areas such as capacity development, teacher remunerations, curriculum, language and recognition. It will also promote links to other existing groups (e.g. Education in Emergencies, Teacher Training, Disability, etc.).

The action will also promote linkages with the efforts of DPs involved in supporting implementation of various aspects of the NESP. This includes linkages with the MoE Department of Alternative Education, which is mandated to significantly expand non-formal education opportunities for OOSC throughout the country (WB/GPE); efforts to support the development of a comprehensive teacher education policy framework (WB, UNICEF, UNESCO, JICA); efforts to promote the teaching of ethnic languages and the inclusion and development of local curricula (UNICEF) within the government education system; and efforts by DPs through the Education and Disability Sub Working Group, which collaborates with the MoE, to promote disability inclusion in education reforms.

Finally, the action directly complements the EU "Enhancing the education and skills base in Myanmar" ESRC and ensures a conflict-sensitive and balanced EU support to education provision in Myanmar/Burma. Under the ESRC, budget support will be provided to the government to implement the NESP, strengthen PFM systems, and support policy dialogue. Through this action, complementary support to indigenous providers of education will allow them to improve the quality of their education provision and expand their reach to some of the most marginalised children in
conflict affected and post-conflict areas. The action will contribute to meeting the MoE education targets in the NESP and strengthen alignment of indigenous education services with government education. This will prepare indigenous providers for government recognition and financing options for the future. The action will support indigenous providers of education to develop evidence-based policy positions on key issues related to the education needs of indigenous children and support their policy advocacy engagement with the MoE. This evidence base will strongly position the EU for a well-informed policy dialogue with the MoE, which will also be leveraged by the political and policy dialogue associated with the ESRC, to encourage MoE to progressively address in government education reforms issues relating to education of indigenous children. Hence, through the ESRC and this action, EU support will improve the quality and expand the reach of both government and indigenous provision of education, and will foster greater dialogue, cooperation and collaboration between the MoE and indigenous providers of education in order to forge, in the longer term, a partnership between the MoE and indigenous providers of education that creates a diverse but coherent national education system that promotes and protects the right of indigenous children to a quality education.

3.3 Cross-cutting issues

The action will contribute to cross-cutting issues through the following:

- Collection and analysis of sex disaggregated data to inform and improve education programme strategies and approaches, gender and disability inclusion analysis and the development of school inclusion policies; and capacity development of teachers so that they are better equipped to teach effectively in a gender and disability inclusive manner. This, together with establishing education services in communities without school, will directly contribute to reducing the number of girls out of school. Improvements in equitable teacher stipends and teacher competencies will directly benefit the living conditions of women in conflict affected rural ethnic areas as women constitute most of the teaching force. Furthermore, improvements in access, retention and completion rates of both girls and boys and adult literacy programmes for older women will directly contribute to improving literacy rates, breaking the cycle of poverty, improving women’s livelihood opportunities, and combating child labour and early marriage, which are all prevalent in ethnic areas. This, in turn, will inform policy engagement by indigenous education providers to raise awareness and promote these issues at the state and national level. Promoting women to senior roles within indigenous providers of education organisations and supporting their capacity development to engage in policy dialogue with the government is a key component of the action and will support the inclusion of more women in decision making roles.

- Improving environmental sustainability, disaster risk reduction and preparedness and mine risk education will be undertaken and will include support to School Management Committees and Parents-Teachers Associations to develop action plans to support environmentally sustainable school operations.

- Indigenous providers of education will be supported to develop collective policy positions informed by evidence from implementation of the action and other donor funded programmes and to engage in policy dialogue at the local, state and national levels. This will contribute to keeping equity issues high on the education reform agenda, particularly related to human rights and rights of indigenous and ethnic minorities, and gender and disability inclusion.

- Strengthening the governance capacity of indigenous providers of education will support their ability to ultimately establish a partnership with the MoE to achieve an equitable and coherent national education system that meets the needs of all children. This will not only ensure that the indigenous peoples of Myanmar/Burma directly contribute to their own social, economic and cultural development but that they also have a place within and help inform Myanmar/Burma’s transition to democracy.
4 Description of the action

4.1 Objectives/results

The overall objective of the action is to contribute to a peaceful and inclusive society for sustainable development in Myanmar/Burma.

The specific objective is: Improved access and learning for indigenous children, youth and women in conflict affected and post-conflict areas who benefit from indigenous education and training harmonised with national education standards.

Expected results:
1. Improved standards of education provision in schools supported by indigenous providers of education.
2. Expansion of indigenous education services to communities without schools and strengthened alternative education pathways to reach OOS youth and illiterate women.
4. The policy positions and standards of operation of indigenous providers of education are more harmonised and unified, including gender and disability inclusive strategies.
5. Progressive alignment between the services provided by indigenous providers of education and government services.

This action is relevant for the Agenda 2030. It contributes primarily to the progressive achievement of SDG 16: Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, in particular Goal 16.b.2 Educational Equality, but also promotes progress towards SDG 4: Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education, SDG 1: End poverty, and SDG 5: Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls. This does not imply a commitment by the country benefiting from this action.

4.2 Main activities

Indicative activities for Result 1: (i) recruit and provide a minimum of 1 year preservice teacher training for community teachers, (ii) improve the standards of preservice teacher education by revising the 1 year preservice training programme to achieve greater alignment with equivalent teaching standards and the Myanmar/Burma teacher competency framework as well as gender and disability inclusion strategies and MTB-MLE, including developing a student teacher placement program, (iii) pay teacher stipends according to agreed equitable standards, (iv) distribute mother tongue based resources and quality teaching and learning materials, (v) conduct a gender and disability inclusion analysis of community schools managed by indigenous providers of education, (vi) train school leaders on instructional leadership and management, gender and disability sensitisation and mainstreaming, (vii) support Parent-Teacher Associations (PTAs)/School Management Committees (SMCs) to mobilise resources to support school improvement plans and initiatives, (viii) conduct mine risk and disaster risk education, (ix) support to community schools to develop Codes of Conduct, child protection and safeguarding policies, (x) contextualise early grade literacy and numeracy assessments for local language, contextual relevance and alignment with government curriculum standards, (xi) undertake literacy and numeracy assessments at baseline, midline and end-line, (xii) report learning outcomes and results, and (xiii) conduct annual learning events to share results and develop actions to address gaps in results for boys and girls.

Indicative activities for Result 2: (i) recruit and train teachers using the 3-month rapid preservice training program for communities without school, (ii) revise the rapid preservice training manual to achieve greater alignment with equivalent MoE teaching standards, (iii) support community education sensitisation events in these communities, support to establish PTAs/SMCs in communities where school services are established, (iv) train SMC/PTAs to develop action plans to support school operations, (v) support new partnerships/collaborations with local indigenous CSOs.
such as women’s and youth groups to expand community outreach and education initiatives, (vi) undertake a needs assessment for non-formal education (NFE)/Technical Vocational Education and Training (TVET)/literacy, numeracy and life skills targeting older OOS boys and girls and women who have missed out on basic education, (vii) funding of priority projects, including assistance for OOS boys and girls and women to participate in appropriate education programmes, and (viii) document action research to capture learning and results of alternative education provision for older OOS boys and girls and women in conflict affected and post-conflict communities.

Indicative activities for Result 3: (i) revise the existing Master training course for Teacher Trainers with a focus on gender and disability inclusion sensitisation, (ii) develop/align in-service teacher training (TT) materials to MoE in-service TT programme and include gender and disability inclusion pedagogy practice, (iii) support to establish and maintain teacher peer networks, (iv) improve management of the TPD database, (v) support mobile teacher trainers (MTT) community school visits, (vi) develop a unified teacher competency framework (TCF) for indigenous providers of education that aligns with MoE TCF, (vii) develop teacher assessment instruments, including observational forms and self-review, (viii) develop a TPD implementation guide that aligns with the MoE Comprehensive Teacher Education framework and best practice TPD models, and (ix) document action research on TPD approaches in remote areas.

Indicative activities for Result 4: (i) develop a joint advocacy strategy, (ii) develop advocacy positions and policy documents to support local and national dialogue, (iii) conduct advocacy training for leaders of indigenous providers of education, (iv) develop gender and disability inclusion organisational policies, (v) conduct quarterly leadership forums, (vi) hold state forums to showcase results of studies undertaken, (vii) hold national forums to promote sharing and learning from indigenous providers of education, and (viii) support for inclusion and empowerment of women in the dialogue process.

Indicative activities for Result 5: (i) exposure visits to MoE teacher training colleges and to training preparation centres managed by indigenous providers of education, (ii) dialogue to advance partnerships with MoE teacher education institutes, (iii) research to map local curriculum delivered by indigenous providers of education including MTB-MLE, (iv) research to document evidence of progressive alignment agenda of services provided by indigenous groups and government services, (v) consultation and dialogue between indigenous providers of education and MoE to advance reform topics of importance to the Indigenous providers of education, with a likely focus on MTB-MLE and (vi) support to continuous coordination between DPs working on education in ethnic areas to create synergies and harmonise efforts to support indigenous service provision.

4.3 Intervention logic

If standards of education provision in indigenous schools are improved, more indigenous children will receive a higher quality education and learning improvements will be visible in assessment data and retention and grade promotions will be evident in school data. This will be more likely if sustainable funding for the maintenance of education services, such as payment of teacher stipends and teaching and learning resources can be secured. Conflict and disaster events will also need to limit disruption to school operations and not prevent distribution of materials, training and supportive supervision inputs reaching schools in a timely manner. With the introduction of quality standards, internal human resource capacity of indigenous providers of education will need to be sufficient to apply quality standards consistently across the diversity of education provision where poverty and remoteness typify the locations where indigenous services are provided.

If the action expands services to communities without schools, more indigenous children will have access to education. This will only be possible if community leaders and indigenous providers of education can identify suitable individuals in their communities to become teachers. Local recruitment is a critical component of the rapid deployment strategy and the cornerstone to the
expansion of services to remote locations. For older OOS youth and women who have either never attended school or have very limited education to engage in non-formal or vocational training programmes, several key assumptions exist. This will be more probable if current national NFE curriculum and national TVET programs can be contextualised for the indigenous learner and the contexts where they live. This will also be more straightforward if TVET and NFE services exist in ethnic areas and have committed organisations to support them. The government and local communities will need to foresee support to the local population to make livelihoods while studying in TVET and NFE centres. Furthermore, collection and making available some labour market information would help motivation of the local population to attend TVET and NFE.

Improving the quality of education delivered by indigenous providers of education can only be made possible if significant investment is undertaken to strengthen Indigenous TPD and bring TPD into alignment with key national education reforms, such as the Comprehensive Teacher Education Framework and Teacher Competency Framework. Several factors influence progress in this result area. Many of the locations are extremely remote and conflict affected so the ability to establish peer teacher networks in all locations will need a degree of adaptation based on what is possible in some locations. Similarly, MTTs’ support to schools is a critical feature of the indigenous TPD approach, yet regularity of visits can sometimes be hampered by the weather and the distance they must travel, usually by foot across difficult terrain. This approach has been implemented in conflict affected areas for over a decade, and indigenous providers are adaptable and resilient to a forever changing context. The action however will require that indigenous providers reach agreement and endorse the frameworks for teacher education that align to the MoE TPD framework and TCF.

This will be more possible through a network approach. Increasing the harmonisation and unification of indigenous providers of education in relation to their policy positions and standards of operation, including gender and disability inclusive strategies, will contribute to improving education quality in ethnic areas and have a positive effect on overall education equality in Myanmar/Burma. In the short term this will also enable indigenous providers of education to leverage capacities across the network and build on each other’s strengths. This will be possible if conflict does not escalate and reduce the willingness of providers to become more unified and/or engage with the government on education reform issues.

Progressive alignment between the services provided by indigenous providers of education and government services will contribute to raising the standards of community schools and create greater complementarity between government and indigenous services. There is much anticipation about this result although it will be dependent on whether the government and indigenous providers continue to be open to constructive dialogue.

The contribution made by this action’s overall objective towards a peaceful inclusive society for sustainable development in Myanmar/Burma will be possible if the government remains supportive of establishing a national platform for dialogue as outlined in the NESP and remains committed to education equality as articulated in its commitment to ‘leaving no child behind’. It is critical that the government expansion of services into ethnic areas is done in a conflict sensitive way and does not displace community teachers and erode indigenous systems as this will reduce trust in the peace process and impact the willingness of indigenous providers to identify common ground and build complementarity. Therefore, a nuanced conflict sensitive approach has been developed to promote unity and avoid fragmentation between indigenous providers who currently service community schools in remote conflict affected regions in Myanmar/Burma. The action will minimise unintended negative outcomes and increase intentional positive ones, while fostering collaboration with the government at local, state and national levels.
5 IMPLEMENTATION

5.1 Financing agreement

In order to implement this action, it is not foreseen to conclude a financing agreement with the partner country.

5.2 Indicative implementation period

The indicative operational implementation period of this action, during which the activities described in section 4.1 will be carried out and the corresponding contracts and agreements implemented, is 72 months from the date of adoption by the Commission of this Action Document.

Extensions of the implementation period may be agreed by the Commission’s authorising officer responsible by amending this decision and the relevant contracts and agreements; such amendments to this decision constitute technical amendments in the sense of point (i) of Article 2(3)(c) of Regulation (EU) No 236/2014.

5.3 Implementation modalities

Both in indirect and direct management, the Commission will ensure that the EU appropriate rules and procedures for providing financing to third parties are respected, including review procedures, where appropriate, and compliance of the action with EU restrictive measures affecting the respective countries of operation\(^{24}\).

5.3.1 Grants: call for proposals “Strengthening Indigenous Provision of Education in Ethnic Areas of Myanmar” (direct management)

(a) Objectives of the grants, fields of intervention, priorities of the year and expected results

The objectives and expected results of the grants will be to improve access to education and learning outcomes for indigenous boys and girls living in remote conflict affected areas of Myanmar/Burma, as described in sections 4.1 and 4.2.

(b) Eligibility conditions

In order to be eligible for a grant, the applicant must:

- be a legal person,
- be a specific type of organisation such as: non-governmental organisation, public sector operator, local authority, international (inter-governmental) organisation;
- be directly responsible for the preparation and management of the action with the co-applicant(s) and affiliated entity(ies), not acting as an intermediary.
- be established in\(^{25}\) a Member State of the European Union or in an eligible country for funding under the DCI Regulation, as stipulated in Article 9 of the Common Implementing Regulation (CIR). This obligation does not apply to international organisations.

Subject to information to be published in the call for proposals, the indicative amount of the EU contribution per grant is EUR 10 000 000 to EUR 20 000 000 and the grants may be awarded to sole beneficiaries and to consortia of beneficiaries (coordinator and co-beneficiaries). The indicative duration of the grant (its implementation period) is 60 months.

---


25 To be determined on the basis of the organisation’s statutes, which should demonstrate that it has been established by an instrument governed by the national law of the country concerned and that its head office is located in an eligible country. In this respect, any legal entity whose statutes have been established in another country cannot be considered an eligible local organisation, even if the statutes are registered locally or a ‘Memorandum of Understanding’ has been concluded.
(c) Essential selection and award criteria
The essential selection criteria are financial and operational capacity of the applicant.

The essential award criteria are relevance of the proposed action to the objectives of the call; design, effectiveness, feasibility, sustainability and cost-effectiveness of the action.

(d) Maximum rate of co-financing
The maximum possible rate of co-financing for grants under this call is 95% of the eligible costs of the action.

If full funding is essential for the action to be carried out, the maximum possible rate of co-financing may be increased up to 100%. The essentiality of full funding will be justified by the Commission’s authorising officer responsible in the award decision, in respect of the principles of equal treatment and sound financial management.

(e) Indicative timing to launch the call
First semester of 2019.

5.4 Scope of geographical eligibility for procurement and grants
The geographical eligibility in terms of place of establishment for participating in procurement and grant award procedures and in terms of origin of supplies purchased as established in the basic act and set out in the relevant contractual documents shall apply.

The Commission’s authorising officer responsible may extend the geographical eligibility in accordance with Article 9(2)(b) of Regulation (EU) No 236/2014 on the basis of urgency or of unavailability of products and services in the markets of the countries concerned, or in other duly substantiated cases where the eligibility rules would make the realisation of this action impossible or exceedingly difficult.

5.5 Indicative budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>EU contribution (amount in EUR)</th>
<th>Indicative third party contribution (amount in EUR )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.3.1 – Call for proposals “Strengthening Indigenous Provision of Education in Ethnic Areas of Myanmar” (direct management)</td>
<td>20 000 000</td>
<td>1 052 631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8 – Evaluation, 5.9 – Audit</td>
<td>will be covered by another decision</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.10 - Communication and visibility</td>
<td>will be covered by another decision</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20 000 000</td>
<td>1 052 631</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.6 Organisational set-up and responsibilities
For the action, it is foreseen that a Steering Committee will be set up to provide strategic direction and review overall progress. This committee would have two co-chairs, i.e. from the indigenous providers of education and the EU. To build trust between indigenous providers and the MoE and to promote the cooperation and formal partnerships, the participation of MoE in the Steering Committee will be explored and pursued.
Policy dialogue will take several forms: (i) EU policy dialogue with the indigenous providers of education through the Steering Committee and regular monitoring of the action; (ii) EU policy dialogue with the MoE and other Ministries through the political and policy dialogue associated with the ESRC and ad hoc bilateral meetings with the government; (iii) EU's participation in forums and events and in consultations and dialogue between indigenous providers of education and the MoE supported by this action; (iv) policy dialogue with the MoE through the governance structure of the IAQE, to which the EU expects to be associated given the strong complementarity; (v) policy dialogue with the MoE through EU's participation in the regular education sector coordination mechanisms; and (vi) EU's participation to the recently established coordination platform between DPs working on education in ethnic areas, which will be further supported through this action.

5.7 Performance monitoring and reporting

The day-to-day technical and financial monitoring of the implementation of this action will be a continuous process and part of the implementing partner’s responsibilities. To this aim, the implementing partner shall establish a permanent internal, technical and financial monitoring system for the action and elaborate regular progress reports (not less than annual) and final reports.

The monitoring system shall include metadata on the definition of indicators specified in the log frame below. Data collection instruments, methods, staffing and training will be established at the beginning of the action. The necessary surveys (e.g. on mapping locations without school services, foundational literacy and numeracy assessment, community school quality standards survey, Indigenous teacher competency assessment, local curriculum mapping, estimates of out of school children, the TVET and skill-building needs for youth and illiterate women, etc.) will be planned and budgeted in the program budget. The grantee will submit annual brief reports on the collected statistics. For the indicators matching with the EU Development and Cooperation Results Framework26, the grantee will consult the respective methodological notes.

Every report shall provide an accurate account of implementation of the action, difficulties encountered, changes introduced, as well as the degree of achievement of its results (outputs and direct outcomes) as measured by corresponding indicators, using as reference the log frame matrix (for project modality) or the list of result indicators (for budget support). The report shall be laid out in such a way as to allow monitoring of the means envisaged and employed and of the budget details for the action. The final report, narrative and financial, will cover the entire period of the action implementation.

The Commission may undertake additional project monitoring visits both through its own staff and through independent consultants recruited directly by the Commission for independent monitoring reviews (or recruited by the responsible agent contracted by the Commission for implementing such reviews).

5.8 Evaluation

Having regard to the importance of the action, a mid-term and final evaluation will be carried out for this action or its components via independent consultants.

The mid-term evaluation will be carried out for problem solving and learning purposes, in particular with respect to emerging policy concerns for indigenous providers of education and to review action research undertaken to inform special projects and advocacy objectives. The mid-term evaluation will provide an opportunity for modifications to the log frame and implementation approach to ensure it remains relevant to the needs of indigenous providers of education.

26 https://europa.eu/capacity4dev.eu-rfi
The final evaluation will be carried out for accountability and learning purposes at various levels, (including for policy revision), taking into account in particular key achievements in relation to teacher competency, boys and girls learning outcomes, the non-formal education pilots to support older OOS boys and girls and progress made in developing unified policy positions and alignment to quality standards of the government. The final evaluation will also consider the volatile peace process and any contextual factors that have influenced implementation and results.

The Commission shall inform the implementing partner at least two months in advance of the dates foreseen for the evaluation missions. The implementing partner shall collaborate efficiently and effectively with the evaluation experts, and inter alia provide them with all necessary information and documentation, as well as access to the project premises and activities.

The evaluation reports shall be shared with the partner country and other key stakeholders. The implementing partner and the Commission shall analyse the conclusions and recommendations of the evaluations and, where appropriate, in agreement with the partner country, jointly decide on the follow-up actions to be taken and any adjustments necessary, including, if indicated, the reorientation of the project.

The financing of the evaluation shall be covered by another measure constituting a financing decision.

5.9 Audit

Without prejudice to the obligations applicable to contracts concluded for the implementation of this action, the Commission may, based on a risk assessment, contract independent audits or expenditure verification assignments for one or several contracts or agreements.

The financing of the audit shall be covered by another measure constituting a financing decision.

5.10 Communication and visibility

Communication and visibility of the EU is a legal obligation for all external actions funded by the EU.

This action shall contain communication and visibility measures which shall be based on a specific Communication and Visibility Plan of the action, to be elaborated at the start of implementation and supported with the budget indicated in section 5.5 above.

In terms of legal obligations on communication and visibility, the measures shall be implemented by the Commission, the partner country, contractors, grant beneficiaries and/or entrusted entities. Appropriate contractual obligations shall be included in, respectively, the financing agreement, procurement and grant contracts, and other agreements.

The Communication and Visibility Manual for European Union External Action shall be used to establish the Communication and Visibility Plan of the action and the appropriate contractual obligations.
APPENDIX - INDICATIVE LOGFRAME MATRIX (FOR PROJECT MODALITY)\(^{27}\)

The activities, the expected outputs and all the indicators, targets and baselines included in the logframe matrix are indicative and may be updated during the implementation of the action, no amendment being required to the financing decision. When it is not possible to determine the outputs of an action at formulation stage, intermediary outcomes should be presented and the outputs defined during inception of the overall programme and its components. The indicative logframe matrix will evolve during the lifetime of the action: new lines will be added for including the activities as well as new columns for intermediary targets (milestones) for the output and outcome indicators whenever it is relevant for monitoring and reporting purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results chain</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Baselines (incl. reference year)</th>
<th>Targets (incl. reference year)</th>
<th>Sources and means of verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall objective : Impact</strong></td>
<td>To contribute to a peaceful and inclusive society for sustainable development in Myanmar/Burma</td>
<td>Education equality (SDG 16.b.2 complementary(^{28}))</td>
<td>0.84 (2014)</td>
<td>TBD in inception phase</td>
<td>SDG16 Data Initiative(^{29})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary completion rate for children (GAP, ** EU RF L1 #14) attending indigenous education services disaggregated by sex and indigenous provider</td>
<td>TBD in inception phase</td>
<td>TBD in inception phase</td>
<td>Indigenous providers EMIS</td>
<td>Transportation is available and travel is not impacted by ongoing conflict or natural weather events. Conflict does not prevent children from enrolling in community schools. Government schools do not further displace community teachers. Education pathways for older OOSC boys and girls and women can be identified and supported. Government is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of children (disaggregated by sex, disability, indigenous provider) enrolled in primary education with EU support (GAP, EU RF L2 # 15 **)</td>
<td>343,649 (49.4% girls, 50.6% boys) (2018)(^{30})</td>
<td>TBD in inception phase</td>
<td>Indigenous providers EMIS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Early grade Literacy and Numeracy outcomes for children attending indigenous education services disaggregated by sex and Indigenous provider</td>
<td>TBD in inception phase</td>
<td>TBD in inception phase</td>
<td>Midline and endline studies of early grade literacy and numeracy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% (number) of community schools with EU support reaching agreed quality standards that supports learning for primary aged children disaggregated by sex and Indigenous provider</td>
<td>TBD in inception phase</td>
<td>TBD in inception phase</td>
<td>Community school quality standards assessment tool</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% (number) of community teachers disaggregated by sex and Indigenous provider achieving satisfactory teacher competency based on the agreed TCF standards</td>
<td>TBD in inception phase</td>
<td>TBD in inception phase</td>
<td>Indigenous providers TCF assessment tool adapted from</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicators aligned with the EU Results Framework are marked with &quot;**&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A complementary set of 2 indicators has been recommended to be used to supplement SDG b.1 – Proportion of population reporting having personally felt discriminated against or harassed in the previous 12 months on the basis of a ground of discrimination prohibited under international human rights law. SDG b.2 measures education equality whereas SDG b.3 measures health equality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.sdg16.org/map/?layer=educational_equality&amp;layerType=indicator">http://www.sdg16.org/map/?layer=educational_equality&amp;layerType=indicator</a>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.sdg16.org/about/">http://www.sdg16.org/about/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Figures from endline of ECHO funded Conflict Areas Support for Education (CASE), which supported 8 indigenous providers of education (ended in April 2018).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output</td>
<td>Inception Phase</td>
<td>Study/Measurement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar TCF is supportive of establishing a national platform for dialogue. Indigenous teachers are hired and paid continuously. The learning materials are supplied uninterruptedly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Out of school (OOSC) children (disaggregated by sex, disability and Indigenous provider) reported by indigenous providers (EU RF L2 #5)</td>
<td>TBD in inception phase</td>
<td>OOSC baseline study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number and ratio of female to male participants who have benefited from skills development with EU support from TVET and non-formal education (GAP, EU RF L2 # 28**).</td>
<td>TBD in inception phase</td>
<td>Indigenous providers EMIS data for TVET and NFE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># older OOSC (disaggregated by sex, disability and Indigenous provider) and women enrolled in non-formal education programs supported by Indigenous providers of education.</td>
<td>Zero</td>
<td>Indigenous providers EMIS data for NFE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># pilot policy initiatives supported by the national government</td>
<td>TBD in inception phase</td>
<td>Documented evidence of the national government’s support for policy initiatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Improved standards of education provision in schools supported by indigenous providers of education.

1.1: # community teachers (disaggregated by sex and Indigenous provider) complete 1-year preservice Teacher Training program or equivalent with the support of this action (EU RF L2 #17)

1.1: Zero

1.1: TBD in inception phase

TPC registration and completion data from TPC student teacher records

Sustainable funding for long term support for maintenance of education services of indigenous providers can be secured by the end of the action.

Weather events or conflict preventing assessment teams from conducting assessments in schools.

1.2: # community teachers (disaggregated by sex and Indigenous provider) receiving equitable stipends annually with support from this action

1.2: Zero

1.2: TBD in inception phase

Indigenous providers EMIS

1.3: # communities where Indigenous providers of education schools receive Mother Tongue Based learning resources and Teaching and Learning Materials from this action annually

1.3: Zero

1.3: TBD in inception phase

Indigenous providers EMIS

1.4: # of community schools with gender and disability inclusion analysis conducted with support of this action by 2021

1.4: Zero

1.4: TBD in inception phase

2021 gender and disability inclusion report

Indigenous providers of education.

---

31 et.al. 23

32 Non-formal education programs may include women’s literacy, life skills education, NFE and TVET
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.5: # school leaders (disaggregated by sex and indigenous provider) trained in Instructional leadership, management, gender and disability sensitive and mainstreaming approaches</th>
<th>1.5: Zero</th>
<th>1.5 TBD in inception phase</th>
<th>records of participation in school leaders training</th>
<th>education have financial and Human/Professional capacity to apply the local curriculum framework in their indigenous community schools.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.6: # of community schools supported by this action that receive mine risk education and DRR training</td>
<td>1.6: Zero</td>
<td>1.6 TBD in inception phase</td>
<td>Training records from MRE and DRR training events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7: # community schools supported by this action with Code of Conduct, child safeguarding and child protection policies in place</td>
<td>1.7 Zero</td>
<td>1.7 TBD in inception phase</td>
<td>School codes of conduct and child safeguarding policy documentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8: # reports on early grade learning outcomes disaggregated by Indigenous provider</td>
<td>1.8 Zero</td>
<td>1.8: 2 learning assessment reports incl. chapter for each Indigenous provider</td>
<td>Learning assessment reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Expansion of indigenous education services to communities without schools and strengthened alternative education pathways to reach OOS youth and illiterate women</td>
<td>2.1: # OOS children (disaggregated by sex, disability, and indigenous provider) reached with the provision of indigenous teachers in their communities</td>
<td>2.1: Zero</td>
<td>2.1: TBD in inception phase</td>
<td>Indigenous providers EMIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2: # teachers (disaggregated by sex and indigenous provider) who have been deployed to communities after completing the 3-month rapid training program with the support of this action (** EU RF L2 #17)</td>
<td>2.2: Zero</td>
<td>2.2: TBD in inception phase</td>
<td>Indigenous providers EMIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4: # of participants in education sensitization events organised with the support of this action (disaggregated by sex and indigenous provider)</td>
<td>2.4: Zero</td>
<td>2.4: TBD in inception phase</td>
<td>Attendance forms from sensitisation events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5: # of communities with Parent-Teacher Associations/School Management Committees established with the support of this action</td>
<td>2.5: Zero</td>
<td>2.5: TBD in inception phase</td>
<td>Indigenous providers EMIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.6: # of communities with involvement of women’s and youth groups in community outreach &amp; education support organised by this action</td>
<td>2.6: Zero</td>
<td>2.6: TBD in inception phase</td>
<td>Partnership agreements with women’s and youth groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Strengthened Indigenous Teacher Professional Development (TPD)</td>
<td>3.1: # indigenous teachers (disaggregated by sex and indigenous providers) who complete 70 hours of in-service TT with the support of this action (** EU RF L2 #17)</td>
<td>3.1: Zero</td>
<td>3.1: TBD in inception phase</td>
<td>Records of training need assessment report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2: # indigenous teachers (disaggregated by sex and indigenous providers) involved in a peer teacher network with the support of this action</td>
<td>3.2: Zero</td>
<td>3.2: TBD in inception phase</td>
<td>Teacher database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3: # indigenous teachers (disaggregated by sex and indigenous provider) with up to date records of professional development stored on the teacher database</td>
<td>3.3 Zero</td>
<td>3.3: TBD in inception phase</td>
<td>Teacher database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4: # community schools receiving MTT school visits annually as part of the school based TPD provision (disaggregated by indigenous provider)</td>
<td>3.4: Zero</td>
<td>3.4: TBD in inception phase</td>
<td>Indigenous providers EMIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.5: The status of harmonisation of the TCF to Myanmar TCF</td>
<td>3.5: Not aligned</td>
<td>3.5 Developed and discussed with MoE and indigenous providers</td>
<td>Minutes of meetings with MoE and Indigenous providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.6: Status of alignment of Teacher assessment instruments to Myanmar TCF</td>
<td>3.6: Not aligned</td>
<td>3.6: Developed and discussed with MoE and indigenous providers</td>
<td>The Teacher assessment instruments incl. observation and self-review forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.7: The status of the TPD Implementation guide</td>
<td>3.7 Not developed</td>
<td>3.7: Developed and endorsed by indigenous providers</td>
<td>TPD implementation guide document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.8: Status of updating the in-service teacher training program with gender and inclusive teaching strategies and MTB-MLE</td>
<td>3.8 Edition 1 – not updated</td>
<td>3.8 Edition 2 endorsed by indigenous providers by 2021</td>
<td>In-service training materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.9: # in service TT programs delivered to Indigenous teachers annually</td>
<td>3.9: Zero</td>
<td>3.9: TBD in inception phase</td>
<td>In-service training records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The policy positions and standards of</td>
<td>4.1: # unified positions concerning Myanmar government policy developed by indigenous providers</td>
<td>4.1: Zero</td>
<td>4.1: TBD in inception phase</td>
<td>Policy positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>operation of indigenous providers of education are more harmonised and unified</strong>, including gender and disability inclusive strategies</td>
<td>with the support of this action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>willingness of providers to become more unified and to harmonise their policies and strategies. The ability of Indigenous providers of education to consolidate, cooperate and utilise the outputs of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2: # personnel from Indigenous providers of education whose knowledge and skills have been built through advocacy training events</td>
<td>4.2: Zero</td>
<td>4.2: 5 (1 per year)</td>
<td>Minutes and presentations from advocacy training events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2: # Indigenous providers of education presenting papers or speeches at state and national forums with the support of this action</td>
<td>4.3: Zero</td>
<td>4.3: TBD in inception phase</td>
<td>Minutes and reports from state and national forums</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4: # Indigenous women from Indigenous providers of education supported by this action to engage in the dialogue process</td>
<td>4.4: Zero</td>
<td>4.4: TBD in inception phase</td>
<td>Network membership profiles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5: # indigenous providers of education with gender and disability inclusive strategies in place</td>
<td>4.5: Zero</td>
<td>4.5: TBD in inception phase</td>
<td>Copies of gender and inclusive sensitivity strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7: Status of mapping of local curriculum delivered by indigenous providers of education including MTB-MLE</td>
<td>4.7: Not performed</td>
<td>4.6: 1 mapping report published</td>
<td>Local curriculum mapping report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8 status of a harmonised local curriculum framework including MTB-MLLE for indigenous providers of education supported by this action</td>
<td>4.8 None</td>
<td>4.7: 1 local curriculum framework</td>
<td>Local curriculum framework document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>Progressive alignment</strong> between the services provided by indigenous providers of education and government services.</td>
<td>5.1: # partnerships formed with Myanmar teacher colleges and teacher preparation centres to strengthen complementarity and alignment</td>
<td>5.1: Zero</td>
<td>5.1: TBD in inception phase</td>
<td>Meeting minutes and MoUs National government and Indigenous providers of education continue to be open to constructive dialogue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2: # research studies documenting evidence of progressive alignment produced to guide political dialogue</td>
<td>5.2: Zero</td>
<td>5.2: TBD in inception phase</td>
<td>Research reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3: Status of a coordination platform with DPs to better harmonise and leverage support to indigenous providers of education and avoid duplication</td>
<td>5.3: Zero</td>
<td>5.3: 1</td>
<td>ToR and working documents of the coordination platform</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4: # of topics (local curriculum, teacher qualification, MTB-MLLE) under the discussion of DPs with recommendations for joint action</td>
<td>5.4: Zero</td>
<td>5.4: TBD in inception phase</td>
<td>Joint action briefing notes &amp; minutes from meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>