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Glossary

This study uses the following definitions:

**Conflict:** ‘Armed or other violent conflict in or between countries or population groups’ (IIEP-UNESCO and UNICEF WCARO, 2011). A broader definition that includes violence within families, schools, communities, and societies, as well as psychological pressures (e.g. harassment, discrimination, gang violence, or social hate towards targeted groups) was also used in the work undertaken in Burkina Faso.

**Conflict risk reduction:** ‘The practice of reducing the risk of conflict through systematic analysis and management of the causal factors of conflict. This involves conducting conflict assessments to identify the drivers of conflict (whether economic, social, political, or environmental) and how these impact on or are impacted by education. Strategies then need to be applied to reduce (and if possible prevent) those risks from negatively affecting education systems, personnel and learners’ (IIEP-UNESCO and UNICEF WCARO, 2011).

**Disaster:** ‘A serious disruption of the functioning of a community or a society involving widespread human, material, economic or environmental losses and impacts, which exceeds the ability of the affected community or society to cope using its own resources’ (UNISDR, 2009).

**Disaster risk reduction:** ‘The practice of reducing the risk of disaster through systematic analysis and management of the causal factors of disasters. This includes reducing exposure to hazards, lessening vulnerability of people and property, wise land and environmental management, and improved preparedness. For education it implies the systematic analysis of and attempt to reduce disaster-related risks to enable the education system to provide (and learners to continue, and out-of-school children to access) quality education for all, before, during, and after emergencies’ (IIEP-UNESCO and UNICEF WCARO, 2011).

**Hazard:** ‘A dangerous phenomenon, substance, human activity or condition that may cause loss of life, injury or other health impacts, property damage, loss of livelihoods and services, social and economic disruption, or environmental damage’ (UNISDR, 2009).

**Prevention:** ‘The outright avoidance of adverse impacts of hazards and related disasters’ (UNISDR, 2009).

**Resilience:** ‘The ability of a system, community or society exposed to hazards to resist, absorb, accommodate to and recover from the effects of a hazard in a timely and efficient manner, including through the preservation and restoration of its essential basic structures and functions’ (UNISDR, 2009).

**Response:** ‘The provision of emergency services and public assistance during or immediately after a disaster in order to save lives, reduce health impacts, ensure public safety and meet the basic subsistence needs of the people affected’ (UNISDR, 2009).

**Vulnerability:** ‘The characteristics and circumstances of a community, system or asset that make it susceptible to the damaging effects of a hazard’ (UNISDR, 2009).
Executive summary

Natural hazards and conflict can have disastrous impacts on an education system. Yet, when educational planning takes into account conflict and disaster risks, it can significantly reduce their impact. Mainstreaming conflict and disaster risk reduction (C/DRR) into education sector planning is a new type of work for many ministries and other education actors and therefore needs to be documented. This case study responds to that need. It examines how Burkina Faso’s Ministry of National Education and Literacy (MENA), with support from the UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP) and UNICEF Burkina Faso, addressed C/DRR within the country’s 10-year Programme for the Strategic Development of Basic Education (PDSEB). This project took place from September 2011 to May 2012.

Burkina Faso has high rates of destructive flooding, drought, violent wind storms, population movement, and recurrent health epidemics, as well as socio-political tensions. The dramatic floods of 2009 and the socio-political tensions of 2011 spurred education sector agencies to systematically address C/DRR in their planning and policy development processes. At the request of MENA, IIEP and UNICEF Burkina Faso supported the Ministry to integrate relevant prevention and response measures into the PDSEB.

This case study reviews the strengths and weaknesses of the project methodology and implementation process in Burkina Faso, in order to inform future work in this area. Based on interviews with key stakeholders, this study describes the individual, organizational, and institutional capacities that were necessary to ensure that C/DRR was appropriately integrated into education planning, as well as the challenges that emerged during this process.

The study analyses the three main phases of the project: (1) the analysis of Burkina Faso’s education sector’s vulnerability to conflict and disaster risks; (2) the development of the sector’s risk reduction strategy; and (3) the integration of the risk reduction strategy into the PDSEB. It outlines the participative processes of developing the vulnerability analysis and risk reduction strategy, including workshops, consultations, and debates.

The case study has identified five key preconditions that facilitated this process in Burkina Faso:

1. **The recognition of the detrimental impacts of disasters as a result of the floods of 2009.** The floods were disastrous and spurred education sector agencies to systematically address the risk of disasters in their planning and policy development processes.

2. **The existence of a national inter-sectoral coordination and risk management body (the National Commission for Emergency and Rehabilitation Aid [CONASUR]), together with a multi-sectoral contingency plan.** These laid the foundation for the development of a C/DRR strategy, and demonstrated Burkina Faso’s considerable and longstanding national political will to address C/DRR in a holistic manner.

3. **Information and awareness raising to convince ministry officials, at both the central and decentralized levels, to explore prevention methods in planning.** Advocacy by UNICEF and other partners was key to convincing ministry officials that the country needed to learn from the past and put C/DRR mechanisms in place.

4. **The concurrent timing of the development of the national C/DRR strategy and the country’s education sector plan.** The national C/DRR strategy development process (for all sectors) began in 2011, coinciding with MENA drafting the PDSEB’s diagnosis and analysis sections.
5. **The establishment of a specific committee for education in emergencies.** This committee strengthened the basis for leadership and policy-making throughout the programme. It was formed by a core group of representatives from diverse departments within the education ministries, as well as the inter-sectoral coordination and risk management body.

This case study also demonstrates that certain institutional, organizational, and individual capacities were essential prerequisites to the process:

- At the institutional level: political will, leadership, international and national frameworks, continued advocacy, and long-term investments to ensure the sustainability of efforts undertaken through this project.
- At the organizational level: participation of a core group of diverse representatives, various technical and financial partners, the Education Cluster, CONASUR, continuity of staff, and maintaining organizational links.
- At an individual level: the initial core group of MENA officials, and participation of a national consultant.

Finally, this case study identifies some key lessons learned from the process concerning:

- linking the C/DRR strategy to the action plan,
- collecting information and data related to the impacts of conflict and disasters on the education system,
- further capacity development,
- continued advocacy and awareness raising,
- long-term commitment,
- facilitating ownership of the C/DRR strategy.
Introduction

Some 50 per cent (28.5 million) of out-of-school children of primary school age live in conflict-affected countries (UNESCO, 2013), and an estimated 100 million children and young people annually are affected by disasters (UNISDR, 2011). Without efforts to mitigate these risks, conflict and disaster stand in the way of achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and Education for All goals.

Conflict and disaster risk reduction (C/DRR) saves lives and protects the right to education. It is also cost effective: for every $1 invested in risk management before the onset of a disaster, $7 of losses can be prevented (Save the Children UK, 2007).

Education is key to C/DRR. The education system can reduce conflict and disaster risks by combining long-term prevention measures and careful preparedness planning.

Ministries of education increasingly recognize that it is possible to reduce risks by systematically integrating C/DRR measures within their national education sector planning processes. In 2011 Burkina Faso decided to do so, with support and technical assistance from the UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP) and UNICEF Burkina Faso.

In 2009 and 2010, Burkina Faso was confronted with major floods that significantly impacted the education system and the school calendar. The floods of 1 September 2009 affected most of the country (11 regions out of 13); the capital city of Ouagadougou (central region) was hardest hit. More than 150,000 people were affected, including 38,000 students. Across the country, a total of 32,260 homes collapsed. School infrastructure was also damaged (405 schools in total), as were teaching materials, furniture, and school supplies.

Floods such as those in 2009 and 2010 tend to recur annually in Burkina Faso, as in many other countries in the region. Drought, violent winds, and storms are also common. In addition to these natural hazards, socio-political tensions in Burkina Faso have also led to violence and conflict, particularly in February 2011 following the death of the student Justin Zongo. These situations affect entire school communities: students, parents, authorities, and partners in education.

To prevent natural hazards and conflict from having a catastrophic impact on education and to ensure that the system is prepared for emergencies, Burkina Faso’s Ministry of National Education and Literacy (MENA) sought to integrate C/DRR into its education sector planning processes, particularly within its 10-year Programme for the Strategic Development of Basic Education (PDSEB). At the request of MENA, IIEP and UNICEF Burkina Faso were asked to support the Ministry in this process.

IIEP, UNICEF Burkina Faso, and MENA implemented the project ‘Integrating conflict and disaster risk reduction into education sector planning processes in Burkina Faso’ from September 2011 to May 2012. The project aimed to ensure that conflict and disaster risks were addressed throughout each phase of the planning process. Particular focus was placed on addressing the risks associated with rain and high winds, drought and food insecurity, population movements, conflict, internal violence, and epidemics. As a result of this process, the MENA integrated prevention and response measures into Burkina Faso’s PDSEB.

This case study documents the methodology, process, and lessons learned from integrating C/DRR into Burkina Faso’s education sector plan. The case study is intended for ministry of education officials and technical partners who will contribute to the development of C/DRR strategies in similar contexts.
The study is based on mission reports and documents, as well as individual and group interviews with project stakeholders. Prior to the project, MENA selected central-level ministry officials from varying departments and established a specific ‘education in emergencies’ committee to fully understand and anticipate emergency impacts on school system functioning in the context of conflict and disaster risks in Burkina Faso. The three main phases of the project are depicted in Table 1.

Table 1. Integrating C/DRR in education sector planning: a three-phased process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE 1</th>
<th>PHASE 2</th>
<th>PHASE 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developing an analysis of Burkina Faso’s vulnerability to risks of conflict and disaster in the education sector</td>
<td>Developing a risk reduction strategy for the education sector</td>
<td>Integrating the risk reduction strategy into the PDSEB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Review the existing education sector diagnosis and other relevant documents (IIEP in collaboration with MENA and UNICEF Burkina Faso).
- Develop a questionnaire for district-level education officials in order to gather additional information on the risks and vulnerabilities in the country’s districts (IIEP in collaboration with MENA and UNICEF Burkina Faso).
- Participate in consultation and technical meetings with central and district-level ministry of education officials in order to consolidate information on the education sector’s vulnerabilities and co-produce a vulnerability assessment (IIEP in collaboration with MENA, UNICEF Burkina Faso and a national consultant).
- Deliver technical assistance through working sessions with national authorities to determine appropriate C/DRR strategies (IIEP).
- Develop an action plan for risk reduction in the education sector (IIEP and MENA officials).
- Finalize the risk reduction strategy over the course of several weeks (IIEP and MENA officials).
- Review the PDSEB and identify areas where C/DRR programmes could be integrated into the plan (IIEP in collaboration with MENA and UNICEF Burkina Faso).
- Provide guidance to integrate C/DRR programmes into the PDSEB (IIEP and UNICEF Burkina Faso).
- Present to the Permanent Secretariat of the Decennial Development Plan for Basic Education (SP/PDDEB) the proposed C/DRR integration strategies into the PDSEB (MENA).
- Finalize the PDSEB and include various aspects of the analysis and risk reduction strategy (MENA with technical assistance from IIEP).
- Validate the risk reduction strategy and the PDSEB (MENA, IIEP, and UNICEF Burkina Faso).

This case study is divided into four sections. To contextualize and justify the project, the first section presents the main hazards that confront the country, as well as the disaster management mechanisms already in place in Burkina Faso. The second section analyses preconditions for the integration of C/DRR in Burkina Faso education sector planning, and the processes leading to that result; this section also briefly describes the C/DRR components that were integrated into the PDSEB. The third section reviews the institutional, organizational, and individual capacities required for integrating C/DRR measures into planning processes, and analyses which capacities were lacking in Burkina Faso. The case study concludes by highlighting some key lessons learned.

1. See Annexes 2 and 5 for more details.
1. **Background**

Burkina Faso is a landlocked, sub-Saharan country in West Africa that faces a number of risks that present considerable challenges to the education sector. This section aims to present the main hazards and the disaster management mechanisms already in place in Burkina Faso. This context provided a justification to integrate C/DRR in education sector planning.

1.1 **Main hazards and their impacts on the education sector**

The main hazards have been described in the country’s *National Multi-risk Contingency Plan* (Burkina Faso, 2009) and are outlined below.

**Risks associated with rain and violent storms**

Tornadoes descend upon the country in May, just before the rainy season. Floods occur mainly during the school holidays in July, August, and September. These natural phenomena are recurrent and cause damage to educational equipment and infrastructure almost every year. In addition to flood damage, many schools are dilapidated and require renovation. The combination of floods and run-down schools results in school infrastructure repair delays, leading to degraded learning environments with poor learning conditions for students.

**Drought and food insecurity**

Drought is another recurring phenomenon in Burkina Faso, particularly in the Sahelian zone. As the country’s economy is mainly based on low-yield cereal agriculture, a poor rainy season has drastic consequences. Burkina Faso’s child malnutrition rate is among the world’s highest (one-fifth of all children die before they reach the age of 5) (UN-OCHA, 2006: 4). Severe food insecurity is particularly pronounced during the critical period of the school year (March, April, and May); a time when students need to concentrate on exam preparation. It is well documented that food insecurity is ‘linked with adverse physical and mental health and learning outcomes among children’ (Howard, 2011).

**Population movement**

In Burkina Faso, two main situations have caused population displacement: cyclical displacement due to disasters such as flooding and drought, and the repatriation of Burkinabé populations from Côte d’Ivoire, particularly in 2002 and 2003. An estimated 40,000 returning children in those years were 7 to 12-year-olds and 31,000 were 13 to 19-year-olds (MASSN, 2003). In 2002, a ministerial circular was issued, requiring school principals to accept all repatriated children. However, enrolment increases were so high in the affected areas that school principals had to refuse many children. Student returnees have faced significant lingering difficulties, including problems accessing supplies and textbooks for economic reasons, disruption of teaching and normal school functioning, absence of certain streams in the education system preventing some students from continuing their education, and serious problems of integration and stigmatization (ERNWACA, 2006; Yaro et al., 2006).

**Conflict and internal violence**

At the time of writing, Burkina Faso’s most recent socio-political unrest was in February 2011, apparently related to legal claims but also grounded in economic, social, and political...
demands. The destruction of courthouses, police stations, and other administrative service facilities symbolized dissatisfaction with the government and a lack of confidence in political authorities.

Land disputes are another source of conflict, mainly due to the imbalance between scarce arable land and a high rate of population growth; migrating herders and their livestock appropriating indigenous lands; and the internal migration of families placing increasing burdens on fertile land (United Nations, 2005).

Episodes of internal violence or socio-political unrest related to tensions around land, political authority, or rivalry with displaced or returnee populations sometimes lead to school closures. Classes have been suspended for from several weeks to a few months, depending on the severity of the crisis, which has considerably impacted on school performance, particularly at primary and secondary levels.

**Epidemics**

Burkina Faso has had to deal with a range of epidemics such as cholera, meningitis, measles, and avian influenza, as well as chronic phenomena such as malaria and HIV/AIDS. In addition to a high rate of HIV infection among teachers (2.7 per cent, compared with 1.88 per cent of the population at large) (Centre Muraz, 2005), it seems that approximately 10 per cent of students are regularly sick with malaria and 75 per cent of absences were malaria-related (World Bank, 2010).

**Other risks**

MENA officials also requested that the following risks be examined in the vulnerability analysis: fires, damage caused by animals, early marriages, child labour, and orphaned children.

### 1.2 Existing legal frameworks and disaster management mechanisms in Burkina Faso

Effective risk reduction measures in the education sector need to be coherent with and aligned to national frameworks and mechanisms for disaster management. Several national frameworks and mechanisms provide the legal basis and justification for risk reduction efforts in the education system.

**Legal foundation for reducing risks of disaster and conflict**

The most significant legal document is the Constitution, adopted in 1991, which guarantees general human and child rights, including access to education, as well as the right to a healthy environment, which is a collective responsibility. Burkina Faso is also signatory to multiple international frameworks on C/DRR, including the Hyogo Framework for Action, and has had the legal grounds for engaging in prevention and preparedness for many years (see Annex 3 for the list of relevant national and international frameworks Burkina Faso has signed).

**Disaster management in Burkina Faso**

Burkina Faso has considerable experience in planning for recovery from national crisis and disaster. Annual flooding and drought led to the creation of the National Commission for Emergency and Rehabilitation Aid (CONASUR), an interdepartmental body tasked with raising awareness and training the population on emergency response and prevention measures, as well as bringing assistance and restoring normalcy in the event of disaster.3 CONASUR brings together representatives from 10 sectors: health, nutrition, food

security, education, shelter, protection, water and hygiene, communications, logistics and transport, and coordination for temporary shelters. Chaired by the Ministry of Social Action and National Solidarity (MASSN), the national structure for emergency and rehabilitation aid, CONASUR, also exists at decentralized levels.

In 2010, MASSN developed a contingency plan to face disasters and emergencies within a framework of coordinated national and regional responses. Each sector, including education, was instructed to progressively integrate risk management into its respective development plan. Using a multi-sector approach to integrate the dynamics of national preparedness and the emergency response framework is an innovative approach because risk reduction measures were not previously included in sector planning processes. Although many challenges remain for disaster management in terms of planning, coordination, resources, and awareness, the existence of CONASUR, together with the multi-sector contingency plan, demonstrates considerable and ongoing national political will to address C/DRR holistically.

4. Interview, MENA resource person, I. Kabore, former Director of the DAMSE, December 2011.
2. Integrating C/DRR in the education sector plan: the preconditions and the process

This section explores the preconditions for the integration of C/DRR in Burkina Faso’s education sector planning, and analyses the process through which the integration was done. It also provides a brief description of the C/DRR components that were integrated into the PDSEB.

2.1 Preconditions for the integration of conflict and disaster risk reduction in education sector planning processes

The recognition of the potential impact, as a result of the floods of 2009

It was not until they reflected on the historical floods of 2009 that MENA and other sector authorities fully recognized the importance and urgency of integrating C/DRR in their respective sector plans and strategies to ensure continuity of services in times of crisis. The floods of 1 September 2009 hit Burkina Faso just seven months after the adoption of the national contingency plan. Of record scale, they hit 11 of Burkina Faso’s 13 regions, particularly affecting Ouagadougou (central region) where more than 150,000 people were affected. In eight of the most severely hit regions, 351 of the total 4,988 schools (7 per cent) were affected (World Bank, 2010b). Flooding caused extensive damage to infrastructure and teaching material, particularly in the central region, where dropout rates increased from 2.7 per cent in 2008/2009 to an estimated 7.7 per cent in 2009/2010. With 38,000 students affected and rehabilitation costs estimated at over FCFA (West African CFA franc) 1.8 billion, the floods were disastrous for the education sector (MENA, 2012). To provide a coordinated response, the Ministry of Basic Education and Literacy (MEBA), in collaboration with other ministries in charge of education, initiated meetings with national and international partners, including the country’s Education Cluster.

The importance of CONASUR and awareness raising

CONASUR was an important factor in the process of developing a risk reduction strategy for the education sector, as this body had prior experience with risk management strategies and also with inter-sectoral coordination.

Ministries from each of the sectors responsible for education represented in CONASUR, together with their technical and financial partners, attended weekly meetings on disaster prevention. Mobilizing participants from different sectors to attend these meetings was challenging, especially because participants had many demands on their time and the integration of C/DRR in sector planning had yet to prove its benefits.

Advocacy and awareness-raising efforts of education partners, such as letter campaigns, helped convince ministries and officials to discuss prevention issues in planning. Education partners also facilitated the process by demonstrating the need to put mechanisms in place to protect the system and its users from potential crises such as the 2009 floods.

PDSEB development and C/DRR

The process of developing a C/DRR strategy began in 2011 when MENA was drafting the diagnosis and analysis section of the country’s 10-year education sector plan (PDSEB), as

---

7. US$3,762,000.
8. Interview, I. Kabore, December 2011.
the intention was to integrate risk reduction measures into the PDSEB. In Burkina Faso, the Permanent Secretariat of the Decennial Development Plan for Basic Education (SP/ PDDEB) is tasked with developing, overseeing implementation, and monitoring progress towards the goals and objectives of the PDSEB. It is structured around the three priority programmes: access, quality, and management of education.

Communication and coordination with this body was essential throughout the process of integrating C/DRR into the plan. However, challenges emerged due to the difficulty of sharing constantly evolving documents. (See the discussion on organizational capacities in Section 3 for more information.) Synergies were also lacking between people in charge of the vulnerability analysis and the risk reduction strategy, and those in charge of developing the sector plan. Continuous advocacy efforts were essential to convince the SP/PDDEB of the necessity of addressing risks in sector planning.

When work began on the development of the vulnerability analysis for the education sector, a first draft of the education sector diagnosis had been produced by SP/PDDEB, and suggestions for text reflecting the country’s risks of disaster and conflict were made based on this draft.

Establishment of a specific committee for education in emergencies

In early 2011, a committee for education in emergencies was created by an official decree from the MEBA after a training of ministry of education officials on education in emergencies. This committee brought together representatives from ministries in charge of preschool, primary, and secondary education; UNICEF; partner NGOs; and associations. The committee’s mandate was to ensure the integration of measures to reduce the risks of conflict and disaster within the education sector’s PDSEB and to work to ensure effective responses to emergencies should they arise (see Box 1). The committee existed until its terms of reference (see Annex 4) were fulfilled in May 2012.

**Box 1. Mandate of the committee for education in emergencies**

The technical team will be responsible for the following:

- Reflect on the processes and mechanisms to be established to ensure an effective integration of conflict and disaster risk reduction (C/DRR) in the national education policy.
- Carry out the recruitment of a national consultant who will be accompanied by an international consultant hired by UNICEF and who will be tasked with updating the education sector diagnosis by integrating C/DRR components and identifying the main strategies in terms of education in emergencies to be integrated into the PDSEB 2011–2020.
- Supervise the work of consultants.
- Ensure the effective integration of conflict and disaster risk reduction in the PDSEB.

**2.2 The integration of conflict and disaster risk reduction in education sector planning: the process**

The integration process was undertaken in three phases: development of an analysis of Burkina Faso’s vulnerability to conflict and disaster risks in the education sector, development of a risk reduction strategy for the education sector, and integration of the risk reduction strategy into the PDSEB.
Developing a vulnerability analysis: methodology

The first task for the committee was analysing the education sector’s vulnerability to conflict and disaster risks. To ensure continuity, the methodology used to develop the vulnerability analysis relied on the definition used in Burkina Faso’s multi-sector contingency plan. The definition reads as follows:

Human vulnerability is the degree to which people risk being exposed to prejudice, damage, suffering, or death. This risk varies according to physical, economic, social, political, technological, ideological, cultural, educational, ecological and institutional conditions that characterize their context. Vulnerability is linked to the capacities that people or communities have to deal with specific threats, at a given point in time (MENA, 2012).

The definition of vulnerability and its main elements used in the Burkina Faso analysis are presented in Figure 1.

Figure 1. Defining vulnerability

IIEP produced a first draft of the vulnerability analysis by reviewing existing documents on risks in Burkina Faso. The key starting point was the national contingency plan, which outlined risks CONASUR had previously identified as being most problematic. The first part of the analysis explored the concepts of hazards and risk, and situated risk in a national context. Potential impacts of these risks on the population in general, and the education system in particular, were also discussed.

The second part of the analysis examined aspects of disparity in educational performance, including disparities in participation, access, and achievement by region, place of residence, gender, and standard of living. This was to determine if educational disparities might either reinforce the education system’s vulnerability to risks of disaster and conflict, or be a reflection of the system’s vulnerability. Systems of education can help prevent the impact of risks from becoming disasters and can also help the management of emergency situations. Therefore, it was essential to consider the state of education in Burkina Faso, especially at primary level. However, linking disparities in provision of and demand for education to risks of conflict or disaster proved difficult, given the lack of specific risk-disaggregated data.

The third and final part of the analysis examined the institutional, organizational, and individual capacities of Burkina Faso’s Ministry of Education to develop and implement a risk reduction strategy. IIEP explored the characteristics and qualities of the education system in Burkina Faso, including the general environment, its structure, the processes
that enable the development and implementation of a risk reduction strategy, and specific C/DRR competencies and skills of staff, including teachers, inspectors, and planners (see Box 2). This part of the analysis was primarily informed by interviews and guided discussions with MENA officials from a wide range of departments, as described in the following section. Other relevant documents, such as the previous education sector plan (PDDEB), were also reviewed when the first draft of the analysis was prepared.

**Box 2. Framework for analysing the capacities to integrate C/DRR in education sector planning**

I. **THE EDUCATIONAL FRAMEWORK AND THE EDUCATION SYSTEM INSTITUTIONAL BACKGROUND**
   - The general framework for risk reduction in Burkina Faso
   - State of intersectoral coordination in risk management

II. **EDUCATION INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK**
   A. The broad educational policies to take into account with regard to risk reduction
   B. The intra-sectoral coordination capacity with regard to risk reduction
      1. Sector working group on education
      2. Working group on education in emergencies – cluster
      3. The relationship between these two approaches
   C. Sector planning analysis with regard to risk reduction
      1. C/DRR integration in the education diagnosis
      2. Identification of action plans and/or policies dedicated to C/DRR
         - Curricula – long-term prevention aspects
         - Curricula – disaster situations preparedness aspects
         - Teacher training
         - School mapping
         - Returnee populations/population movement management
      3. Identification of action plans and/or policies that support potential C/DRR strategy
         - Policies and programmes taking into account local specificities
         - Policies and programmes aiming at reducing inequalities
         - Policies and programmes designed to attract out-of-school children/youth
         - Policies and programmes aiming at involving communities in school functioning
      4. Identification of strategies or alert plans and emergency intervention plans for the education sector
      5. Capacity to mobilize resources for risk reduction
         - For emergency plan(s)
         - For long-term planning of risk reduction
      6. Monitoring and evaluation: EMIS system status and vulnerability indicators

**Official consultations and debates to identify vulnerabilities and develop a risk reduction strategy**

The initial draft was validated by national education authorities at both central and decentralized levels, to ensure relevance and accuracy. A national consultant was hired to undertake consultations with relevant authorities, and to finalize the vulnerability assessment.
At the central level, the representatives of the education sector’s committee for education in emergencies were involved, as per their mandate. An interview guide was prepared and used to structure the conversations that took place during the first IIEP mission, in collaboration with the national consultant.

A key aspect of discussions with MENA officials concerned the potential impacts of the hazards confronting the education system. The results of these discussions were categorized into impacts on ‘Access’ to education and impacts on the ‘Quality’ of education in order to align with the structure of the sector plan. Impacts on access include damage and destruction of school infrastructure and equipment, the limit of a school’s capacity to admit returnees and internally displaced persons, and student absenteeism due to epidemic factors and temporary interruptions of school functioning. Regarding impacts on quality, MENA officials outlined the weakening of the school environment due to infrastructure degradation, the nutritional crisis impacting learning ability, overcrowded classrooms due to the arrival of returnees and internally displaced persons, destruction and loss of teaching materials, lack of psychosocial support to traumatized children who are repatriated or disaster victims, stigmatization of returnee students, and community tensions within school institutions.

At the decentralized level, interviews were held with representatives of educational and emergency departments and organizations (see Annex 5). The vulnerability analysis was then revised by IIEP, with support from the national consultant. The final analysis was used to enrich the country context and the sector diagnosis of the PDSEB. It provided the justification for the integration of risk reduction measures into the country’s sector plan.

**Developing a risk reduction strategy in the education sector**

The next step involved identifying strategic priorities for risk reduction within the education sector. Working sessions with ministry officials were organized by UNICEF and IIEP, in collaboration with the Directorate for Allocation of Specific Materials to Schools (DAMSE), around the following themes: infrastructure, curriculum, school feeding programmes, and rapid response mechanisms. Based on the analysis of the impacts of the different hazards previously described, objectives were defined during these working sessions. Response and prevention measures were then identified. Subsequently, the most relevant entry points in the PDSEB were highlighted, in order to facilitate the integration of these measures into the sector plan.

The final step of the process was to draft a risk reduction strategy document based on the suggestions that emerged from the working sessions. To ensure coherence, the risk reduction strategy document was designed to mirror the structure of the PDSEB, with entry points for the suggested programmes specifically suggested in the document. However, the final version of the PDSEB was not yet available, so the structure of the national contingency plan document was used instead. The different programmes of the draft strategy were structured around the following headings, in order to ensure that the proposed programmes would be operationalized: specific objective, strategy, expected results, monitoring and evaluating progress towards the objectives, and logical framework.

Officials clarified the actions to be taken in each of the strategic areas. They also identified the actors responsible for each of the activities, together with the respective costs. The process of validating the risk reduction strategy was iterative between ministry of education officials, representatives from the technical committee, SP/PDDEB, and IIEP.

---

9. See Glossary for definitions of ‘response’ and ‘prevention’. ‘Response capacity’ refers to the ability of the ministry to ensure the continuity of education provision after a disaster. ‘Prevention capacity’ refers to the ability of the ministry to put in place measures that can enable the outright avoidance of adverse impacts of hazards and related disasters (adapted from UNISDR, 2009).
Table 2. Comparison between suggestions from the risk reduction strategy and C/DRR components integrated into the PDSEB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestions from the risk reduction strategy</th>
<th>C/DRR components integrated into the PDSEB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerability analysis of the education sector</td>
<td>Elements of the vulnerability analysis were summarized and integrated into the ‘Socio-economic and political context of the country’ section of the PDSEB, as a sub-section entitled ‘Risks of natural disasters and conflict’ (MEBA, 2012: 6).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision and sector principle</td>
<td>The PDSEB does not include a separate guiding principle related to C/DRR as suggested in the strategic action plan. However, C/DRR was included as part of a broader principle on governance, decentralization, and community participation ‘taking into account disaster risks and strategies to reduce them’ (MEBA, 2012: 39).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme 1: Establishing school infrastructure resilience to risks associated with high winds and flood</td>
<td>This programme was globally integrated into the PDSEB and includes specific C/DRR outcomes and indicators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme 2: To better feed children in vulnerable areas during the ‘critical period’</td>
<td>Most of this suggested programme was included in the PDSEB. However, the PDSEB does not contain any outcome, activity, or indicator on capacity development initiatives for community management of school canteens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme 3: Strengthening the capacities of schools to receive displaced pupils following disasters</td>
<td>Part of a PDSEB sub-programme addressed the issue of reinforcing the capacities of host school communities to receive displaced students through pre-positioning emergency management equipment in identified sites by CONASUR. However, there are no specific outcomes, activities, or indicators mentioned for the development of host communities’ capacities to receive displaced populations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme 4: Replacement of damaged or lost school furniture and materials</td>
<td>Reference to the provision of school materials and furniture was made in the PDSEB. However, the PDSEB does not contain any detailed activity or indicator related to the C/DRR suggested programme on replacement of damaged or lost school furniture and materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme 5: Developing and revising teaching/training curricula and programmes for conflict and natural disaster risk prevention and reduction</td>
<td>These issues were not integrated into the PDSEB beyond incorporating prevention of common diseases into the curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk analysis</td>
<td>The last section of the PDSEB is an analysis of the risks that could hinder the achievement of the education sector goals. The last sub-section is entitled ‘Risks associated with emergencies’ and makes explicit reference to both climatic hazards and internal and external social conflicts, as well as the importance of working with other sectors on the implementation of a disaster management and risk reduction strategy that is guided by a national vision (MEBA, 2012: 93–94).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3 Components of the analysis and risk reduction strategy integrated in the PDSEB

The final version of the risk reduction strategy was handed over to the PDSEB secretariat and colleagues drafting the PDSEB. They drew relevant elements from this document and incorporated them into corresponding sections of the PDSEB. Based on a revision of the final version of the PDSEB, Table 2 summarizes to what extent C/DRR components were included in the education sector plan.

Based on this comparison, the bulk of the recommendations put forward in the risk reduction strategy seem to have been integrated into the 10-year sector plan. It remains to be seen to what extent the strategies and specific activities are being implemented. Further analysis is required to ensure that progress towards the specific C/DRR objectives has been measured regularly during annual review processes undertaken by SP/PDDEB.
3. Capacities necessary for the integration of C/DRR measures into the planning processes

In Burkina Faso, several essential factors contributed to the successful integration of C/DRR measures in the education sector planning process. The following section highlights some of the institutional, organizational, and individual capacities that were particularly important during the process, as well as a few capacity challenges that arose.

3.1 Institutional capacities

At an institutional level, existing capacities include: political will, leadership, international and national frameworks, continued advocacy, and long-term involvement and investments. Additional advocacy and longer-term commitment would have further facilitated the process in Burkina Faso.

Political will

Political will was particularly important to the process. The floods of September 2009 highlighted the need for disaster risk reduction, and national authorities were pressured to institute measures to protect the population. The floods hit Burkina Faso’s capital city of Ouagadougou; central-level authorities personally experienced the impact and identified with calls for action.

Leadership

The Director and Deputy Director of DAMSE were key actors throughout the process, as they led the development of the vulnerability analysis and C/DRR strategy for the education sector. Ensuring the continuity of personnel, and particularly of the leadership, was extremely important for galvanizing the involvement of other high-level ministry representatives. The Director of DAMSE played an important role in mobilizing the different representatives from various departments of MENA, MASSN (Ministry of Social Action and National Solidarity), MJFPE (Ministry of Youth, Professional Training and Employment), and MESS (Ministry of Secondary and Higher Education). He was typically responsible for convening and chairing the sector meetings, as well as suggesting and proposing themes and agendas.

However, leadership was considered by some to be more individual than organizational.10 When DAMSE’s Director left MENA to work for an NGO, the Deputy Director took the lead in the process, rather than the new Director himself. This was to some extent logical, as the Deputy Director had been involved throughout the process, but more weight would have been brought to the process by the new Director.

International and national frameworks

Ensuring coherence and making links to national disaster management mechanisms and international frameworks is essential to the sustainability and ownership of education-specific plans. The fact that Burkina Faso adheres to international frameworks such as the Convention on the Rights of the Child and has its own national frameworks and mechanisms, such as CONASUR and the national contingency plan, greatly facilitated the development of the education sector’s vulnerability analysis and risk reduction strategy.

10. Interview UNICEF representative.
The contingency plan provided the framework through which the education sector’s vulnerability was analysed. Furthermore, the risk reduction strategy built upon strategies that had already been developed in the contingency plan.

Continued advocacy
Throughout the duration of the project there was a need for continued advocacy, as the production of a C/DRR strategy for the education sector was slowed by the difficulty of motivating and mobilizing some key decision-makers to act.\(^{11}\) Prevention and long-term plans for C/DRR are not typically popular policies, since they are not driven by an urgent situation. According to a representative of CONASUR, development of these policies and programmes was relatively easy to postpone and the responsibility often shifted from department to department. CONASUR also encountered funding difficulties in the development and implementation of its national risk reduction strategy, which were attributed to donors being interested in funding acute emergencies, rather than prevention and preparedness.\(^{12}\)

Long-term involvement and investments
There is a need for long-term investments in order to ensure sustainability. Representatives from UNICEF acknowledged that the integration of C/DRR into the education plan was a difficult task. As mentioned by officials from the Secretariat of the PDSEB, the process of integrating C/DRR measures into the PDSEB required a comprehensive effort that spanned each of the phases of the planning cycle, which implied the need to involve multiple actors over the long term. Given the long-term nature of planning processes, the project’s duration and the funding allocated were not sufficient, and did not amply anticipate the amount of time required to develop annual operational plans or data collection tools for specific C/DRR indicators. This will require further technical assistance with individuals from the Directorate for Research and Planning (DEP) as well as the SP/PDDEB.

3.2 Organizational capacities
At an organizational level, key capacities included: participation of a core group of diverse representatives, various technical and financial partners, the Education Cluster, and CONASUR, as well as the continuity of staff and maintaining organizational links.

Participation of a core group of diverse representatives
The participation of a core group of representatives from diverse departments within the education ministries, as well as CONASUR and SP/PDDEB, was essential to the success of the process. Crises impact areas of the country differently, and various aspects of the education system, including management, infrastructure, and content, are also impacted differently. It was important to be able to understand how the resource allocation department is affected by various crises, and how it can mitigate the impacts of such crises. Additionally, it was important to understand how the infrastructure of the education system is impacted, and what could be put in place to ensure that the system’s infrastructure is resilient to disaster. Likewise, it was essential to look at what education content was put forward and how this content either exacerbates or mitigates conflict and disaster.

---

11. Interview CONASUR representative.
12. Interview CONASUR representative.
Various technical and financial partners

The process was greatly facilitated by technical and financial partners, such as UNICEF and IIEP. UNICEF financed the recruitment of the national consultant, as well as IIEP’s technical assistance during the development of the vulnerability analysis and the risk reduction strategy. Technical assistance greatly helped convince decision-makers of the importance and feasibility of examining risks of disaster and conflict in an education sector diagnosis, and the role that the education sector can play in mitigating impacts and preventing occurrences of disaster. For instance, UNICEF and IIEP facilitated a consultation seminar with representatives from various ministries of education in West and Central Africa in order to develop guidance notes on integrating C/DRR into education sector planning processes.

Education Cluster

The presence of the Education Cluster in Burkina Faso was another factor that was key to the development of a risk reduction strategy for the education sector. The Education Cluster provided a forum for discussion, and raised awareness among education stakeholders as to the importance of preparedness and prevention.

CONASUR

CONASUR was another important partner in mobilizing resources and leading the process. The prior existence of this inter-ministerial body was crucial in establishing the basis for developing the C/DRR strategy for the education sector. As mentioned, to further develop measures of prevention and mitigation that were not part of the multi-sectoral national contingency plan, CONASUR prepared a national risk reduction strategy after the 2009 floods. The process of developing this national strategy was highly consultative; consultants were recruited to conduct nationwide enquiries concerning disasters and conflict targeting a wide range of stakeholders: partners, disaster victims, citizens, communities, etc. This process raised awareness among some of the individuals who were ultimately involved in developing the C/DRR strategy for the education sector.

Continuity of staff and maintaining organizational links

The interdepartmental structure of CONASUR, although necessary for risk reduction, presented some organizational constraints, especially as the representatives changed quite frequently. Additionally, a lack of incentives made it difficult to attract representatives from different sectors to meetings (mostly in terms of compensation for transportation costs).

Maintaining organizational links with the staff responsible for the plan development was important but challenging in Burkina Faso. Although the staff of SP/PDDEB were keen to address the risks of crisis with which Burkina Faso is confronted, at times it was difficult to obtain the planning documents. This was not due to lack of will or transparency, but rather due to logistic constraints. The documents for the plan were being written at the same time as the analysis and C/DRR strategy, and were therefore constantly evolving.

13. Interview MENA resource person, former Director of DAMSE.
15. Interview CONASUR representative.
16. Interview CONASUR representative.
3.3 Individual capacities

At an individual level, requisite capacities included an initial core group of MENA officials and the participation of a national consultant.

Initial core group of MENA officials

Raising awareness with the core group of MENA officials prior to the development of the analysis was key to ensuring that this group shared a common knowledge base. It also meant they had expertise to address the risks of conflict and disaster in the sector’s planning processes. This was achieved through a series of workshops on education in emergencies for all regional directors, facilitated by UNICEF.

Participation of a national consultant

The role of the national consultant was very important to the process in Burkina Faso. The individual recruited for the position had considerable experience working with CONASUR, as well as solid understanding of disaster risk reduction concepts, strategies, and activities in the country. These assets proved to be very valuable during group discussions.
4. Lessons learned from the process

The following lessons that emerged from the process might inform ministries of education and technical partners both regionally and globally on integration of C/DRR into plans and policies.

Linking the C/DRR strategy to the action plan

The ultimate goal in developing a vulnerability analysis and risk reduction strategy for the education system in Burkina Faso was to address and fully integrate C/DRR into the education sector plan and the related planning processes. However, the project’s duration and funding were not sufficient to deliver further technical assistance for the development of annual operational plans or data collection tools for specific C/DRR indicators.

As mentioned by a representative of Burkina Faso’s Department of Planning, integrating the C/DRR strategy into the action plan is crucial in order to demonstrate its importance as a priority within the education sector and ensure the implementation of the C/DRR strategy. It is also crucial that sufficient funds are available for this component of education planning.

Collecting information and data related to the impacts of conflict and disasters on the education system

The process showed that the impact of conflict and disasters on the education system is not sufficiently documented in Burkina Faso. Information and data on the impact of conflict and natural hazards on the education system is key in raising awareness and advocating the integration of C/DRR within education planning processes. Lack of action and commitment are often caused by limited knowledge about the situation or about the impacts of a phenomenon.

Annual school census questionnaires primarily focus on quantitative indicators. Qualitative indicators such as detailed information about damage incurred during floods and strong winds, or the impact of drought and food insecurity on the education system, have been ignored (e.g. in what zones or at what period of the school year have children dropped out of school as a result of drought and food insecurity?). As a consequence, there is an evident gap in important information about the frequency and scale of the impact of disasters.

Further capacity development

Section 3 of this case study demonstrated that certain capacities at the institutional, organizational, and individual levels were key in the process of integrating C/DRR into education sector planning in Burkina Faso. In such an initiative, it is essential to develop the capacities of ministry of education officials to effectively analyse the contextual risks, plan a risk reduction strategy, and ensure its implementation. This allows national stakeholders to take ownership of the programme and support its long-term development for the education sector.

Officials from the SP/PDDEB agreed on the need for a capacity development plan to accompany the strategy, with elements related to data collection. This may ensure that the strategy is effectively implemented and that future planning processes continue to address these issues.17 As part of this capacity development plan, additional Department of Planning personnel should be trained on C/DRR. This could help to ensure that relevant indicators are developed and the means to collect the related data are available (e.g. the

17. Interview SP/PDDEB representative.
number of schools that lack flood-resistant drainage systems, or that are located in flood-prone zones).

**Continued advocacy and awareness raising**

As explained in Sections 2 and 3, one of the key factors to ensure the success of the process was continued advocacy and awareness raising. Therefore, the vulnerability analysis and risk reduction strategy for the education system should be further promoted within the ministries responsible for education (MENA, MESS, MJFPE, and MASSN) and among partners. This document has the potential to change attitudes towards risk reduction, especially in the education sector.

**Long-term commitment**

The long-term commitment of the different stakeholders will determine the sustainability of the efforts undertaken through this project. Coordination mechanisms such as the Education Cluster or the Education Sector Working Group are key to ensuring appropriate follow-up on C/DRR capacity development activities as well as continued awareness raising.

**Facilitating ownership of the C/DRR strategy**

Representatives of the SP/PDSEB indicated that engaging multiple stakeholders should be a major priority in the implementation of the C/DRR strategy, in order to facilitate ownership. This would support the integration of the strategy, even down to the school level, where activities and programmes will be put in place.
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Annex 1. Map of Burkina Faso’s regions

Source: http://d-maps.com/m/africa/burkina/burkina17.pdf
Annex 2. Individuals interviewed at the central level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Last name</th>
<th>First name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>M. KABORE</td>
<td>Issaka</td>
<td>MENA (former Director of DAMSE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>M. HANNI</td>
<td>Olivier</td>
<td>CONASUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>M. DIANE</td>
<td>Aboubacar</td>
<td>CONASUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mme. DIA</td>
<td>Erinna</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>M. KAFANDO</td>
<td>Georges</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>M. OUEDRAOGO</td>
<td>Boureima</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>M. SANKARA</td>
<td>Frédéric</td>
<td>DEP, MENA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>M. ZIDA</td>
<td>Edmond</td>
<td>SP/PDDEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>M. OUEDRAOGO</td>
<td>Séri</td>
<td>SP/PDDEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>M. ZONGO</td>
<td>Souleymane</td>
<td>SP/PDDEB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex 3. Legal frameworks for risk reduction signed or ratified by Burkina Faso

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statute</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Decree No 2004-624 / PRES/ PM/ MASSN – on establishment, organization, mandate, and functioning of the National Commission for Emergency and Rehabilitation Aide (CONASUR)</td>
<td>CONASUR established on 30 December 2004 by decree of the Council of Ministers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War – International Committee of the Red Cross, 2 August 1949, Geneva</td>
<td>7 November 1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Protocol I relative to the Protection of Victims of International Armed Conflict (amendment protocol to the 1949 Geneva Conventions) – International Committee of the Red Cross, 8 June 1977, Geneva</td>
<td>20 October 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Protocol relative to the Protection of Victims of Non-International Armed Conflicts (amendment protocol to the 1949 Geneva Conventions) – International Committee of the Red Cross, 8 June 1977, Geneva</td>
<td>20 October 1987</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 4. Terms of reference for Burkina Faso’s technical committee on education in emergencies

Memorandum

A technical team is created within the ministries in charge of education and technical and financial partners in the field of education in order to reflect on the mechanisms for the integration of conflict and disaster risk reduction in the national education policy.

The technical team will be responsible for:

- Reflect on the processes and mechanisms to be established to ensure an effective integration of conflict and disaster risk reduction (C/DRR) in the national education policy;
- Carry out the recruitment of a national consultant who will be accompanied by an international consultant hired by UNICEF and who will be tasked with updating the education sector diagnosis by integrating C/DRR components and identifying the main strategies in terms of education in emergencies to be integrated into the PDSEB 2011–2020;
- Supervise the work of consultants;
- Ensure the effective integration of conflict and disaster risk reduction in the PDSEB.

The technical team is composed of representatives of the Ministries in charge of education, UNICEF and representatives of partner NGOs and Associations as follows:

- MENA: DGRIEF; DGB; DGAENF; DAMSE; SP/PDDEB; ES/CEBNF; DAF; DEP; DPEF; DREBA Centre;
- MASSN: SP/CONASUR; DEP; DPEPE;
- MESS: Focal point for emergency issues;
- MJFPE: Focal point for emergency issues;
- United Nations system: UNICEF;
- NGOs/Associations: Save the Children; Plan Burkina; CRS; Croix Rouge; CNAPEP.

In addition, the technical team is coordinated by a core group responsible for all ongoing affairs and is composed of:

- A Coordinator: DAMSE / MENA;
- A 1st Co-coordinator: UNICEF;
- A 2nd Co-coordinator: Save the Children;
- A 1st General Rapporteur: DAMSE / MENA;
- A 2nd General Rapporteur: DPEPE / MASSN.
The technical team meets once a month and whenever necessary as required by the core coordination group and reports regularly to the Secretary-General of MENA.

The team’s mandate ends with the effective consideration of proposals made by the consultants and approval of the group of the integration of conflict and disaster risk reduction in the PDSEB 2011–2020.

This memorandum takes effect upon the date of signature and shall be published wherever necessary.

Noraogo Innocent ZABA
Officer of the National Order
Annex 5. Interviews at the decentralized level

Interviews were held with representatives of the following departments or organizations:

- Governorate (president of the regional council for emergency relief and rehabilitation),
- High Commission,
- Regional Board (president of the provincial council for emergency relief and rehabilitation),
- Regional Directorate for Agriculture and Water,
- Regional Directorate for Health,
- Regional Directorate of Burkina Faso’s Ministry of Social Action and National Solidarity (MASSN) (permanent secretariats of the regional, provincial, and county councils for emergency relief and rehabilitation),
- Regional Directorate for Basic Education and Literacy (directorates for basic education and literacy, basic education districts, and schools),
- Regional Committees of Students’ Parents Organizations
- Educating Mothers Organization,
- Management committees of school institutions,
- City Hall (president and vice-president),
- Red Cross.
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