REGIONAL CO-OPERATION IN THE PRE-APEID PERIOD

Regional co-operation began in Asia and the Pacific in 1952 with the Regional Conference on Free and Compulsory Education (Bombay) and in 1953 with the creation of the International Institute of Child Study, (Bangkok), and continued in a more systematic way in 1960 when representatives of Asian countries met in Karachi and adopted the so-called “Karachi Plan”. The objective of the Plan was to achieve universal primary education by the year 1980. Today, in 1996 we must admit that there were some shortfalls in the implementation of the Plan, but, many of us remember it, because it was the first expression of the hopes and aspirations of Asian educators. Many of us believed that twenty years on we would be able to achieve our noble objectives, but unfortunately population growth - much faster than we had envisaged in 1960 - outpaced that of education. Critical economic problems combined with other social and human factors did not facilitate the achievement of our joint goal.

Co-operation in the field of education in this region developed around the Karachi Plan. In those days UNESCO was the only credible agency in this field; now, of course, the World Bank, OECD, SEAMEO and other agencies are doing excellent work in education. Nevertheless, in those days, UNESCO was the only forum where such regional co-operation was possible. In the initial stages, much of our thinking was not as refined or sophisticated as today. The Karachi Plan was the numerical formulation of the various targets on the basis of rather simple arithmetic. Many Asian countries felt in those days that in order to achieve the regional objective as formulated in the Karachi Plan, the best way was to set up regional institutes or regional centres, and through these regional centres to be established by UNESCO, most of the human resources, especially the key educational personnel of the Member States, could be trained. Thus, we first established three regional centres in the region. The first one in New Delhi was the Regional Centre for Educational Planning and Administration, which later become the National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration (NIEPA). The second centre at the University of the Philippines was in the field of teacher education. The third was in Bandung, Indonesia, for school building research, later transferred to Colombo for political reasons. The three regional centres were established and financed by UNESCO. To co-ordinate the work of these centres, UNESCO established the UNESCO Regional Office for Education in Bangkok. Originally called “UNESCO Regional Office for Primary Education”, in the course of negotiations with the Thai authorities, the name was changed to “Regional Office for Education”.

UNESCO continued this type of co-operation from 1960 to 1970 and in the course of these ten years there was a new development. The National Institute of Educational Research in Tokyo joined in regional co-operation, not as a national participating institution, but to provide regional services and co-operation. The late Dr. M. Hiratsuka was the real promoter of this regional co-operation. This formula of a national centre to offer regional co-operation, or a national centre to provide the regional services on behalf of UNESCO, was a new concept which immediately gained full acceptance in the region and gave a tremendous boost to the future evolution of regional co-operation. By the time this had matured, many national institutions in the region had also become competent, and often the UNESCO regional institution was not necessarily better than some of the national institutions. Furthermore, it was also becoming evident that the limited number of regional centres set up by UNESCO could not meet the vast needs of the region. In the early seventies UNESCO thus felt the
time had come for responsibility to be assumed by the Member States directly, instead of UNESCO doing
direct training and research. UNESCO was not a rich organization in terms of financial resources, and
unfortunately it remains as poor or even poorer today. With limited funds in those days, UNESCO was facing
tremendous difficulty in maintaining the regional institutes, where infrastructures cost often outweighed that of
programme costs. And, we thought new forms of co-operation should be developed, taking into account
UNESCO’s financial limitations on the one hand, but more importantly, the availability of several national
institutions which were becoming more and more competent and internationally renowned.

**THE BIRTH OF APEID**

It was in 1971 in Singapore when the Ministers of Education of the region made a very important policy
change. They concluded that the first ten years of regional co-operation were extremely valuable in providing the
regional structure for manpower training, and unifying the countries of the region for technical co-operation, but
they judged that a new form of co-operation should evolve from the 1970s onwards by networking all the national
institutions of the region responsible for various aspects of education to promote mutual exchange of
information and experiences and joint co-operative activities. This was the birth of the Asian Programme of
Educational Innovation for Development (APEID); the Pacific region joined later and it became the Asia-Pacific
Programme of Educational Innovation for Development. The basic philosophy or rationale of this programme is
to share information and experience, to learn mutually and to progress together, the ultimate objective being to
advance and progress in partnership. It was a very unique programme in the 1970s, and many technical co-
operation agencies wanted to learn about APEID. UNDP was in the process of developing a new policy of
“Technical Co-operation among Developing Countries” i.e. TCDC, to emphasize South-South co-operation. For
UNDP, APEID was exactly what they were advocating and that was why UNDP was very actively associated
with this programme for many years.

In the 1970s the economic situation of the world was still favourable, and there was a lot of willingness on
the part of donors to support development co-operation programmes and projects. Furthermore, experiences in
the 1960s had already demonstrated that the linear extension or expansion of traditional models would not
ensure education for all. There was therefore a genuine climate to seek alternatives, such as non-formal
education, or identify new models through research and experimentation. The term “Innovation for development”
therefore sounded attractive and was wholly accepted by the development co-operation agencies. If the 1960s
were the decade for development, then the 1970s could be the decade for experimentation and innovation. It is,
however, ironical that while innovation is more acutely needed at times of economic austerity, there is a
tendency for innovation, experimentation and development in the field of education to be more actively
supported at a time of economic prosperity. The economic situation was very favourable for the development of
APEID which attracted considerable funding from various sources. There was genuine faith in innovation,
because it was clearly recognized that by attempting to repeat the same process of development which certain
industrially advanced countries had followed, the developing nations could not hope to catch up with their
advanced partners; and shortening the process through innovation was earnestly hoped for. All the developing
nations were seeking a new process of educational development, because they could not afford the long
process followed by advanced countries.

One should also remember that the birth of APEID was made possible by an important voluntary financial
contribution from Japan, because the Regular Budget of UNESCO was not sufficient to sustain its rapid initial
development. This generous contribution, which still continues today, was prompted by the late Mr. Ryoji Ito,
then Secretary-General of the Japanese National Commission for UNESCO. He invented a unique formula of
financial support for the post-Karachi Plan implementation; that UNESCO, Japan and the rest of the Member
States in the region would each bear one third of the cost. Without waiting for UNESCO’s decision, he went
ahead in negotiating with the Ministry of Finance of Japan to obtain and succeeding in obtaining this one third. He then put pressure on UNESCO to formulate the programme. Although the final shape of the programme, as seen in the present APEID, was different from what he had envisaged, his energetic drive accelerated the process of programme formulation on the part of UNESCO with the assurance of the funding support. We should give special thanks to a man whose ingenuity brought about such an extensive network of friendship in this region.

One should not consider the emergence of APEID as an isolated incident. The early 1970s was the period when international debates took place on educational development, such as Edgar Faure's Commission report *Learning to be*; Philip Coombs' non-formal education studies through UNICEF and the World Bank; the UNESCO-UNICEF Co-operative Programme in basic education continuing the search for learning priorities; IBE's new International Education Reporting Service; and the Bellagio Group's work. OECD launched a new concept of 'recurrent education'. The World Bank also issued the Education Sector paper. The uniqueness of APEID was that the nationals became the actors and initiators, putting the international agencies or bilateral agencies behind the scenes and also that a scheme of combined action in research, experimentation, operations, evaluation and regional consultation/co-operation was systematically applied.

APEID - EVOLUTION OF INITIAL PROGRAMMES

Any chronology of APEID's development must record the following important consultations:

(a) Fifth Regional Conference of the Asian National Commissions of UNESCO, (Tehran, 1970)

(b) A study seminar on Regional Co-operation in Education in Asia (Bangkok, Chiangmai, February, 1971)

(c) Third Regional Conference on Ministers of Education and those responsible for Economic Planning in Asia (Singapore, 31 May-7 June 1971)

(d) The 17th session of the General Conference of UNESCO (Paris 1972)

The Asian Centre of Educational Innovation for Development (ACEID) authorized by the 17th session of the General Conference became operational in early 1973, this modest beginning marked by the participation of eight Member States, and the association of 37 national centres by the end of 1973. Two programme development meetings of the representatives of these national centres prepared a four-year programme for 1974-1977 of which the First Regional Consultation Meeting (February/March 1974) made an extensive review. UNDP was then closely associated with the programmes with its funding support, together with Japan.

During the first period, 1974-1977, there were six areas of major concern: (a) development of new orientation and structure of education, (b) management of innovation in each country, (c) curriculum development, (d) educational technology, (e) new structure and methods of teacher education, and (f) science education.

When we look at APEID today, we see that much of today's concerns were already expressed in the early 1970s, i.e. twenty-five years ago. Many of these six major priorities remain valid today. During the second cycle, 1978-1981, programme areas were more clearly defined and added a certain specificity.
The “new orientation and structure” under the first cycle was defined as a “non-formal and alternative structure”. This was certainly connected with the world-wide movement created by Philip Coombs and other non-formal education groups: a tremendous impact made on the Member States had quickly been reflected in the work plan of APEID even before UNESCO’s Regular Programme adopted the idea in UNESCO’s official vocabulary. Another new area added in the second cycle was vocational and technical education. Because many Asian countries were in the process of economic, technological and social transformation, technical and vocational education had to cope with such transformation. The administration and management of educational innovation, curriculum development, educational technology, teacher education and science and technology education remained unchanged.

Another innovation was adopted during this programme cycle, namely special “development themes”: (a) education for integrated rural development, (b) education for development of productive skills relevant to economic development, (c) universalization of education at the early school levels and functional education for out-of-school youth and adults, and (d) education for better health and nutrition. So, in the second cycle an effort was made to link educational innovation with development issues.

In the third period, 1982-1986, these development themes and programme areas were combined and the following new programme areas emerged: (a) universalization of education; access to education at first level by both formal and non-formal means, (b) education for promotion of scientific and technological competence and creativity (with the introduction of a new concept of creativity), (c) education and work encompassing technical and vocational education and productive skills, (d) education and rural development, (e) educational technology with stress on mass media and low-cost instructional materials, (f) professional support services and training of educational personnel, expanding the notion of teacher education, and (g) co-operative studies and innovative research projects and research-based experiments related to educational development. Here, APEID clearly marked a step towards research-based, research-oriented or experimentation-oriented programmes, rather than operational or general logistic support programmes. APEID’s basic “raison d’être” became clear. It was not in support of general logistic or general operational expansion of educational structures and programmes on a linear basis, but was based more on research-based, experimentation-based innovations in order to give direction, guidance or insights to educational policy-makers for general application at a later stage. APEID programmes were not at all independent of world trends or movements in education. Reference was already made to the link with Philip Coombs’ non-formal education movement, but it was the Member States’ acceptance of non-formal education as a national priority which made its entry into APEID’s programme.

APEID priorities evolved side by side with the objectives of UNESCO’s Medium Term Plan in the field of education. Universalization of education, for example, was not just an Asian monopoly but was a world-wide trend; and the same was true for science education, education and work and education for rural development. A new idea would come into APEID’s programme either through UNESCO’s Medium Term Plan, or through the region’s, or Member States’ acceptance of them. Reciprocally, APEID provided new inputs to other regions. For example, the network scheme of APEID has given rise to similar networking in Africa, the Caribbean, South and South-east Europe, and the Arab region. Despite interlinks and interfaces, the Asia and Pacific region differed in certain respects from other regions. Some examples are (a) more research-based experiments, (b) Asian or Pacific ways of approaches and operations and (c) the importance attached to moral education and science education from an early age. As to the latter, it was the real specificity of this region; in Africa, for example, priority was more on teacher education.
When the author was responsible for UNESCO-UNICEF co-operation in the 1960s and 1970s, primary education or primary teacher training was the major area of priority for both organizations. But, many Asian countries placed special emphasis on science education, rather than on general teacher training and were interested in developing science education, science curricula, science teacher training or local production of science equipment. This made UNICEF obviously unhappy because they wanted to operate in areas more directly connected with children, rather than supporting secondary or higher education. The author remembers there were many science laboratories or scientific equipment production units established and developed with UNICEF’s help in those days. Asia was a pioneer in recognizing the importance of science education. Another area was moral education. This region was very active in moral education, even before APEID, through the initiatives of the late Dr. Hiratsuka. It was not accepted at first in countries of mono-religion because of the role of religious education. But those countries with multi-cultural and multi-religious components, were obliged to adopt a secular approach in education in which moral education is required as a forceful means for national development. This is another sphere of Asian initiative.

The major areas of the APEID programme action in the 4th cycle (1987-1991) covered:

(a) **Education for All**
- Universalization of primary education
- Literacy or non-formal education
- Continuing education

(b) **Education relevant to societal requirements**
- Education and work
- Restructuring secondary education
- Science and technology education

(c) **Supportive activities and infrastructures common to all educational levels and systems**
- Education and communication technology
- Professional training including professional support services and distance education

As seen above, considerable streamlining and consolidation were made in terms of conceptualization and programme concentration compared to the previous three programming cycles.

The term “education for all” was introduced in UNESCO’s Medium Term Plan for 1984-1989, but APEID adopted it in 1987. “Education for all” was not the invention of the Jomtien conference; this idea was there long before and was taken up by the four host organizations of that meeting. UNESCO’s Medium Term Plan defined “education for all” as combining universal primary education, literacy and continuing education. APEID was obviously under the influence of UNESCO’s Medium Term Plan, but in certain other aspects, it had relative autonomy and independence from UNESCO Headquarters in conceptualization, programming and operations. A typical example was the definition of new programme areas for secondary education under the 4th programming cycle of 1987-1991, based on the specific needs of the region and not on UNESCO’s general theme.

A majority of the countries in the region were, and still are, concerned with the gigantic task of achieving universal primary education, i.e. access of all to education, their retention and success in learning achievement. Many countries are on the threshold of realizing these goals, and are now concerned with the new pressure being mounted for secondary education. However, not just to increase the number of secondary schools, or to train more teachers, but to make a more fundamental review and definition of its orientations, re-structuring and new roles, in order to be relevant to the needs of the people and of the country. The results of activities in this field would influence other regions because they would sooner or later face this problem.
Education for all under APEID is giving increasing attention to specific issues more relevant to the region, such as the special dimension of moral education, the promotion of new values, parental education, school clustering, entrepreneurship education, etc. However, one specific feature is the definition of "deprived population" to cover not only the geographically deprived, but also social, cultural and physical deprivation, as well as the deprivation of the racial, tribal, or language minority groups. Also for the first time, special education for the handicapped appeared in the APEID programme in this period. We often hear the argument, "We do not have enough room even for normal children. Why should we bother for handicapped children?" This was often the argument of policy-makers. But, it is no longer true, and the National Institute of Special Education in Japan was instrumental in bringing about this change by initiating modest co-operation with Asian countries in sending some mobile training teams to several countries. We were breaking the ice at that time to mobilize concern among Asian countries to generate policy level interest in special education. Some effort was made to provide a new concept of "science for all", along with education for all, or health for all (WHO), but this programme did not have much impact.

Lastly research and development or "R and D" have become a clear focus in the programme of APEID, particularly in such areas as measurement and testing, assessment of innovations, or indicators to measure learning achievements. In short, the 4th cycle of the APEID programme, 1987-1991, was concentrated around education for all, education relevant to societal requirements and support activities.

This was also a period of constraint and austerity both in personnel and finance on the part of UNESCO which obliged APEID to limit its activities to certain priority activities within those identified programmes. Universal primary education, continuing education, world of work, secondary education, use of educational and communication technology, personnel training, and science and technology education were areas, in which many participating countries of APEID showed specific interest.

**PRESENT PROGRAMME OF APEID AND PROBLEMS BEING FACED**

The Twelfth Regional Consultation Meeting of APEID in 1990 identified the following three areas for action during the fifth cycle (1992-1996):

(a) Universal primary education
(b) Science and technology education
(c) Re-orientation and qualitative improvement of secondary education

Several sub-areas have been identified under each of these areas and participating countries are already launching activities. However, APEID faces two major problems; lack of financial resources, and lack of a clear distinction between APEID and its sister programme, called APPEAL.

Concerning coordination with APPEAL, an explanation of the background is necessary. The "Asia-Pacific Programme of Education for All", or APPEAL started in 1987. It was originally recommended by the Conference of Ministers of Education in Bangkok in 1985. There were similar programmes in Africa and Latin America and so Asia was not the first to start this type of programme. Nevertheless, when the Asia-Pacific region did start this programme, sufficient preparations had been made and the region demonstrated considerable progress immediately after inauguration. This "education for all" programme also covers universal primary education, literacy and continuing education. Therefore, both APEID and APPEAL share the same programme areas. As each programme was designed and formulated through its own consultation process, it was not easy for the Secretariat of UNESCO to modify the contents. This confusion in the region has made it difficult to distinguish
between the two programmes. In Japan for example, in order to avoid this problem, both APEID and APPEAL were combined to form an APEID-APPEAL sub committee in the UNESCO National Commission.

Within a short time, APPEAL has succeeded in setting up 20 national co-ordination committees, while APEID has over 30 national development groups with 199 associate centres. So both programmes have a tremendous coverage and impact in the region and a clear distinction is urgently required to clarify the demarcation lines between APEID and APPEAL. One way could be for APPEAL to concentrate on completing the unfinished business of illiteracy, and UPE in more operational and logistic areas, whereas APEID would move into issue-oriented, research-oriented programmes. The simplest way could have been APPEAL for literacy and APEID for UPE, from the beginning. However, UNESCO's concept of "education for all" defines very clearly the inseparable link of UPE and literacy.

The clear division of responsibility between APPEAL and APEID could have been defined by the Regional Conference of Ministers of Education in Kuala Lumpur in 1993 on the basis of the recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Regional Co-operation in Education in Asia and the Pacific. Unfortunately neither the Regional Advisory Committee nor the UNESCO Secretariat did the necessary homework for the ministers to decide, and the ambiguity persists. In the author's personal opinion, the major tasks of education for all will have to be assigned to APPEAL, while APEID will have to pay increasing attention to burning issues such as environment, the measurement of learning achievements, conflict resolution, AIDS prevention, search for new values, etc., through more sophisticated research or experimentation-oriented approach.

APEID's financial constraints are closely related to UNESCO's own financial crisis. Apart from the continued absence of USA, UK and Singapore, the majority of the East European countries, especially those of the former USSR, are unable to pay their annual contributions. UNESCO is thus operating its activities through bank loans, which affects the resources of APEID - both human and financial - very adversely. Therefore, APEID will have to depend increasingly on extra-budgetary resources, especially from Japan.

UNDP has been a close associate of APEID since the outset by providing substantial financial contributions. UNDP does not normally provide funding support to a project beyond five or six years, but for APEID, UNDP made an exceptional concession to maintain its contribution for twenty years. UNDP stopped funding APEID in the early 1990s, but should, however, be in a position to support certain projects or activities under APEID if they are well formulated and demonstrate the clear link between educational innovation and development.

APEID has to ensure its own financial autonomy through UNESCO's own regular programme and funds-in-trust contributions from Japan and other countries. However, a major problem was once posed by UNDP, not so much by its threat to discontinue financial support, but by its proposal to set up a parallel programme outside UNESCO by subsuming the work of APPEAL and part of APEID.

Following the Jomtien Conference on Education for all in 1990, each of the four organizers - UNESCO, UNDP, UNICEF and the World Bank - is co-operating or competing in the implementation of the conference resolution. UNICEF and the World Bank are substantially increasing their assistance to basic education. UNESCO, despite financial constraints, carries out a number of activities. UNDP also endeavours to identify its own unique contribution to the follow-up of the Jomtien Conference. While UNICEF or the World Bank tended to work alone, UNDP's traditional mode of operations was to work with the technical agencies of the United Nations System, and has worked with or through UNESCO in the field of education.
What UNDP suggested was a much more vigorous inter-sectorial, multi-disciplinary approach, not only in education, but also in other sectors. Instead of using the existing regional mechanism developed by APEID, they recommended the appointment of regional and national co-ordinators so that the programme could be implemented more efficiently and effectively, which really meant a take-over of APPEAL and part of APEID by UNDP into a programme directly run by it. The majority of participating countries of APEID and APPEAL did not agree. The author was one of the most outspoken in defending UNESCO and APEID. All considered that the approach recommended by UNDP would be contradictory to the idea of regional co-operation nurtured through APEID over the years, and felt very strongly that each member had the right to participate in the formulation, execution and evaluation of the programme - i.e. genuinely equal partnership.

In the regional consultation meeting of APEID in Jomtien and the regional co-ordination meeting of APPEAL in Bangkok in 1992, the region expressed its vigorous opposition to such an approach. The author emphasized in those meetings that if UNDP decided to withdraw its funds UNESCO should endeavour, even with limited resources, to be self-sufficient. Furthermore, Japan’s contribution to UNESCO and its contribution through national universities such as Hiroshima, Tsukuba and Obihiro, NIER, the National Institute of Special Education and ACCU, as associated centres of APEID or APPEAL, would ensure viable regional co-operation. The World Terakoya Movement and the National Federation of UNESCO Associations in Japan also constitute strong NGO support in the education for all programme of UNESCO and they organized a world conference of NGOs for the mid-term review of the International Literacy Decade on 5-8 September 1995 in Tokyo.

The international community was called upon to respect UNESCO’s mandate in the field of education. Nowadays many agencies are interested in education, but UNESCO should be the principal organization responsible for education providing guidelines on the basis of its position as an internationally recognized intellectual body. This basic position should be maintained and safeguarded in future. It is to be hoped that the UN will maintain orderly development and division of responsibilities.

**MAJOR TRENDS IN REGIONAL CO-OPERATION AND FUTURE CHALLENGES FOR APEID**

It was an unprecedented event in the field of education that in early 1990 UNESCO, UNICEF, UNDP and the World Bank jointly organized in Jomtien, Thailand, the World Conference of Education for All. The International Bureau of Education also organized an international conference on education with the special theme of literacy. In the same year, UNICEF succeeded in staging a World Summit on Children. It is really gratifying that world attention began to shift from mere economic or production-oriented priorities to human considerations, such as human development, in which UNDP has also established its unique role by developing “human development indicators”. UNICEF has courageously fought on behalf of hard-pressed LDCs with a new theme of “adjustment with a human face”, fighting against the purely economic approaches of IMF which were rigorously imposing adjustment measures on these countries. UNICEF is now extending this concept of “adjustment with human face” to “development with a human face”. We should congratulate all these partner agencies for their genuine concerns for human development and the enhancement of human qualities.

There is an increasing need to seek for equitable human value and quality, and the guarantee of human aspirations for better quality of life, equity and environment-development equilibrium. At the same time, there is an acute and urgent need to redefine of the concept of the nation and the state, which ensure the harmonious and peaceful co-existence of different groups; socio-economic, ethnic, religious, cultural, linguistic, etc.; and each group’s desire to retain its own identity and aspirations.
These are definitely the new developments of the 1990s. The future, especially what remains of the twentieth century must be characterized by this quest for human values and human quality. This region and the world will have to tackle this major issue now and in the years to come. For example, in a situation of conflict between two races or ethnic groups, how can we enhance a new concept of mutual understanding, tolerance, and respect? 50 years after the creation of UNESCO, the world will have to come back to the original ideals of the Organization as vividly expressed in the preamble of its Constitution. New values have to be established through mutual consultation, and co-operation; human quality has to be re-defined and enhanced in a new perspective. We have to improve the quality of life for everyone on this planet. Education and learning are one of the essential factors and conditions in the development of new values, new human qualities and quality of life. The enhancement of moral and civic responsibility is another area in which UNESCO, through APEID and other programmes must make renewed efforts.

Concerning the search for new values and objectives in education, while UNESCO's special commission established to consider of education for the 21st century is expected to provide certain guidelines, APEID should express its own ideas and make its own propositions.

In the near future, a new mechanism of consultation, co-ordination and co-operation should emerge. In the past, the world was often divided between the east and the west and there was only a limited number of bridges between the two. Today this no longer exists. There is only one world and there should be one common mechanism to embrace all countries, all peoples, namely the system of the United Nations. The United Nations system must be safeguarded, as must a fair division of tasks among agencies. The new mechanism does not preclude the existence or emergence of diverse forms and fora of consultation and co-operation. All these multiplying fora should exist to enhance co-operative ventures, and not for confrontation and conflicts.

CONCLUSION

APEID has provided a regional forum for all countries of the region enabling them to join as equal partners. Despite socio-economic or political differences, all participating countries succeeded in establishing a spirit of co-operation and in mobilizing professional resources. This network of APEID will need to evolve with changes of major currents, with the more active participation of NGOs or the private sector and specific academic or professional disciplines, so as to develop a more rigorous academic and research-based approach to the identification of problems and the elaboration of strategies for their future development.

While APEID remains a forum of regional and international co-operation, national capacity-building will be the key focus of regional co-operation. Again, the existing strength of regional networks and co-operation will continue to play very important roles, because no country can exist in isolation in the future.

The unique feature of APEID is equal partnership among the developing and the industrially advanced, and the present joint effort must be respected, valued and continued. For this, the regional consultation mechanism must be strengthened. Having said this, it would not be the consolidation of APEID or APPEAL in their present forms. Today, APEID and APPEAL need re-definition of mutual functions and responsibilities. For example, APEID for development and APPEAL to complete unfinished business. To provide funding support, countries such as Japan, Australia, the Republic of Korea or Thailand want to know clearly to which one they are contributing, especially to justify such contributions before national authorities i.e. the Ministry of Finance, the distinction should be more easily understandable.
This re-definition must be undertaken by the participating countries themselves and should not be dictated from outside. APPEAL should deal with the essential basic task of completing the unfinished business of education for all while APEID should be more and more development and research-oriented, especially in the search for new goals and objectives of education, facing the 21st century, and the definition of new criteria for better human values and quality of life, and the identification of factors which will contribute to socio-economic and environmental development.
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