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What this chapter does

• Studies the trends of mainly 5 educational outcomes:
  1. Attendance of Primary;
  2. Completing Primary; Attendance of secondary;
  3. Completing secondary;
  4. Average years of education.
Main findings

- **Primary attendance** became universal except for Mauritania, Sudan, Comoros and Yemen.
- **Primary completion** improves over time but varies a lot across countries. Highest in Palestine and Jordan and lowest in Mauritania and Yemen.
- **Secondary attendance** varies across countries. Libya being the highest is quite surprising! Any explanations?
- Wealth continues to matter despite the great progress.
Suggestions

• Only indicators of quantity of education are considered. Completion rates are a poor proxy for the quality of education system. I then suggest that the authors removes this statement from in the introduction.

• Discussion of the education systems across the region and their evolution over time is needed. For example, Jordan has ten-year basic school, but how this is reconciled to compare with other structures is not explained. Footnote 9 is therefore not accurate.
Suggestions

• A discussion about government expenditure on education in MENA is needed (see Chapman & Miric 2005 and 2009).

• What about the targeting of education inequality in national policies? In Vietnam, specific targeting of inequality was linked to a relatively equitable distribution of school quality and to improved levels of learning overall.

• The chapter lacks a comparison between MENA and the other developing regions.
Tertiary Education

• A discussion about Tertiary education is added only toward the end of the report. Not clear why it’s was not mentioned earlier.

• Authors state that tertiary education represents the main challenge to the region while analysis show it’s rather the secondary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Egypt 2014</th>
<th>Libya 2014</th>
<th>Sudan 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prim</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ter</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Suggestions

• Discussion of general vs. technical secondary education would be relevant to explain the low access to tertiary education.
Minor Issues

- Add the outline of the chapter in the introduction would help the reader to follow.


- Avoid graphs with baseline/endline. May be misleading and confusing as years differ from one country to another. [figures 2; 8 and 15].

- Some countries are missing on graphs. For example, Libya is not on figure 21.
Thank you for your attention