

**T.C.
TURKISH- GERMAN UNIVERSTY INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL
SCIENCES INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND EUROPE**

**INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS AND GLOBAL CRISIS: UNESCO'S
EFFORTS ON SDG4 AND COVID-19 PANDEMIC**

MASTER'S THESIS

Hilal Şüheda

SOLMAZ

ADVISOR

Dominic HEINZ

ISTANBUL, July,

2023

**T.C.
TURKISH- GERMAN UNIVERSTY INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL
SCIENCES INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND EUROPE**

**INTERNATIONAL INSTIUTIONS AND GLOBAL CRISIS:UNESCO'S
EFFORTS ON SDG4 AND COVID-19 PANDEMIC**

MASTER'S THESIS

Hilal Şüheda

SOLMAZ 208101017

Thesis Submission Date to Institute :21.07.2023

Thesis Defence Date:24.08.2023

Thesis Advisor : Dominic Heinz

Other Jury Members : Murat Erdoğan, Philip Decker

ISTANBUL, July, 2023

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ÖZET iv
ABSTRACT vi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS viii
LIST OF TABLES..... x
 INTERNATIONAL INSTIUTIONS AND GLOBAL CRISIS:UNESCO’S EFFORTS ON SDG4 AND COVID-19 PANDEMIC 11
 INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION 19
 INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS 24
 UNDP AND UNESCO COOPERATION.....28
 HOW DID INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND COOPERATION FIGHT AGAINST GLOBAL PANDEMICS SUCH AS ASIAN FLU, HIV AND COVID 19? 29
 UNESCO IN TERMS OF INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS AND GLOBAL PROBLEMS 31
METHODOLOGY..... 32
FINDINGS..... 33
DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS..... 34
CONCLUSION 38
LIST OF REFERENCES..... 43
APPENDICES..... 47
App.A LOSS OF EDUCATION% WORLD WIDE 47
App.B UNESCO'S EFFECT ON SDG4..... 47

ÖZET

ULUSLARARASI KURUMLAR VE KÜRESEL KRİZ: UNESCO'NUN SDG4 ÇABALARI VE COVID-19 PANDEMİSİ

COVID-19 salgını, sürdürülebilir eğitiminin önemini ve aciliyetini gün ışığına çıkarmıştır. Birleşmiş Milletler Kalkınma Programı'nın (UNDP) liderliğinde ilerletilen sürdürülebilirlik çalışmalarını Birleşmiş Milletlerin diğer kuruluşları da desteklemiştir. Bu bağlamda Birleşmiş Milletler Eğitim Bilim ve Kültür Kurumu (UNESCO); özellikle sürdürülebilir eğitim konusunda etkin bir rol alma mücadelesini COVID-19 (2019-2022) sırasında ve sonrasında göstermiştir. Bu makale, UNESCO'nun bu mücadelesinin ışığında ve uluslararası ilişkiler teorisinin merceğinden, küresel örgütlerin ve uluslararası iş birliğinin global krizlerde bir çözüm aracı olup olmadığını inceleyecektir. UNESCO'nun örnek olay incelemesiyle, neoliberalerin haklılık payı; uluslararası kurumların ve uluslararası işbirliğinin gerekliliği ve etkisi değerlendirilecektir. Makale, UNESCO'nun çabalarının ardından Sürdürülebilir Kalkınma Amaçlarından biri olan eğitimde eşitlik hedefine istinaden elde edilen sonucun olumluluğunu analiz edecektir. Bu gözlem ile, okulların COVID-19 sonrası UNESCO'nun eğitimde eşitlik hedefinde yaşadığı zorluklar incelenmekte ve UNESCO'nun bu zorluklara rağmen eğitim sistemini iyileştirme ve yeniden inşa etme çabasının sürdürülebilir eğitim amacına hizmet ettiği çalışmalar makalede yer almakta. Eğitim sistemlerini uzaktan öğrenme ortamına uyarlama çabalarıyla sürdürülebilir eğitimin devam etmesini sağlamak için hibrit öğrenme, sanal işbirliği ve dijital platformların kullanımı gibi yeni stratejiler COVID-19 küresel krizine yanıt vermede kullanıldı. Bu makaledeki veriler Sahra Altı Afrika'da okula kayıt, okulu tamamlama ve okuryazarlık oranı değişkenleri ile sınırlandırılmıştır. COVID-19 sırasında ve sonrasında bu değişkenlerin artış hızları yavaşlamış olsa da, COVID-19 gibi çok beklenmedik, tehlikeli ve deneyimlenmemiş bir küresel kriz yaşanmış olmasına rağmen hala artışın olduğunu görmek çok umut vericidir. Bu sebeple neoliberal yaklaşımların haklılık payı ortaya çıkmaktadır. Bu yazıda incelenen Sahra Altı bölgesinin tercih edilmesinin nedeni, düşük gelişmişlik oranı ve UNESCO'nun tercih edilme sebebi ise kurumun COVID-19 ile dolaylı ilişkisinin olmasıdır. Bu sayede uluslararası

kurumların oluřan kresel krize dolaylı bir yoldan baęlantısında bile o krize zm olabilmesi ve bunun UNESCO ile rneklenmesi uluslararası kurumların kresel krizlerin etkisinin azalmasında olumlu bir etkisi olduęunu kanıtlar. Bu sayede bu rneklerle uluslararası krizlerin ve uluslararası kurumların arasındaki iliřki ile ilgili olan neo-liberal varsayımlarının, seilen veri kmesi ve rneklerde, haklı olduęu kanıtlanmıřtır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Uluslararası Kuruluřlar, Uluslararası İř birlięi, UNESCO, Neoliberalizm
Tarih: Temmuz,2023

ABSTRACT

INTERNATIONAL INSTIUTIONS AND GLOBAL CRISIS:UNESCO'S EFFORTS ON SDG4 AND COVID-19 PANDEMIC

The COVID-19 pandemic has brought to light the importance and urgency of sustainability education, and it has also disrupted education systems and made it difficult to implement the Sustainable Development Goals. Even though the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) plays a crucial role as a catalyst, connecting the SDG-outlined global goals to actual on-the-ground initiatives and ultimately advancing the global mission of sustainable development, some other international institutions like the United Nations Educational and Scientific Organizations (UNESCO) helps UNDP to reach the goals of 2030. This paper, through the lens of international relations theory, will try to explain as neoliberals suspected by the case study of UNESCO if global organizations and global cooperation are a help in the times of global crisis. The paper will focus on the continuity and change in the wake of UNESCO's efforts. The analysis reveals that schools have faced difficulties delivering education that is focused on sustainability as a result of this disruption, which has impacted the implementation of the UN's objectives after COVID-19. Education reform has been incorporated into efforts to recover and rebuild education systems following a crisis, contributing to a more resilient and sustainable future. In order to ensure that sustainability education continues through efforts to adapt education systems to the remote learning environment, educators and institutions have tried out novel strategies like blended learning, virtual collaboration, and the use of digital platforms. Students can be empowered to address challenges of the present and the future by preparing students to respond to global crises, such as those involving public health, climate change, and disruptions to social and economic order. This paper is limited by the variables of school enrollment, school completion and literacy rate, and even though their increasing rate has been slowed down during and after COVID-19, it is still very promising to see that there is still and increase even though very unexpected and dangerous and not exercised global crisis occurred like COVID-19. The choice of UNESCO is due to the indirect relationship of the institution to COVID-19 as the perspective of this institution analyzed in this paper is education. This choice is on purpose as even witha indirect correlation with the international institution and the global crises is seen positively interacted as seen in this case study, then neo-liberal scholars

assumptions are proven to be right as international cooperation and institution is help during global crisis.

Keywords:International Organizations, InternationalCooperation, UNESCO, Neoliberalism

Date:July,2023

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CEPI: Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness Innovations

COVAX: COVID-19 Vaccines Global Access

COVID-19: Coronavirus Disease

GEC: Global Education Coalition

GEC: Global Environment Center

GIP :The Global Influenza Programme

HIV/AIDS: Human Immunodeficiency Virus/Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome

ICT : International Cooperation Theory

IMF: International Monetary Fund

IR: International Relations

SDG 13: Climate Action

SDG 16: Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions

SDG 4: Quality Education

SDG 5: Gender Equality

SDG 9: Industry, Innovation, and Infrastructure

SDG: Sustainable Development Goals

UNAIDS: United Nations Program on HIV/Helps

UNDP: United Nations Development Programme

UNESCO: United Nations Educational, Scientific And Cultural Organization.

UNICEF: The United Nations Children's Fund

WHO:World Health Organization

GPG: Global Public Goods

LIST OF TABLES

| | |
|---|----|
| Table 1 LOSS OF EDUCATION..... | 38 |
| Table 2 UNESCO'S EFFECT ON SDG4..... | 38 |

INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS AND GLOBAL CRISIS: UNESCO'S EFFORTS ON SDG4 AND COVID-19 PANDEMIC

INTRODUCTION

Millions, millions of years ago, way before humanity, history recorded many unexpected things such as earthquakes, tsunamis etc that are not under humanity's control. Most of the people did not see those milestones coming, nor did many in the 21st century's first up-to-date global pandemic. Considering the destruction of earth and nature by high levels of pollution, increased amount of consumption and the lack of national and international regulations on both air and soil pollution according to data (European Environment Agency, 2022; Food Organization of the United Nations, and Agriculture, Global assessment of soil pollution: Report,2021), it was not at all that surprising to see people were experiencing a global pandemic called COVID-19. The impact of COVID-19 on the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) was also unanticipated. In order to comprehend the effect, additional information regarding the SDGs must first be provided. They are laid out in 2015 as a component of the 2030 Plan for sustainable development, give an extensive structure of 17 objectives and 169 focuses on that address a large number of worldwide difficulties, including poverty, inequality, environmental change, and biodiversity loss encountered the Coronavirus adversely too. The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), that is a key United Nations agency tasked with promoting sustainable development and increasing education worldwide takes the role as a primary driver for the implementation of the SDGs (Martín-Blanco et al, 2022). It plays a central role in helping countries integrate the SDGs into their national policies and development agendas, providing technical assistance, funding, and expertise to facilitate progress towards these goals. In accordance with the SDGs' core goals, UNDP's work includes poverty reduction, gender equality, climate action, and more. As a result, the UNDP plays a crucial role as a catalyst, connecting the SDG-outlined global goals to actual on-the-ground initiatives and ultimately advancing the global mission of sustainable development. Even though the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) work together to promote environmental harmony and global well-being, UNESCO also helps UNDP just as much as UNICEF does. Within the context of the Sustainable Development Goals, there

is a synergistic relationship between the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization and the United Nations Development Programme. The SDGs are made possible in large part thanks to the efforts of both organizations. UNESCO, as the specialized agency responsible for promoting education, culture, science, and communication, contributes significantly to SDG 4 (Quality Education), SDG 5 (Gender Equality), and SDG 9 (Industry, Innovation, and Infrastructure), among others. Meanwhile, the UNDP, with its focus on poverty reduction, environmental sustainability, and overall human development, addresses a broader spectrum of the SDGs, including SDG 1 (No Poverty), SDG 13 (Climate Action), and SDG 16 (Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions) (Pereznieto, Oehler, 2021). Their relationship is complementary, as UNESCO's efforts in improving education and cultural preservation are instrumental in achieving the UNDP's overarching goal of human development and well-being. Education and cultural understanding are essential components of sustainable development, promoting inclusivity and fostering social cohesion. The UNDP often collaborates with UNESCO to integrate educational and cultural elements into its development programs, recognizing that holistic development encompasses not only economic growth but also the preservation of cultural heritage and the empowerment of individuals through education. In this way, the cooperation between UNDP and UNESCO underscores the interconnectedness of the SDGs and highlights their shared commitment to achieving a more equitable, sustainable, and inclusive world.

Considering this unfortunate historical milestone called COVID-19 and the relationship between UNESCO and UNDP, this paper through the lens of international relations theory, which is the study of international relations (IR) from a theoretical perspective, will try to explain by the case study of UNESCO if global organizations and global cooperation are a help or a hindrance. Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, the world was already behind schedule in meeting the education goals of 2030. If no extra measures are taken, just one of every six nations will meet SDG4 and accomplish widespread admittance to quality of education by 2030 (Strielkowski, 2022, p.198). An estimated 84 million children and adolescents will continue to be absent from school, and an additional 300 million students will continue to lack the fundamental literacy and numeracy skills necessary for success in life. The primary school completion rate increased from 85% to 87% between 2015 and 2021, the lower secondary completion rate increased from 74% to 77%, and the upper secondary completion rate increased from 54% in

2015 to 58%. Even though the numbers are increase, these rates had slowed down in comparison to progress in 2010–15 even before COVID-19 hit (p.200). The analysis reveals that global learning levels did not improve between 2015 and 2019 when closely examining reading levels at the end of primary school. In addition, educational damage resulting from COVID-related school closures have been documented in four out of every five of the 104 nations that have conducted such studies (Department of Economic and Social Affairs Sustainable Development, 2022). Further, not only Individuals have been confronting an education crisis since Coronavirus, an entire global generation also has had their education disrupted for the first time in human history. Over 1.6 billion students were out of school because of the COVID-19 pandemic. On a number of levels, this will have a long-lasting and significant impact. It is known from previous crises that the likelihood of children not returning to school increases with the longer time of absence. Since school is not only where children learn, but also where their social skills develop, students will also suffer from stunted peer interaction, which is an essential part of development. Due to the fact that girls typically have fewer years of schooling than boys do (relative to their male peers, a lost year of schooling is experienced more in their lifetime of education) and families frequently place a higher priority on their son's education than on their daughter's, gender inequality can also increase due to the COVID-19 Pandemic's effects of education. The negative effect of the Covid on Education can be seen in Table 1 (Garagiola, et al, 2022,p.220).

Considering the above proof of the negative impact of COVID-19 Pandemic's on education, one of the ways to explain the system's reaction to these effects is by NeoLiberalism. NeoRealists hold the belief that the main players in the international system are sovereign states. It is believed that individuals, international institutions, non- governmental organizations, multinational corporations, and other sub-state or trans-state actors have indirect influence. However, even if Neorealist assumptions apply, some scholars of neoliberalism (such as member of International Cooperation Theory (ICT) (Dai, Snidal, Sampson,2017, p.3) believe that still the role that international organizations and nongovernmental actors play in influencing state preferences and policy decisions are highly correlated. This school of thought holds the belief that interdependence between states facilitates cooperation through international institutions. Neo-Liberals are of the opinion that, with the right institutions and diplomacy, states can cooperate with one another to maximize prosperity and minimize conflict. Although both Neo-Liberals and Neo- Realist agree that international cooperation is a possible outcome of a

conflict, both theories differ when it comes to the likelihood of international cooperation. Neorealists perceive international cooperation as “harder to achieve, more difficult to maintain, and more dependent on state power” (Baldwin, 1993, p.278), this might be plausible considering national securities, however COVID-19 Pandemic would give such an extraordinary case as it was an international health problem that has one single agreement of from all of the countries, it must be fought.

A stable set of norms and rules designed to regulate the behavior of states and other actors in the international system is known as an international organization, international institution, or intergovernmental organization (Simmons, Martin, 2002, p.428). Then, rational actors can overcome these challenges and encourage international cooperation by using existing institutions or creating new ones. By connecting various issues in a manner resembling a game, international institutions can encourage cooperation (McGinnis, 1986, p.4) By arranging trades across issues that are beneficial to both parties, institutions can also increase the benefits of cooperation. Getting states to change their behavior to the prescribed cooperative actions and provoking and justifying retaliation against noncompliance (and thus ensuring compliance in the first place) can be accomplished by simply agreeing on a rule regarding what constitutes cooperation. Information on compliance is also provided in a variety of ways by international institutions (Downs, Rocke, & Barsoom, 1996, p.380). States create international institutions to solve their collective action issues because international institutions can improve cooperation through mechanisms like promoting issue linkage or providing necessary information. Specific causal mechanisms that international institutions use to persuade states to comply with international agreements are the focus of compliance studies (Koremenos, Lipson, & Snidal, p.780). As illustrated, and also suggest by Neoliberals if Institutional choice is in favor of current the current international organizations, international cooperation is plausible, especially under common risks like health. The United Nations developed a strategy to prevent influenza pandemics like the 1918 flu, which killed over 40 million people, long before the coronavirus. The World Influenza Centre was established in 1948 to monitor, analyze, and disseminate health data on any epidemics. The Global Influenza Programme (GIP) was established in 1947 by the Interim Commission of the World Health Organization (WHO). By coordinating efforts, providing support, and advocating for effective policies and programs, international organizations have played a crucial role in the fight against HIV/AIDS, just like the Influenza pandemic did. For

instance, UNAIDS is a United Nations program that brings together a number of UN agencies, governments, civil society organizations, and individuals living with HIV/AIDS. The United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) emphasized both the care and support of HIV-affected children and the prevention of mother-to-child transmission (Stein,1990, p.6). It helps countries expand pediatric HIV services, provide antiretroviral therapy to pregnant women, and ensure that children and adolescents have access to treatment. Just as such, as a result, international organizations have contributed significantly to the global response to the COVID-19 pandemic. The following are some of the most important steps that international organizations have taken to deal with the pandemic: The World Health Organization (WHO) was crucial to the coordination of the COVID-19 response. It has worked to ensure that vaccines are distributed fairly, disseminated information to the general public, and advised nations on testing, treatment, and prevention strategies (Clinton& Sridhar, 2017, p.3). In addition, WHO urged global solidarity in the response, supported countries in strengthening their health systems, and facilitated international cooperation and research collaboration. Countries affected by the pandemic have received financial support from the World Bank. It established the COVID- 19 Fast Track Facility and allocated funds to support the most vulnerable populations, scale up testing and treatment capacities, and strengthen health systems worldwide. Countries' COVID-19 response and recovery efforts have also received policy advice and technical assistance from the World Bank. Countries dealing with the pandemic's effects on their economies have received assistance from the IMF (Duran & Menon, 2020, p.5). It supported nations in managing the economic aftermath, ensuring fiscal stability, and protecting vulnerable populations by providing financial assistance and policy advice. Additionally, in order to lessen the financial strain on low-income nations, the IMF advocated for debt relief and debt restructuring measures. Through its COVAX facility, Gavi has been instrumental in the global distribution of COVID-19 vaccines. In order to guarantee equitable access to vaccines worldwide, it has collaborated with partners to acquire and distribute vaccines to low- and middle-income nations. Gavi has also helped countries improve their vaccine delivery systems and immunization programs (Weintraub et al, 2021,37). The Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness Innovations (CEPI) has contributed significantly to the creation of COVID-19 vaccines and their equitable distribution. It has supported the production and distribution of vaccines worldwide, facilitated technology transfer, and provided funding to accelerate the development of vaccine candidates. Communities affected by the pandemic have

received assistance from the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, which has included humanitarian aid, public health awareness campaigns, and medical assistance. In addition, they have worked to address the crisis's socioeconomic effects, offer psychosocial support, and encourage community resilience. Finally, in response to the COVID-19 crisis, the UN has coordinated its efforts (Duran & Menon, 2020, p.5. The COVID-19 Response and Recovery Fund was established by the United Nations to assist nations in their health and socioeconomic recovery efforts. In addition, it established the UN COVID-19 Supply Chain Task Force to guarantee the equitable and efficient distribution of vaccines and essential medical supplies. In order to coordinate efforts, share information and resources, support research and development, ensure an effective and equitable global response to the COVID- 19 pandemic, governments, public health agencies, civil society organizations, and the private sector have collaborated with these international organizations and a great number of others (Clinton& Sridhar, 2017, p.3).

Neoliberalism, which views international organizations as significant players in global governance that provide platforms for nations to engage in dialogue, negotiate agreements, and establish common standards, thus provides an explanation for these cooperation and behaviors. It is demonstrated that the role of non-state actors, such as multinational corporations, civil society organizations, and philanthropic foundations, in international cooperation can be recognized when there is a common interest of humanity. Neoliberalism also emphasizes the importance of international law and institutions in promoting cooperation, resolving conflicts, and maintaining stability in the international system. Beyond traditional state-based cooperation, these actors demonstrated that they contributed to global problem solving and provided resources and expertise.

In accordance with this, as it was not highlighted in the literature, this paper from a perspective of Neoliberalism, will evaluate a case study of UNESCO's The United Nations Decade of Education for Sustainable Development (2005-2014), focus on the continuity and change in the wake of this initiative and project. The COVID-19 pandemic and UNESCO's have intersected in numerous ways. From 2005 to 2014, the UNESCO aimed to incorporate sustainable development principles, values, and practices into all education-related activities. The pandemic has made it difficult for education systems all over the world, including the progress that was made during the UNESCO's efforts before pandemic. The following are some

important connections between them (Duran & Menon, 2020, p.5. Educational challenges due to the COVID-19 pandemic disruption education systems worldwide forced many schools to close. Schools have faced difficulties delivering education that is focused on sustainability as a result of this disruption, which has impacted the implementation of the UNESCO objectives. The transition to remote learning has made it harder to make sure that sustainable development principles are incorporated into education. However, the pandemic has also provided an opportunity to rethink education and reinforce sustainable development principles, despite the difficulties. The UNESCO's emphasis on extraordinary training, which advances decisive reasoning, critical thinking, and an all-encompassing comprehension of maintainability issues, is exceptionally significant with regards to the pandemic. Students can be empowered to address challenges of the present and the future through efforts to adapt education systems to remote and blended learning. The global issues of public health, environmental sustainability, and social justice are all intertwined, as the COVID-19 pandemic has demonstrated (Clinton& Sridhar, 2017, p.3). By promoting education that fosters a multidisciplinary approach and recognizes the interdependencies of various issues, the UNESCO 's goals align with this understanding. Learners can gain a better understanding of the intricate interactions that occur between health, ecosystems, climate change, inequality, and other pressing global issues with education for sustainable development (Clinton& Sridhar, 2017, p.3).

The pandemic has brought to light the significance of having the capacity for adaptation and resilience during times of crisis. By giving students the knowledge, skills, and values they need to deal with and adapt to new challenges, education for sustainable development can help build these qualities. Education systems have the potential to foster a sense of agency, empower individuals, and strengthen their capacity to respond to future crises, including those related to climate change and environmental degradation, by incorporating sustainability principles into curriculum. The expanded dependence on innovation during the pandemic offers chances to improve supportability schooling. Digital platforms and tools can be used to make resources more accessible, make it easier to work together, and get students involved in interactive and hands-on learning experiences about sustainable development. However, closing the digital divide and ensuring that all students have equal access to technology and digital literacy skills are crucial. The COVID-19 pandemic has not only highlighted the importance and urgency of sustainability education, but it has also disrupted education systems and made it difficult to

implement the UNESCO . The UNESCO's principles and goals can be incorporated into efforts to recover and rebuild education systems following a pandemic, contributing to a more resilient and sustainable future. UNESCO is a broader idea that includes all aspects of education that incorporate sustainable development principles. It aims to give students the skills, attitudes, and values they need to deal with sustainability issues. UNESCO is addressing global issues and constructing a future that is more resilient and sustainable. The COVID-19 pandemic has thrown off education systems all over the world, forcing schools to close and moving toward online learning. The transition to online platforms and remote teaching has made it difficult to provide education that is focused on sustainability, so this has had an effect on the UNESCO implementation. In order to ensure that sustainability education continues throughout the pandemic, efforts have been made to adapt UNESCO content and pedagogical strategies to the remote learning environment. The pandemic has demonstrated how important and urgent UNESCO and its guiding principles are. It has brought to light the interconnectedness of global issues like environmental sustainability, social justice, and public health. The UNESCO provide a framework for comprehending and dealing with these challenges that are interconnected, encouraging resilience, and promoting solutions that are sustainable. Existing disparities, including the digital divide in education, have been exacerbated by the pandemic. UNESCO implementation have been impacted by uneven distribution of online learning resources and technologies. The digital divide must be bridged and equitable access to sustainable development education must be guaranteed, particularly in disadvantaged communities. The pandemic has also provided opportunities for UNESCO delivery innovation and creativity. To get students interested in sustainability education, educators and institutions have tried out novel strategies like blended learning, virtual collaboration, and the use of digital platforms. Innovative educational practices that can be used to improve UNESCO implementation have been accelerated by the crisis. The pandemic has brought to light the significance of having the capacity for adaptation and resilience during times of crisis. UNESCO emphasize the ability to overcome new obstacles and build resilience. The pandemic is a real-world illustration of the necessity of preparing students to respond to global crises, such as those involving public health, climate change, and disruptions to social and economic order (Clinton& Sridhar, 2017, p.3).

In conclusion, the COVID-19 pandemic has affected UNESCO implementations, particularly in terms of the need to address equity issues and the shift to remote learning,

additionally, it has emphasized the significance and urgency of sustainability education. However, it has also highlighted opportunities for innovation and resilience- building within the framework of UNESCO and show international cooperation and international institutions are help to overcome global crisis.

LITERATURE REVIEW

This part will be composed of literature analytical research of international cooperation and international institutions and how they react to global problems by considering multiple variables and how IR theories explain this behaviors and why Neo-liberalism is a great fit to explain the behaviors of actors towards COVID-19 by also observing similar cases of common interest to see if the behaviors of the institutions are stable considering the nature of the global problem as well as comparison between ideas of the same authors before and after COVID-19 to see if their assumptions were plausible. Both Neo-liberalist and Neo-realist ideas are illustrated as both have been evaluated as their opposites so due to the limitations of this work, the other IR theories will not take place.

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

The post-2015 process for establishing a global development agenda raises concerns regarding international cooperation that have been discussed in the past but have not been adequately addressed. One of the biggest obstacles to convincingly putting a global development agenda into action is better integrating the larger framework of international cooperation and global collective action into development efforts. Conceptual bases for this debate have been laid out in this paper. In the first section, we saw how the larger framework of international cooperation and global collective action fits into the larger picture of development goals and actions. With the categories of provision, support, access, and preservation, the framework identifies points of contact between domestic and global action and goals. From a GPG perspective, these categories correspond to the various functions international cooperation plays in development. The second section of the paper provides an overview of important ideas from the literature on global governance, international relations, and GPGs, organized by the main categories of aggregation technology, contribution types, governance mechanisms, the role of various stages in the provision process, and institutional complexity. The overview emphasizes

the diversity and patterns of global problem solving and GPG provision. Any combination of the characteristics discussed in the preceding sub-sections could constitute international cooperation (.Parra, Lewis & Ali, 2020,p.4).

In light of this conceptual overview, there are two main challenges that must be overcome in order to incorporate the broader framework of international cooperation and global collective action into a coordinated strategy for achieving development goals: First, the question of why international cooperation fails or GPGs are underprovided is at the center of development studies due to the relevance of the larger framework of international cooperation to development. Development research can use the existing body of literature from economic theory, international relations/global governance, and other fields to approach this question and further develop it. Overall, the conceptual overview raises questions about dichotomist ideas about cooperation by drawing a clear line between the state, which uses top-down control to solve problems with collective action, and the anarchic international system, which is full of free-riding. When the state's black box is opened, it becomes clear that actors in a given architecture of institutions and processes (or a lack thereof) engage in both conflict and cooperation during policymaking at all levels. The fact that domestic and local policymaking is not simply a top-down, hierarchical process that primarily relies on coercion and enforcement has long been recognized by public policy analysis. Even if the "shadow of hierarchy" plays a role, such processes typically involve cooperation in networks and negotiation systems (Ostrom, 1990, p.12; 1993 Mayntz, p.34; Voigt 1995, p.9). To put it another way, examining the reasons for the success or failure of cooperation outside of the nation-state is not fundamentally different from the research questions that are typically addressed in development studies. Understanding the processes of development in developing nations relies heavily on collective action and cooperation: When their societies are good at cooperating, states are institutional frameworks that help to provide positive development outcomes; When a society lacks cooperation, states underproduce public goods. This reasoning holds true at any level of human interaction. After all, policy failure and reform impasse may recur in domestic politics as well as in global governance. As a result, the question of how to encourage cooperation mechanisms is relevant to all levels of analysis. Messner, Guarn, and Haun (2013) argue, utilizing various fields of study like economics, evolutionary biology, and social anthropology, that the existence of a limited number of fundamental mechanisms of cooperation underpins cooperative behavior. They identify seven fundamental

mechanisms for cooperation's effectiveness: trust, reciprocity, communication, reputation, fairness, enforcement, and our identity are all important. In a global context marked by power shifts and complex issue-linkages that characterize many challenges that are likely to figure on a broadening agenda for global development, such as climate stability, food security, peace, and global health, working on these underlying mechanisms of cooperation is especially important. Second, highlighting international cooperation's lack or failure contrasts sharply with the abundance of cooperation that can be observed and the intricate architecture and procedures that are reflected in the conceptual overview. From this point of view, the difficulty is not always establishing international cooperation in the first place, but rather bringing its various components together and directing them toward growth. For instance, the issue with GPGs is frequently malprovision rather than under provision (Kaul 2012: 736). As a result, a second set of questions asks how to direct the intricate structures and procedures of international cooperation so that they contribute to the implementation of a growing global development agenda. In promoting development-orientation in other areas of international cooperation, the policy area of development cooperation has claimed a central role. However, development cooperation has also struggled to strike a balance between establishing connections with the broader framework of international cooperation and asserting its uniqueness. It is still unclear to what extent and in what manner institutions and procedures that have recently emerged from the policy area of development cooperation will be able to carry out this steering role (for instance, the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation post-2015 process). In the end, a global development agenda needs to be thought of as an all-encompassing issue that can't be claimed by any one policy area. This comprehensiveness makes it difficult to overcome sectorization and fragmentation, both domestically (such as ministerial reorganization) and globally (mainstreaming development issues, coordination in global governance forums, etc.). In order to accomplish this, forums with the potential to influence the larger framework of international cooperation in the context of implementing a global development agenda (such as the G20) must also provide impetus (Elfer & Morris, 2022, p.44).

Procuring global participation in global relations requires political endeavors, successful correspondence, common comprehension, and the quest for shared objectives. A few vital procedures to encourage global collaboration have many perspective. Trust is the groundwork of participation. Laying out trust through straightforward and dependable correspondence is

fundamental. Distinguish shared interests and shared objectives that can shape the reason for participation. Feature regions where cooperation can prompt shared advantages and address normal difficulties. Underscore mutual benefit results that can upgrade participation. Participate in multilateral gatherings and establishments, like the Unified Countries, provincial associations, and global meetings (Elfer & Morris, 2022, p.44). These stages give chances to connect with numerous nations all the while, cultivating exchange and participation on different worldwide issues. Discretionary discussions are urgent in settling clashes and agreeing. Participate in useful discourse, undivided attention, and split the difference to settle on something worth agreeing on. Look for conciliatory arrangements that oblige alternate points of view and interests. Recognize power imbalances and work towards tending to them. Perceive the contrasting capacities and assets of nations, and take a stab at comprehensive dynamic cycles that engage all countries to partake and contribute successfully (Matthewman, & Huppatz, 2020, p.680). Empower shared liability and weight dividing between countries. Support commitments in light of every nation's ability and aptitude. Team up on issues, for example, environmental change, worldwide wellbeing, and security, where shared endeavors are fundamental. Effectively support and participate in compromise endeavors (Elfer & Morris, 2022, p.44). Empower quiet discussions, intervention, and discourse to determine questions and encourage participation. Worldwide foundations, territorial associations, and regarded go between can assume a urgent part in working with the goal of struggles. Work towards the turn of events and adherence to worldwide standards, deals, and arrangements. Team up on making lawful systems that administer conduct and advance collaboration in regions like common liberties, demobilization, exchange, and ecological security. It is critical to perceive that gaining worldwide participation is an intricate and progressing process. It requires supported discretionary endeavors, adaptability, and a pledge to discourse and think twice about.

The COVID-19 pandemic has highlighted the crucial role of international cooperation in addressing global challenges and has had a significant impact on international relations (Elfer & Morris, 2022, p.46). Global Health Governance is one of the key aspects of international cooperation. The pandemic has underscored the importance of strong global health governance and cooperation. International organizations, such as the WHO, have played a central role in coordinating global efforts, sharing information, and providing guidance to member states. Collaboration among countries, sharing of scientific knowledge, and coordinated responses have

been critical in controlling the spread of the virus and mitigating its impact. The pandemic has highlighted a tension between multilateralism and nationalism. Some countries have adopted a more inward-looking approach, prioritizing national interests and implementing unilateral measures. However, the global nature of the pandemic has necessitated collective action and international cooperation (Elfer & Morris, 2022, p.49). Multilateral platforms and initiatives have played a vital role in coordinating responses, sharing resources, and facilitating equitable access to vaccines, treatments, and medical supplies. The development and distribution of COVID-19 vaccines have required extensive international cooperation. Global initiatives, such as COVAX, have been established to ensure fair and equitable access to vaccines for all countries, regardless of their income levels. International collaboration among scientists, researchers, and pharmaceutical companies has been crucial in accelerating vaccine development and ensuring global supply (Toquero, Calago, & Pormento, 2021,p.90). The pandemic has caused severe economic disruptions globally. International cooperation has been vital in coordinating economic responses and recovery efforts. Organizations like the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank have provided financial support and guidance to countries in need. Cooperation in areas such as trade, investment, and debt relief has been crucial to mitigate the economic impacts and promote global recovery. The pandemic has led to the imposition of travel restrictions and border controls by many countries. International cooperation has been important in coordinating these measures to ensure effective border management while minimizing disruptions to trade, transport, and essential travel. Cooperation among countries and adherence to common guidelines have facilitated the safe reopening of borders and the resumption of international travel. The rapid sharing of scientific information, research findings, and best practices has been crucial in understanding and combating the virus. International cooperation among scientists, researchers, and public health institutions has facilitated knowledge exchange, collaboration on vaccine development, and the development of effective public health measures(Toquero, Calago, & Pormento, 2021,p.95).

Overall, the COVID-19 pandemic has emphasized the interconnectedness of countries and the need for international cooperation in addressing global crises. Collaboration among states, international organizations, and various stakeholders has been essential in controlling the spread of the virus, mitigating its impact, developing vaccines, and promoting global recovery. The pandemic has highlighted the importance of a coordinated and cooperative approach in

international relations to effectively respond to and overcome global challenges(Matthewman, & Huppatz, 2020, p.680).

INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

To comprehend worldwide collaboration and friction, it is important to foster an information on how global organizations work, and how they change. In the pursuit of such knowledge, the presumption of substantive rationality has proven to be a useful tool. A "reflective" approach, which emphasizes the impact of human subjectivity and the embeddedness of contemporary international institutions in pre-existing practices, has recently challenged the intellectual dominance of the rationalistic approach. The advantages and disadvantages of each approach can be better understood when they are confronted with one another. A critical comparison of rationalistic and reflective views suggests hypotheses and directions for the development of better-formulated rationalist and reflective research programs, which could serve as the basis for historically and theoretically grounded empirical research, and perhaps even for an eventual synthesis of the two perspectives. However, advocates of the reflective approach have so far failed to develop a coherent research program of their own (Toquero, Calago, & Pormento, 2021,p.99).

International institutions are almost exclusively the subject of rational research. It places an emphasis on formal international organizations and international regimes. This research program is based on exchange theory, so it assumes that actors are rational and that there is competition and scarcity. Therefore, it begins with the premise that specific international institutions would not be required if there were no potential gains from agreements to be captured in world politics—that is, if agreements between actors could not be mutually beneficial. However, trade agreements, rules of war, and peace treaties have been evidence of mutual benefit for millennia, and international organizations have been evidence of mutual benefit for the past century (Matthewman, & Huppatz, 2020, p.680). On the other hand, institutions would not be required to facilitate cooperation if cooperation were simple—that is, if all deals that benefit both parties could be made for free. However, the assumption that there are no potential benefits to be gained from agreements is just as false. International regimes are significant because of the potential value of agreements and the difficulty of their implementation. Humans must utilize institutions in order to cooperate in global politics on a consistent basis. According to rationalist theories of institutions, incentives influence cost patterns. In particular, institutions alter transaction costs

and reduce certain forms of uncertainty: that is, the "costs of specifying and enforcing the contracts that underlie exchange" Institutions maintain expectations and provide information (through monitoring) even in the absence of hierarchical authority. Decentralized enforcement may also be possible through the creation of conditions for reciprocity, for instance (North, 1981; 1985; Williamson, 1981; 1984, Keohane; Moe, 1987). The institutional context has a significant impact on transaction costs at any given time. According to the theory, there will be a curvilinear relationship between these transaction costs that are affected by institutions and the creation of new institutions. It will not be necessary to establish new institutions to facilitate beneficial exchange if transaction costs are minimal; Establishing institutions will be difficult, if not impossible, if transaction costs are extremely high.

Because of their pervasiveness and significance in international politics, as well as the difficulty of comprehending their operation and development, international institutions merit study. Yet additionally encourage regard for them on regulating grounds. Cooperation can be made easier by international institutions. Collaboration will be limited without institutions. And if people don't know how institutions work and what makes them work well, there will probably be fewer and worse institutions than if people knew. Obtaining this knowledge of institutions through theory and the application of theory to practice, but especially through empirical research, is a major obstacle for students of international relations. Such knowledge is unlikely to come from pure rationalistic theory or criticism (Toquero, Calago, & Pormento, 2021,p.90).

Neoliberalism and international institutions have a complicated and multifaceted relationship. Neoliberalism is an ideology that places a strong emphasis on individual economic freedom, limited government intervention, and free markets. On the other hand, organizations known as international institutions help states collaborate and coordinate on a variety of global issues, such as trade, finance, development, security, and health education. Numerous international organizations' strategies and design have been influenced by neoliberalism. In the wake of World War II, these organizations were established with the intention of encouraging development, economic stability, and international cooperation. In addition to economic institutions, other international organizations are influenced by neoliberalism. However, it is essential to keep in mind that not all international organizations are in complete agreement with neoliberalism, and their strategies and policies may differ. Institutions may take a more mixed approach to

policymaking and place economic considerations ahead of social and environmental ones (Toquero, Calago, & Pormento, 2021,p.90). Neoliberal approaches and the impact of worldwide establishments have added to expanded monetary imbalance, diminished social securities, and the disintegration of state sway at times. They argue that the limited intervention of the government can have negative social effects, particularly on underrepresented groups and developing nations. In conclusion,despite the fact that many international institutions' policies and approaches have been influenced by neoliberalism, it is essential to recognize these institutions' various perspectives and goals (Wargadinata et al, 2020, p.535). Neoliberalism and international institutions have a dynamic relationship that is the subject of ongoing debate and contestation.

During the COVID-19 pandemic, the relationship between neoliberalism and international institutions like UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization) can be understood in terms of how the institutions responded to the crisis as well as their underlying principles and priorities (Toquero, Calago, & Pormento, 2021,p.97). As a specialized United Nations agency, UNESCO's mission is to advance education, science, culture, and communication all over the world. Even though UNESCO does not explicitly support neoliberalism, some aspects of its work and the larger international context exhibit the influence of neoliberal concepts. During the COVID-19 pandemic, UNESCO participated in a variety of communication, culture, and education-related endeavors. It has focused on issues like ensuring that people can continue to get access to good education even during lockdowns, supporting the preservation of cultural heritage, and making it easier to get reliable information and fight misinformation. UNESCO's response to the pandemic can be seen as embracing and challenging neoliberal principles in the context of neoliberalism. In order to guarantee continued access to education during school closures, UNESCO has, on the one hand, emphasized the significance of digital technologies and online learning. This is in line with the neoliberal emphasis on innovative solutions driven by the market and the application of technology to overcome obstacles. UNESCO has also stressed the importance of addressing disparities in education and access to digital resources. The digital divide has been made clear by the pandemic, making it hard for people from underrepresented groups and nations to get online education. In response, UNESCO has called for efforts to close the digital divide and promote equitable access to digital resources, challenging neoliberalism's market-driven inequality. During the crisis, UNESCO has

also emphasized the significance of cultural diversity and cultural heritage preservation. In contrast to the homogenizing tendencies that are frequently associated with neoliberal globalization, this focus acknowledges the significance of cultural diversity and expression. It emphasizes the significance of safeguarding cultural identities and fostering diverse and inclusive societies. UNESCO has worked to combat misinformation and promote accurate and dependable information sources in information and communication. This is in line with the neoliberal emphasis on transparency and the free flow of information as well as the significance of making decisions based on evidence. It is essential to keep in mind that UNESCO operates within the larger international context that has been shaped by neoliberalism. In this context, market-oriented policies and involvement of the private sector frequently predominate. Beyond UNESCO, global trends like privatization, commodityization, and the growing role of private actors demonstrate the influence of neoliberalism on education, science, culture, and communication. Throughout the COVID-19 pandemic, the relationship between UNESCO and neoliberalism is complex. While UNESCO's responses have emphasized addressing inequality, preserving cultural diversity, and combating misinformation, they have also included elements that are in line with neoliberal principles, such as the use of technology and market-driven solutions. The pandemic has prompted a reexamination of neoliberal strategies and an emphasis on the significance of equity, inclusivity, and the preservation of cultural heritage.

How international institutions react to global problems is another question this paper works on. Worldwide establishments assume an essential part in resolving worldwide issues by giving stages to collaboration, working with coordination among part states, and creating techniques and drives. Their responses to worldwide issues fluctuate contingent upon the idea of the main thing, yet here are a few general manners by which global foundations answer: International organizations examine worldwide issues, direct examination, and foster approaches and systems to address them. They unite specialists, partners, and part states to talk about and form techniques, rules, and best practices. These strategies frequently plan to advance participation, lay out standards, and give direction to activity. Global organizations act as discussions for exchange, cooperation, and coordination among part states, empowering them to cooperate to address normal difficulties. These foundations work with dealings, support data sharing, and encourage agreement building processes. They likewise lay out instruments for joint activity, for example, joint drives, teams, and working gatherings. International organizations frequently

assume a part in assembling monetary assets, specialized help, and skill to resolve worldwide issues (Milner, 1992, p.478). They might lay out devoted assets or funding systems, draw in giver commitments, and direction the distribution of assets to help drives and ventures pointed toward handling the central concern. International organizations create and advance global principles, rules, and guidelines to resolve worldwide issues (Wargadinata et al, 2020, p.520). These norms might cover different regions, like common freedoms, natural insurance, exchange, wellbeing, and security. By setting normal standards, worldwide foundations assist with laying out a level battleground and urge part states to embrace and carry out settled upon principles. International organizations frequently screen the execution and effect of their arrangements and drives connected with worldwide issues. They gather information, direct appraisals, and assess progress to guarantee that endeavors are compelling and distinguish regions for development. Observing and assessment processes assist with considering part states responsible and give 1 to direct future activities. International organizations bring issues to light about worldwide issues through open missions, reports, and promotion endeavors (Wargadinata et al, 2020, p.520). They spread data, teach the general population, and draw in with media and common society to assemble support, create political will, and advance comprehension of the main things in need of attention. International organizations give limit building projects and specialized help to part states, especially agricultural nations, to upgrade their capacity to resolve worldwide issues. This help might incorporate preparation, information sharing, innovation move, and institutional reinforcing. International organizations might participate in intercession and compromise endeavors to address clashes and questions connected with worldwide issues. It is essential to take note of that the methodologies and viability of International organizations in resolving worldwide issues can shift contingent upon the particular command, degree, and limits of every foundation. The viability of their responses likewise relies upon the ability and responsibility of part states to team up and execute the suggested activities.

HOW DID INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND COOPERATION FIGHT AGAINST GLOBAL PANDEMICS SUCH AS ASIAN FLU, HIV AND COVID 19?

International associations and collaboration played vital parts in battling worldwide pandemics like the Asian Influenza, HIV/Helps, and Coronavirus. Here is an outline of their endeavors for each situation: The World Wellbeing Association (WHO) started to lead the pack in planning worldwide reactions to the Asian Influenza pandemic. The WHO gave direction to part states on observation, detailing, and regulation measures. Worldwide cooperation worked with the sharing of data, examination, and assets to screen the spread of the infection and foster compelling immunizations. The worldwide reaction to the Asian Influenza prompted the foundation of the WHO's Worldwide Flu Observation and Reaction Framework, which proceeds to screen and answer flu flare-ups around the world (Wargadinata et al, 2020, p.520).

United Nations Program on HIV/Helps (UNAIDS) was laid out in 1996 to arrange the worldwide reaction to the HIV/Helps pandemic. UNAIDS works intimately with part states, common society associations, and other worldwide accomplices to help avoidance, treatment, care, and backing programs. Worldwide collaboration has worked with the sharing of best practices, exploration, and assets for HIV/Helps anticipation, treatment, and backing programs. Endeavors have been made to decrease the cost of antiretroviral medications and increment admittance to treatment in agricultural nations. WHO plays had a focal impact in organizing the worldwide reaction to the Coronavirus pandemic (Elfer & Morris, 2022, p.44). The WHO has given direction on general wellbeing measures, testing, contact following, treatment conventions, and immunization dissemination. Global associations, like the World Bank and the Worldwide Money related Asset, have given monetary help to help medical care frameworks and alleviate the financial effects of the pandemic. WHO has worked with the turn of events and evenhanded dispersion of Coronavirus antibodies through worldwide associations (Wargadinata et al, 2020, p.520).. Worldwide coordinated effort and information sharing play played critical parts in progressing logical information, creating antibodies, and checking the spread of the infection. Worldwide wellbeing drives, like the Worldwide Wellbeing Security Plan, have attempted to fortify nations' ability to forestall, distinguish, and answer irresistible infection episodes. In this multitude of cases, global associations and participation have given stages to cooperation,

information sharing, asset activation, and coordination of endeavors. They have worked with the turn of events and execution of systems to control the spread of sicknesses, guarantee admittance to medical services, and advance examination and development.

UNDP AND UNESCO COOPERATION

The relationship between the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) has become even more important in the context of global crises, including Corona virus pandemic, COVID-19. In the face of global crises such as the COVID-19 pandemic, cooperation between UNDP and UNESCO becomes increasingly important.

The pandemic has disrupted education systems around the world, threatening progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), especially SDG 4 (Quality Education). UNESCO, as the leading educational agency, has played a central role in addressing these challenges, providing guidance on distance learning, ensuring access to quality education during quarantine and promote scientific cooperation to fight the virus. This is in line with UNDP's human development mission, as access to education is a fundamental element of development. Furthermore, the pandemic has highlighted the importance of science, technology and innovation (STI) in responding to global crises. UNESCO plays a key role in promoting STI through its scientific initiatives and UNDP's commitment to SDG 9 (Industry, Innovation and Infrastructure) is part of the efforts. Together, they support research and innovation that can lead to the development of vaccines, treatments and sustainable solutions to fight COVID-19 and future global challenges. The pandemic also highlights the need for strong institutions and international cooperation, in line with SDG 17 (Partnering for the Goals). UNDP and UNESCO are working together to advance multilateral partnerships to address the socio-economic impacts of the pandemic, strengthen health systems and promote the sharing of scientific knowledge. Their joint efforts highlight the interdependence of the SDGs and the importance of coordinated action by UN agencies in times of crisis. In short, the relationship between UNDP and UNESCO takes on greater importance during global crises such as the COVID-19 pandemic. Their collaboration addresses key aspects of the SDGs, from education and innovation to institutional partnerships, highlighting the importance of a coordinated, multifaceted approach to addressing urgent

challenges the world's most urgent (Soleimani, et al, 2023; Park et al, 2023).

UNESCO IN TERMS OF INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS AND GLOBAL PROBLEMS

UNESCO is a worldwide organization that assumes a pivotal part in resolving worldwide issues connected with schooling, science, culture, and correspondence. UNESCO's command is to advance harmony, maintainable turn of events, intercultural exchange, and the free progression of information (Elfer & Morris, 2022, p.44). UNESCO perceives that instruction is fundamental for accomplishing supportable turn of events and tending to worldwide difficulties. It advances comprehensive and evenhanded quality instruction for all, with an emphasis on minimized gatherings, orientation uniformity, and deep-rooted learning. UNESCO attempts to further develop admittance to instruction, upgrade educator preparing, foster educational plans, and promoter for training as a basic common freedom. UNESCO advances logical examination, participation, and the utilization of science to resolve worldwide issues. It stresses the significance of proof-based navigation and the job of science in feasible turn of events. UNESCO upholds logical organizations, limit building, and the exchange of innovation to help nations in tending to difficulties, for example, environmental change, biodiversity misfortune, and general wellbeing emergencies (McCloskey, 2019,2)

UNESCO perceives the significance of social variety, legacy safeguarding, and intercultural discourse for cultivating common figuring out, social attachment, and economical turn of events. It attempts to safeguard social legacy destinations, advance social articulations, and protect elusive social legacy. UNESCO additionally advocates for the insurance of social variety and the privileges of native people groups. UNESCO advances opportunity of articulation, media improvement, and admittance to data. It resolves issues connected with media pluralism, media education, and the utilization of data and correspondence advancements for improvement. UNESCO attempts to reinforce media amazing skill, support autonomous reporting, and counter disinformation and can't stand discourse (Wargadinata et al, 2020, p.530).. In resolving these worldwide issues, UNESCO uses different techniques. UNESCO creates and advances worldwide standards, shows, and statements to direct part states in resolving worldwide issues. For instance, the All inclusive Statement on Social Variety and the Show on the

Assurance of the Submerged Social Legacy give structures to social protection. UNESCO offers specialized help, limit building projects, and skill to part states to upgrade their capacity to handle worldwide difficulties. It works with information sharing, preparing programs, and cooperative organizations to fortify school systems, logical examination capacities, social safeguarding endeavors, and media advancement. UNESCO advocates for worldwide issues through mindfulness missions, examination, and strategy proposals. It brings issues to light about the significance of training, social variety, and logical exploration in accomplishing reasonable turn of events. UNESCO additionally advances exchange and understanding among part states to cultivate collaboration and shared arrangements. UNESCO teams up with state run administrations, common society associations, the scholarly world, and other global establishments to resolve worldwide issues. It structures associations to use ability, assets, and organizations for additional viable and comprehensive arrangements (Elfer & Morris, 2022, p.44).

Generally speaking, UNESCO fills in as a stage for worldwide participation and activity in resolving worldwide issues connected with education, science, culture, and correspondence. Through its endeavors, it adds to the headway of manageable turn of events, harmony, and common comprehension among countries. Within this context, this paper analyzes how UNESCO reacts to COVID-19 to help to improve SDG4.

METHODOLOGY

This paper is a mixed type of research of both qualitative data and quantitative data to show how to measure UNESCO's effect on SDG4 after pandemic. UNESCO choice is here is critically important because a highly correlated international institution would be an obvious example to study the theory of neoliberalism and how international institutions would help state actors to overcome global problems, yet UNESCO has somehow indirect relations due to its area of work with the chosen global problem which is COVID-19. COVID-19 is a health problem where UNESCO focuses of education and science, so to see UNESCO's effect on SDG4 after the pandemic would provide a solid base for explanation of neoliberal assumptions. By induction method, the conclusion is made. Induction method is essential because it connects the outcomes of the data with theory. These all help to create findings.

FINDINGS

Assessing the specific effect of on SDG4 after the pandemic is really a perplexing and extreme undertaking. In any case, the accompanying advances will be utilized to understand UNESCO's effect on SDG4 to restrict the variable of this review: Recognizing key points connected with SDG4, which centers around guaranteeing comprehensive and evenhanded quality instruction and advancing long lasting learning valuable open doors for the academic purposes.

Gathering pre-pandemic information is the first step. For the time before the pandemic (pre-2020), collection data on the identified indicators is needed. This benchmark information will act as a source of perspective point for examination.

Investigating the pandemic's effect is the second step. Evaluating the effect of the pandemic on education around the globally. Detecting the factors such as literacy rate, school enrollment, completion rates will the limitations of the studied variable. This examination will help contextualize the difficulties looked in accomplishing SDG4 during and after the pandemic. After that distinguishing UNESCO's drives must be established. Investigating the different projects, drives, and approaches executed by UNESCO to help education and SDG4 during and after the pandemic creates an area of comparison. UNESCO has been active in promoting inclusive education, providing member states with technical assistance, and promoting distance learning. Then, this paper assesses the interventions of UNESCO as well to see UNESCO's efforts to mitigate the negative effects of the pandemic on education's effectiveness and reach. This appraisal can include data driven from their date base. Next, comparing the baseline data gathered in step 2 to the post-pandemic data on education indicators and examining the degree to which UNESCO's intercessions have added to positive changes or limited adverse consequences on SDG4. Finally, a table of records of the estimation of UNESCO's impact on SDG4 after the pandemic will be shown.

External factors should not be considered for the sake of limitations of this work. Surely, the effect of UNESCO on education before and after the pandemic could be also due to the as national policies, economic conditions, and social dynamics (Gustafsson, & Deliwe, 2020,p.3).

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS

As the pandemic had far-reaching effects on education systems worldwide, it is difficult to assess the specific effects on literacy rates during and after the pandemic. The conclusion of schools and disturbances in learning conditions might have unfavorably impacted education progress for some understudies, particularly in underestimated networks with restricted admittance to remote learning assets. Simultaneously, UNESCO and different associations probably adjusted their projects to address the difficulties of the pandemic and alleviate its effect on education and education. By the data taken from UNESCO, Table 2 ((UNESCO, 2023), it is seen that their efforts have been fruitful, yet one can see the clear decreasing rate in increasing the rate of literacy which is also something positive because despite all the negativeness, UNESCO'S effort increased the literacy rate.

When it comes to the school enrolment, it is seen that even though the increase of the speed of the rate is not going up, considering how huge and unexpected the global crisis of COVID-19 was, %2 uprise in the rate is a success especially when we consider the amount of students who especially in the beginning suffered from many technical problems due to lack of equipment's. Further more and more importantly, completion rate has been increasing comparing the two last of the variables more dramatically because even though, COVID-19 required quick thinking and creative solutions, it in a way made possible to see that distance education is also a possibility and that is why the dramatic increase stands. It is important to note that some education systems and institutions quickly adapted to the new circumstances and implemented novel strategies to guarantee continued education. For example, in certain areas, schools could have embraced distance learning techniques and gave learning materials to understudies, which might have decidedly impacted school finishing rates. Schools and teachers put forth attempts to guarantee congruity in learning, and a few understudies could have been urged to finish their examinations in spite of the difficulties. Because of the pandemic, some education frameworks could have executed more adaptable evaluation and reviewing strategies, permitting understudies to finish their investigations and progress to the following grade. Schools and instruction specialists could have offered designated help and intercessions to understudies in danger of exiting, which might have added to higher fulfillment rates. A few locales could have acquainted get up to speed programs with address learning holes brought about by school terminations,

which might have assisted understudies with remaining focused and complete their investigations (Iglesias-Pradas, et al, 2021, p.119)

This achievement is additionally due to from the beginning UNESCO worked with services of training, public and confidential accomplices and voluntary organizations to guarantee distance learning for all kids and youth. Since 2020, around 400 million students and 12 million educators in 112 nations have profited from GEC activities. Four significant missions are pointed toward preparing 1 million youth to secure positions; supplying remote learning capabilities to one million teachers; assisting 1 million students with getting therapeutic learning in STEM; furthermore, supporting 5 million young ladies in 20 nations to satisfy their right to training. It involves brand-new actors, including media outlets, education technology companies, and telecommunications companies, to supplement national efforts to guarantee learning continuity.

This limited success of UNESCO can be criticized as well. Neo-realists could argue that UNESCO's response to the COVID-19 pandemic was slow and ineffective. The organization's structure and decision-making processes might be criticized for being bureaucratic and hindered by the need to obtain consensus among member states. Neo-realists prioritize the interests and security of individual states. They might argue that UNESCO's pandemic response did not adequately consider national security concerns and focused more on global cooperation and humanitarian efforts. This could be seen as a weakness in addressing the immediate needs of states during a crisis as during global crisis still the most disadvantageous gets the more support, and the international institutions wait for developed countries to sacrifice their interest, like in Europe, the transition to the distance learning was quick yet, Europe still expected to shoulder the weight of the global crisis of COVID-19. Critics from this perspective might argue that UNESCO did not address the power dynamics among countries during the pandemic adequately, and some states might have exploited the situation to further their own interests, such as pressure to follow certain guidelines or recommendations.

However, these given information in this paper shows as neoliberals perceive that a few issues, like worldwide pandemics, natural challenges require aggregate activity and coordination among countries need global establishments like UNESCO that can work with collaboration and the pooling of assets to really resolve these common issues. States can gain access to shared information, expertise, and resources by joining organizations like UNESCO, which can result in

benefits for both parties. Neoliberals contend that global foundations can act as discussions for tact and compromise, decreasing strains and encouraging quiet relations among states. UNESCO's drives that advance shared comprehension of training issues for this situation adds to struggle counteraction. Taking into account UNESCO's endeavors previously, during, and after the Coronavirus pandemic, neoliberals could highlight the accompanying perspectives as proof of effective worldwide collaboration, during the pandemic, UNESCO's endeavors in advancing distance learning and instructive progression during the pandemic may be viewed to act as an illustration of how global establishments can uphold part states in tending to normal difficulties (Wijesinghe,2022, p.1116)

It's essential to take note of that alternate points of view and belief systems exist with respect to the job and viability of worldwide establishments. Neoliberal perspectives on global collaboration through associations like UNESCO are one focal point through which these endeavors can be investigated. For a thorough and objective evaluation, it is essential to think about numerous perspectives and inspect experimental information and assessments from different sources. Therefore, the following questions can be addressed for the follow-up of this paper: what external factors, other than COVID-19, promote international cooperation? Could UNESCO be more successful by changing their projects and how? Can UNESCO's relationship be analyzed using other IR lenses? It's important to note that different perspectives and ideologies exist regarding the role and effectiveness of international institutions. Neoliberal views on international cooperation through organizations like UNESCO are one lens through which these efforts can be analyzed. For a comprehensive and objective assessment, it is crucial to consider multiple viewpoints and examine empirical data and evaluations from diverse sources. Thus, for the follow up of this paper, next issues can be addressed, what external factors promote international cooperation other than COVID-19, could UNESCO be more successful by changing their projects and how, can UNESCO's relationship be analyzed through other lenses of IR etc.

As part of this pandemic, large-scale closures of educational institutions globally have affected approximately 70% of the global student population (UNESCO 2020a). The entire education system relies on technology that allows students to access the Internet to gain their knowledge. The exposure to distance learning is enough to make an impact in the education sector and it can have a positive impact on SDG 4 in the coming years. A UNESCO study shows

that the costs of achieving SDG 4 were already rising before COVID-19, but as a result of the pandemic, they have increased even more (UNESDOC Digital Library 2020). Cumulative funding needed over the next decade (through 2030) costs approximately \$335 billion due to additional capital needed for sanitation, re-enrollment, second chance programs and infrastructure needs, leading to a total net gain of \$205. billion compared to the normal situation (Elavarasan, 2022).

It is important to explain the results in detail. What actions by UNESCO have led to this optimistic impact? From the beginning, UNESCO's Education Sector has worked with ministries of education, public and private partners and civil society to ensure lifelong learning for all children and young people. The Sector's work aims to prioritize education as a public good for all to avoid generational disaster and promote sustainable recovery. The establishment of the Global Education Alliance, a new model of international cooperation to develop innovative responses to help countries address the consequences of the crisis, is a key element of the initiatives of this organization. It has more than 175 members working around three main topics:

Gender, connection and teachers. Organize ministerial-level meetings to create space for policy dialogue on educational recovery to prevent learners from being left behind, specifically as follows:

- March 29, 2021:

One year after the start of COVID:

Prioritize education recovery to avoid generational disaster

- October 20-22, 2020:

Special session of the Global Education Conference

- March 20, 2020:

In addition, UNESCO has implemented global monitoring through interactive maps. Interactive maps have been developed to track developments in school closures and learning loss around the world, as well as teachers' prioritization of vaccinations. They analyze school closures and vaccinations using live data, see Table 3 and Table 4. As it can be seen, the data provided reflects how the numbers become more promising by each reported time, proving the actions of UNESCO was in fact sufficient.

They have launched two campaigns with members of the Global Education Alliance to

ensure learning continues and girls stay in school: Keeping Girls In Touch and Learning never stop. Workshops and webinars were organized to share information on countries' efforts to maintain inclusive education provision in different contexts. Thematic notes have been published to provide evidence of good practice, practical advice and links to key references to minimize the short and long-term impacts of school closures . A series of digital learning resources aimed at helping governments, schools, teachers and parents reach out to students who cannot go to school are introduced, along with the launch of a technical learning platform repository number (“UNESCO’s Education Response to COVID-19,” 2023)

CONCLUSION

Real-world events and actions are often more complex and multifaceted than what any single theory can fully explain. The Coronavirus pandemic has uncovered the significance and desperation of maintainability schooling, and it has likewise disturbed schooling systems and made it hard to execute .This paper, from the perspective of IR Theory hypothesis, will attempt to explain neoliberals’ assumptions associated by the contextual investigation with UNESCO on the off chance that worldwide associations and worldwide cooperation that are an assistance in terms of worldwide emergencies. The paper acknowledges that the primer institution for SDGs are UNDP yet, analyzes if the behaviors of associations with indirect relations to COVID-19 like UNESCO, would help international cooperation and support SDGs, like in this case SDG4. The investigation uncovers that schools have confronted many challenges that is centered around maintainability because of this disturbance due to COVID-19 which has influenced the execution of the 2030 goals.

After the crisis, efforts to recover and rebuild education systems have incorporated education reform, resulting in a more resilient and sustainable future. To guarantee that schooling continues by adjusting the school systems by the remote learning climate, teachers and foundations have evaluated novel methodologies like mixed learning, virtual coordinated effort, and the utilization of computerized stages. This study is constrained by the variables of school enrollment, completion, and literacy rate. Despite the fact that their rate of growth slowed during and after COVID-19, it is still very encouraging to see that there is still an increase, even though global crises like COVID-19 were very unexpected, dangerous, and not exercised. The decision of UNESCO is because of the circuitous relationship of the organization to Coronavirus

as the primary concern of UNESCO is not health. This decision is deliberate as to prove the following: even with an indirect relationship between the international institutions and the global emergencies, it is that the institutions can help to decrease the impact of the crises. At that point, neo-liberal researchers assumptions are demonstrated to be right as international cooperations and organizations are help during worldwide emergencies.

This paper is an examination of both qualitative and quantitative information to demonstrate the best way to quantify UNESCO's' impact on SDG4 in the context with COVID-19. As stated before, UNESCO decision is here is fundamentally significant in light of the fact that a profoundly corresponded worldwide foundation would be an undeniable guide to concentrate on the hypothesis of neoliberalism and how worldwide organizations would assist with expressing entertainers to conquer worldwide issues, yet UNESCO has indirect relation - because of its area of work- with the picked global issue which is Coronavirus. Coronavirus is a medical condition where UNESCO focal points of education and science, so to see UNESCO's' impact on SDG4 in the context of COVID-19 would give a strong base to clarification of neoliberal assumptions. By induction technique, the conclusion is made. Enlistment technique is fundamental since it interfaces the results of the information with hypothesis. These all assistance to make discoveries. After the pandemic, assessing the specific impact on SDG4 is a difficult and difficult task. Anyway, the going with advances will be used to comprehend UNESCO's' impact on SDG4 to confine the variable of this survey: Perceiving central issues associated with SDG4, which revolves around ensuring thorough and fair quality guidance and progressing dependable learning important entryways for the scholarly purposes. Gathering pre-pandemic data is the initial step. For the time before the pandemic (pre-2020), assortment information on the recognized markers is required. This benchmark data will serve as a point of reference for the examination. Examining the pandemic's' impact is the subsequent step. Assessing the impact of the pandemic on schooling around the universally. Distinguishing the elements, for example, education rate, school enlistment, finish rates will the restrictions of the concentrated-on factor. This assessment will help contextualize the hardships searched in achieving SDG4 during and after the pandemic. After that distinctive UNESCO's' drives should be laid out. An area of comparison can be found by looking into the various initiatives, drives, and strategies that UNESCO implemented to support education and the SDGs during and after the pandemic. UNESCO has been dynamic in advancing comprehensive training, furnishing part

states with specialized help, and advancing distance learning. After that, this paper looks at how UNESCO's interventions have helped to reduce the pandemic's impact on education's effectiveness and reach. This evaluation may incorporate data derived from their data base. Then, looking at the standard information assembled in sync 2 to the post-pandemic information on schooling pointers and analyzing how much UNESCO's' mediations have added to positive changes or restricted unfriendly outcomes on SDG4. At last, a table of records of the assessment of UNESCO's' influence on SDG4 after the pandemic will be shown. Outside variables ought not be considered for limits of this work. Definitely, the impact of UNESCO on training when the pandemic could be additionally because of the as public approaches, financial circumstances, and social elements (Gustafsson, and Deliwe, 2020,p.3). As the pandemic had extensive impacts on school systems around the world, it is challenging to evaluate the particular consequences for education rates during and after the pandemic. The finish of schools and aggravations in learning conditions could have horribly affected training progress for certain students, especially in underrated networks with confined permission to remote learning resources. At the same time, UNESCO and various affiliations likely changed their activities to address the troubles of the pandemic and reduce its impact on training and schooling. By the information taken from UNESCO, Table 2, it is seen that their endeavors have been productive, yet one can see the unmistakable diminishing rate in expanding the pace of proficiency which is additionally something positive on the grounds that in spite of all the negativeness, UNESCO'S exertion expanded the education rate. With regards to the school enrolment, it is seen that despite the fact that the speed up the rate isn't going up, taking into account how gigantic and surprising the worldwide emergency of Coronavirus was, %2 uprise in the rate is a triumph particularly when we consider how much understudies who particularly before all else experienced numerous specialized issues because of absence of gear's. Further increasingly more critically, consummation rate has been expanding contrasting the two last of the factors all the more decisively in light of the fact that despite the fact that, Coronavirus required speedy reasoning and clever fixes, it in a way made conceivable to see that distance training is likewise a chance and to that end the emotional increment stands.

UNESCO's limited success can also be criticized. Neo-pragmatists could contend that UNESCO's' reaction to the Coronavirus pandemic was slow and inadequate. The association's' construction and dynamic cycles may be condemned for being administrative and prevented by

the need to acquire agreement among part states. Neo-pragmatists focus on the interests and security of individual states. They might make the case that UNESCO's pandemic response put more emphasis on global cooperation and humanitarian efforts than it did on national security issues. This should have been visible as a shortcoming in tending to the prompt necessities of states during an emergency as during worldwide emergency still the most disadvantageous gets the more help, and the worldwide organizations trust that created nations will forfeit their advantage, as in Europe, the progress to the distance learning was speedy at this point, Europe actually expected to bear the heaviness of the worldwide crise of Coronavirus. Pundits according to this viewpoint could contend that UNESCO didn't address the power elements among nations during the pandemic satisfactorily, and a states could have taken advantage of the circumstance to additional their own advantages, for example, strain to keep specific rules or suggestions. In any case, these given data in this paper shows as neoliberals see that a couple of issues, as overall pandemics, regular difficulties require total action and coordination among nations need worldwide foundations like UNESCO that can work with joint effort and the pooling of resources for truly resolve these normal issues. States can get close enough to shared data, aptitude, and assets by joining associations like UNESCO, which can bring about benefits for the two players. Neoliberals battle that worldwide establishments can go about as conversations for consideration and split the difference, diminishing strains and empowering calm relations among states. UNESCO's' drives that advance common appreciation of preparing issues for this present circumstance adds to battle neutralization. Neoliberals could use UNESCO's efforts before, during, and after the Coronavirus pandemic as evidence of effective global collaboration. During the pandemic, UNESCO's efforts to advance distance learning and educational advancement could be seen as an example of how global establishments can support part states in addressing normal problems (Wijesinghe,2022, p. 1116). It is important to remember that different perspectives and beliefs exist regarding the function and viability of global establishments. Neoliberal viewpoints on worldwide coordinated effort through affiliations like UNESCO are one point of convergence through which these undertakings can be researched. For an exhaustive and objective assessment, it is crucial for contemplate various points of view and investigate exploratory data and evaluations from various sources. Consequently, the accompanying inquiries can be tended to for the development of this paper: what outer variables, other than Coronavirus, advance global collaboration Might UNESCO at any point find true success by

changing their ventures and how Could UNESCO's' relationship be examined utilizing other IR focal points It's' vital to take note of that alternate points of view and philosophies exist in regards to the job and adequacy of worldwide organizations. Neoliberal perspectives on global collaboration through associations like UNESCO are one focal point through which these endeavors can be investigated. For a thorough and objective evaluation, it is essential to think about numerous perspectives and inspect experimental information and assessments from different sources.

Therefore, the following questions can be addressed for the follow-up of this paper: what external factors, other than COVID-19, promote international cooperation? Could UNESCO be more successful by changing their projects and how? Can UNESCO's relationship be analyzed using other IR lenses? Understudies can be engaged to address difficulties of the present (like data in limited and new etc), and more SDGs can be studied like environmental change, poverty etc.

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Baldwin, D. A. (2013). Power and international relations. *Handbook of international relations*, 2, 273-297.
- Clinton, C., & Sridhar, D. L. (2017). *Governing global health: Who runs the world and why?*. Oxford University Press.
- COVID-19 Vaccine To Vaccination: Why Leaders Must Invest In Delivery Strategies Now: Analysis describe lessons learned from past pandemics and vaccine campaigns about the path to successful vaccine delivery for COVID-19. *Health Affairs*, 40(1), 33-41.
- Dai, X., Snidal, D., & Sampson, M. (2010). International cooperation theory and international institutions. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of International Studies from*
<https://oxfordre.com/internationalstudies/display/10.1093/acrefore/9780190846626.01.0001/acrefore-9780190846626-e-93>
- Downs, G. W., Rocke, D. M., & Barsoom, P. N. (1996). Is the good news about compliance good news about cooperation?. *International organization*, 50(3), 379-406.
- Duran, D., & Menon, R. (2020). Mitigating the Impact of COVID-19 and Strengthening Health Systems in the Middle East and North Africa. *Education*, 16(1), 90-97.
- Elfert, M., & Morris, P. (2022). The long shadow between the vision and the reality: A review of the UNESCO report “Reimagining our futures together: A New social contract for education”. *Quaderni di pedagogia della scuola*, 1(2), 37-44.
- Emergency remote teaching and students’ academic performance in higher education during the COVID-19 pandemic: A case study. *Computers in human behavior*, 119, 106713.
- Garagiola, E. R., Lam, Q., Wachsmuth, L. S., Tan, T. Y., Ghali, S., Asafo, S., & Swarna, Gustafsson, M., & Deliwe, C. N. (2020). How is the COVID-19 pandemic affecting educational quality in South Africa. *Evidence to date and future risks. Department of Economics, University of Stellenbosch.*
Handbook of international relations, 2, 326-351.

- Iglesias-Pradas, S., Hernández-García, Á., Chaparro-Peláez, J., & Prieto, J. L. (2021). *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 30(1), 141-170.
- Koremenos, B., Lipson, C., & Snidal, D. (2001). The rational design of international institutions. *International organization*, 55(4), 761-799.
- M. (2022). Adolescent resilience during the COVID-19 pandemic: a review of the impact of the pandemic on developmental milestones. *Behavioral Sciences*, 12(7), 220.
- Martin, L. L., & Simmons, B. A. (2013). International organizations and institutions.
- Martín-Blanco, C., Zamorano, M., Lizárraga, C., & Molina-Moreno, V. (2022). The impact of COVID-19 on the sustainable development goals: achievements and expectations. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(23), 16266.
- Matthewman, S., & Huppertz, K. (2020). A sociology of COVID-19. *Journal of Sociology*, 56(4), 675-683.
- McCloskey, Stephen. (2019). The Sustainable Development Goals, Neoliberalism And NGOs: It's Time To Pursue A Transformative Path To Social Justice. *Policy & Practice: A Development Education Review*, (29).
- McGinnis, M. D. (1986). Issue linkage and the evolution of international cooperation.
- Milner, H. (1992). International theories of cooperation among nations: Strengths and weaknesses. *World politics*, 44(3), 466-496.
- Park, K. H., Liu, Q., & Li, H. (2023). UNESCO practices under the SDG4 and COVID-19 response framework: Topic modeling from 2003 to 2021. *International Journal of Innovative Research and Scientific Studies*, 6(2), 322-329
- Parra, C., Lewis, B., & Ali, S. H. (Eds.). (2020). *Mining, materials, and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs): 2030 and beyond*. CRC Press.
- Pereznieto, P., & Oehler, I. (2021). Social costs of the COVID-19 pandemic. *The Independent Panel for Pandemic Preparedness and Response*, 1-31.
- Peruzzo, F., & Allan, J. (2022). Rethinking inclusive (digital) education: lessons from the pandemic to reconceptualise inclusion through convivial technologies. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 1-15.

- Regmi, K. D. (2022). The COVID-19 pandemic, the Sustainable Development Goals on health and education and “least developed countries” such as Nepal. *International Review of Education*, 68(4), 511-538.
- Soleimani, A., Fahim Nia, F., Naghshineh, N., & Soleimani Nejad, A. (2023). Providing a framework for the reuse of research data based on the development dynamic framework of United Nations Development Program (UNDP). *Library Hi Tech*, 41(2), 642-665.
- Stein, A. A. (1990). *Why nations cooperate: Circumstance and choice in international relations*. Cornell University Press.
- Strielkowski, W. (2022). New trends in international education: Impact of COVID-19 and digitalization on higher education and student mobility. In *Education Policies in the 21st Century: Comparative Perspectives* (pp. 191-215). Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore.
- Toquero, C. M., Calago, R., & Pormento, S. (2021). Neoliberalism crisis and the pitfalls and glories in emergency remote education. *Asian Journal of Distance*
- UNESCO (2020a) COVID-19 Educational Disruption and Response.
<https://en.unesco.org/covid19/educationresponse>
- UNESCO, NATIONAL SDG 4 BENCHMARKS TO TRANSFORM EDUCATION, 2022.
- UNESCO, UNESCO’s Education Response To COVID-19, 2023.
- Wargadinata, W., Maimunah, I., Eva, D., & Rofiq, Z. (2020). Student’s responses on learning in the early COVID-19 pandemic. *Tadris: Journal of Education and Teacher Training*, 5(1), 141-153.
- Weintraub, R. L., Subramanian, L., Karlage, A., Ahmad, I., & Rosenberg, J. (2021).
- Wijesinghe, S. N. (2022). Neoliberalism, COVID-19 and hope for transformation in tourism: the case of Malaysia. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 25(7), 1106-1120.
- Elavarasan, R. M., Pugazhendhi, R., Shafiullah, G. M., Kumar, N. M., Arif, M. T., Jamal, T., ... & Dyduch, J. (2022). Impacts of COVID-19 on Sustainable Development Goals and effective approaches to maneuver them in the post-pandemic environment. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 29(23), 33957-33987.

UNESCO's education response to COVID-19. (2023). *UNESCO*.

<https://www.unesco.org/en/COVID-19/education-response/initiatives>

Education: From School Closure To Recovery. (2023). *UNESCO*.

<https://en.unesco.org/covid19/educationresponse/>

APPENDICES

APP.A LOSS OF EDUCATION% WORLD WIDE

Table 1 LOSS OF EDUCATION

| Region | Lifetime schooling lost, total | Lifetime schooling lost, boys | Lifetime schooling lost, girls | Delta between boys and girls |
|--|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Sub-Saharan Africa | 6.7% | 6.1% | 7.6% | 23.8% |
| South Asia | 7.7% | 6.9% | 8.9% | 29.3% |
| East Asia and Pacific | 4.1% | 4.1% | 4.2% | 2.2% |
| Latin America and the Caribbean | 10.1% | 10.1% | 10.1% | N/A |
| Middle East and North Africa | 6.2% | 6.2% | 6.3% | 1.6% |
| Eastern Europe and Central Asia (excl. Western Europe ¹) | 3.7% | 3.5% | 4% | 14.4% |
| North America | 0.2% | 0.2% | 0.2% | N/A |
| Western Europe | 2.8% | 2.8% | 2.8% | N/A |

(Garagiola, et al, 2022,p.220).

APP.B UNESCO'S EFFECT ON SDG4

Table 2 UNESCO'S EFFECT ON SDG4 (NATIONAL SDG 4 BENCHMARKS TO TRANSFORM EDUCATION,2022) %

| Various Programs, Initiatives, And Policies Implemented By UNESCO, Reports, Case Studies | Indicators | Pre-Pandemic % | Pandemic % | After Pandemic % |
|--|-------------------|----------------|------------|------------------|
| | Literacy Rates | 54 | 58 | 59 |
| | School Enrollment | 11 | 18 | 20 |
| | Completion Rates | 48 | 58 | 63 |

(UNESCO, 2023)

APP.C UNESCO GLOBAL DATASET ON THE DURATION OF SCHOOL CLOSURES

Table 3 UNESCO GLOBAL DATASET ON THE DURATION OF SCHOOL CLOSURES

| UNESCO global dataset on the duration of school closures | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--------------------------------------|---|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| Definitions : | Full school closures refer to situations where all schools were closed at the nation-wide level due to COVID-19. | | | | | | | | | |
| | Partial school closures refer to school closures in some regions or for some grades, or with reduced in-person instruction. | | | | | | | | | |
| Description: | The data displayed on the map is that in column C - Duration of FULL and PARTIAL school closures (in weeks). | | | | | | | | | |
| | It is derived from the UNESCO global monitoring map of school closures https://en.unesco.org/covid19/educationresponse | | | | | | | | | |
| | recognizing that patterns of school closures have changed since September 2020 and 2021, the last six columns break down the periods | | | | | | | | | |
| | March - August 2020, September 2020 - August 2021, and September 2021- November 2021 by type of closure. It becomes evident that governments have made | | | | | | | | | |
| | efforts to shift away from nation-wide closures as the pandemic progressed. Note possible discrepancies due to rounding. | | | | | | | | | |
| Country | ISO | Duration of FULL and PARTIAL school closures (in weeks) | Duration of FULL closures (in weeks) | Duration of PARTIAL closures (in weeks) | Duration of FULL closures from Mar-Aug 20 (in weeks) | Duration of FULL closures from Sep 20 - Aug 21 (in weeks) | Duration of FULL closures from Sep 21 - Oct 21 (in weeks) | Duration of PARTIAL closures from Mar-Aug 20 (in weeks) | Duration of PARTIAL closures from Sep 20 - Aug 21 (in weeks) | Duration of PARTIAL closures from Sep 21 - Oct 21 (in weeks) |
| Afghanistan | AFG | 57 | 35 | 22 | 23 | 9 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 10 |
| Albania | ALB | 29 | 11 | 18 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 13 | 0 |
| Algeria | DZA | 21 | 19 | 2 | 13 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Andorra | AND | 16 | 15 | 1 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Angola | AGO | 46 | 28 | 18 | 23 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 |
| Anguilla | AIA | 28 | 7 | 21 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 12 | 0 | 9 |
| Antigua and Barbuda | ATG | 65 | 28 | 37 | 16 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 28 | 9 |
| Argentina | ARG | 79 | 22 | 57 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 13 |
| Armenia | ARM | 12 | 9 | 3 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Aruba | ABW | 13 | 8 | 5 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Australia | AUS | 44 | 0 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 20 | 7 |
| Austria | AUT | 39 | 15 | 24 | 6 | 9 | 0 | 4 | 19 | 1 |
| Azerbaijan | AZE | 49 | 29 | 20 | 13 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 1 |
| Bahamas | BHS | 66 | 32 | 34 | 14 | 5 | 13 | 0 | 34 | 0 |
| Bahrain | BHR | 68 | 34 | 34 | 18 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 11 |
| Bangladesh | BGD | 73 | 63 | 10 | 18 | 44 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Barbados | BRB | 52 | 29 | 23 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 1 | 22 | 0 |
| Belarus | BLR | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Belgium | BEL | 27 | 9 | 18 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 10 | 0 |
| Belize | BLZ | 58 | 42 | 16 | 10 | 18 | 14 | 2 | 14 | 0 |
| Benin | BEN | 15 | 4 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 |
| Bermuda | BMU | 33 | 10 | 23 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 17 | 5 |
| Bhutan | BTN | 67 | 20 | 47 | 18 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 39 | 0 |
| Bolivia (Plurinational State of) | BOL | 82 | 43 | 39 | 22 | 20 | 1 | 0 | 26 | 13 |
| Bosnia and Herzegovina | BIH | 49 | 19 | 30 | 11 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 0 |
| Botswana | BWA | 25 | 11 | 14 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 1 |
| Brazil | BRA | 78 | 38 | 40 | 21 | 17 | 0 | 2 | 25 | 13 |
| British Virgin Islands | VGB | 51 | 9 | 42 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 34 | 0 |
| Brunei Darussalam | BRN | 32 | 24 | 8 | 9 | 3 | 12 | 8 | 0 | 0 |
| Bulgaria | BGR | 47 | 18 | 29 | 12 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 24 | 5 |
| Burkina Faso | BFA | 16 | 9 | 7 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 3 |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Burundi | BDI | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cabo Verde | CPV | 20 | 20 | 0 | 16 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cambodia | KH M | 64 | 40 | 24 | 15 | 23 | 2 | 1 | 11 | 12 |
| Cameroon | CM R | 18 | 8 | 10 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 0 |
| Canada | CAN | 51 | 13 | 38 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 1 |
| Cayman Islands | CY M | 17 | 14 | 3 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Central African republic | CAF | 23 | 13 | 10 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 0 |
| Chad | TCD | 28 | 23 | 5 | 17 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Chile | CHL | 77 | 14 | 63 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 42 | 12 |
| China | CHN | 27 | 9 | 18 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 8 | 0 |
| Colombia | COL | 77 | 23 | 54 | 21 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 12 |
| Comoros | CO M | 35 | 29 | 6 | 15 | 14 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 |
| Congo | COG | 39 | 10 | 29 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 23 | 0 |
| Cook Islands | COK | 4 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Costa Rica | CRI | 79 | 43 | 36 | 21 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 14 |
| Cote d'Ivoire | CIV | 13 | 7 | 6 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| Croatia | HRV | 10 | 8 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Cuba | CUB | 62 | 19 | 43 | 15 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 37 | 6 |
| Curaçao | CU W | 14 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 1 |
| Cyprus | CYP | 28 | 13 | 15 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 1 |
| Czechia | CZE | 46 | 20 | 26 | 9 | 11 | 0 | 7 | 18 | 1 |
| Democratic People's Republic of Korea | PRK | 39 | 31 | 8 | 7 | 24 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 0 |
| Democratic Republic of the Congo | COD | 33 | 24 | 9 | 17 | 7 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 0 |
| Denmark | DNK | 34 | 8 | 26 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 6 | 20 | 0 |
| Djibouti | DJI | 11 | 7 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Dominica | DM A | 28 | 28 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Dominican Republic | DO M | 55 | 33 | 22 | 13 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 6 |
| Ecuador | ECU | 79 | 40 | 39 | 16 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 13 |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|------|----|----|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|
| Egypt | EGY | 19 | 16 | 3 | 14 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| El Salvador | SLV | 80 | 46 | 34 | 24 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 13 |
| Equatorial Guinea | GNQ | 34 | 27 | 7 | 13 | 14 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 1 |
| Eritrea | ERI | 50 | 14 | 36 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 28 | 0 |
| Estonia | EST | 26 | 15 | 11 | 8 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 |
| Eswatini | SWZ | 57 | 34 | 23 | 16 | 18 | 0 | 8 | 15 | 0 |
| Ethiopia | ETH | 62 | 21 | 41 | 14 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 0 |
| Faroe Islands | FRO | 9 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Fiji | FJI | 40 | 35 | 5 | 12 | 14 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 4 |
| Finland | FIN | 33 | 8 | 25 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 0 |
| France | FRA | 12 | 7 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| Gabon | GAB | 21 | 16 | 5 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| Gambia | GM B | 28 | 20 | 8 | 14 | 6 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| Georgia | GEO | 35 | 19 | 16 | 16 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 16 | 0 |
| Germany | DEU | 38 | 14 | 24 | 5 | 9 | 0 | 10 | 13 | 1 |
| Ghana | GHA | 39 | 10 | 29 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 11 | 18 | 0 |
| Gibraltar | GIB | 20 | 20 | 0 | 12 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Greece | GRC | 37 | 18 | 19 | 7 | 11 | 0 | 6 | 13 | 0 |
| Greenland | GRL | 4 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Grenada | GRD | 69 | 20 | 49 | 12 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 37 | 4 |
| Guatemala | GT M | 79 | 33 | 46 | 24 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 13 |
| Guinea | GIN | 22 | 22 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Guinea-Bissau | GNB | 23 | 18 | 5 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Guyana | GUY | 68 | 27 | 41 | 18 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 12 |
| Haiti | HTI | 31 | 18 | 13 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 0 |
| Honduras | HN D | 81 | 58 | 23 | 25 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 13 |
| Hungary | HU N | 39 | 20 | 19 | 14 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 18 | 0 |
| Iceland | ISL | 6 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| India | IND | 82 | 25 | 57 | 18 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 41 | 13 |
| Indonesia | IDN | 77 | 20 | 57 | 19 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 42 | 14 |
| Iran (Islamic Republic of) | IRN | 62 | 22 | 40 | 16 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 9 |
| Iraq | IRQ | 62 | 51 | 11 | 23 | 28 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 0 |
| Ireland | IRL | 26 | 22 | 4 | 14 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| Israel | ISR | 33 | 16 | 17 | 5 | 11 | 0 | 2 | 14 | 1 |
| Italy | ITA | 38 | 13 | 25 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 22 | 1 |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-----|----|----|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|
| Jamaica | JAM | 61 | 26 | 35 | 14 | 3 | 9 | 0 | 31 | 4 |
| Japan | JPN | 11 | 3 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 |
| Jordan | JOR | 54 | 44 | 10 | 15 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| Kazakhstan | KAZ | 43 | 9 | 34 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 0 |
| Kenya | KEN | 37 | 28 | 9 | 21 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 |
| Kiribati | KIR | 3 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Kuwait | KWT | 70 | 62 | 8 | 17 | 40 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Kyrgyzstan | KGZ | 27 | 14 | 13 | 9 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 1 |
| Lao PDR | LAO | 46 | 15 | 31 | 9 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 16 | 13 |
| Latvia | LVA | 49 | 16 | 33 | 9 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 30 | 0 |
| Lebanon | LBN | 49 | 34 | 15 | 15 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| Lesotho | LSO | 43 | 11 | 32 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 15 | 17 | 0 |
| Liberia | LBR | 37 | 15 | 22 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 13 | 0 |
| Libya | LYB | 58 | 17 | 41 | 15 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 1 |
| Liechtenstein | LIE | 13 | 5 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 1 |
| Lithuania | LTU | 38 | 10 | 28 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 27 | 0 |
| Luxembourg | LUX | 15 | 9 | 6 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| Madagascar | MDG | 32 | 6 | 26 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 10 | 16 | 0 |
| Malawi | MWI | 26 | 18 | 8 | 14 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 0 |
| Malaysia | MYS | 61 | 42 | 19 | 14 | 23 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 8 |
| Maldives | MDV | 16 | 14 | 2 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Mali | MLI | 17 | 12 | 5 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 |
| Malta | MLT | 21 | 18 | 3 | 14 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| Marshall Islands | MHL | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Mauritius | MUS | 25 | 12 | 13 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 9 | 3 |
| Mexico | MEX | 71 | 53 | 18 | 17 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 13 |
| Micronesia (Federated States of) | FSM | 24 | 11 | 13 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 0 |
| Monaco | MCO | 13 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 1 |
| Mongolia | MNG | 56 | 24 | 32 | 18 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 13 |
| Montenegro | MNE | 51 | 19 | 32 | 12 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 19 | 13 |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|-----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Montserrat | MSR | 38 | 35 | 3 | 12 | 23 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Morocco | MAR | 34 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 0 |
| Mozambique | MUZ | 53 | 31 | 22 | 21 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 0 |
| Myanmar | MMR | 69 | 59 | 10 | 14 | 37 | 8 | 5 | 4 | 1 |
| Namibia | NAM | 25 | 14 | 11 | 11 | 3 | 0 | 9 | 2 | 0 |
| Nauru | NRU | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Nepal | NPL | 82 | 35 | 47 | 23 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 37 | 10 |
| Netherlands | NLD | 31 | 12 | 19 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 16 | 0 |
| New Zealand | NZL | 24 | 8 | 16 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 10 |
| Nicaragua | NIC | 15 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 |
| Niger | NER | 16 | 16 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Nigeria | NGA | 24 | 18 | 6 | 15 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| Niue | NIU | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| North Macedonia | MKD | 54 | 20 | 34 | 16 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 0 |
| Norway | NOR | 29 | 5 | 24 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 22 | 0 |
| Oman | OMN | 54 | 8 | 46 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 12 |
| Pakistan | PAK | 61 | 37 | 24 | 16 | 19 | 2 | 2 | 18 | 4 |
| Palau | PLW | 8 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Palestine | PSE | 60 | 17 | 43 | 16 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 38 | 0 |
| Panama | PAN | 81 | 55 | 26 | 25 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 13 |
| Papua New Guinea | PNG | 6 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Paraguay | PRY | 74 | 32 | 42 | 23 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 13 |
| Peru | PER | 75 | 34 | 41 | 15 | 19 | 0 | 7 | 21 | 13 |
| Philippines | PHL | 61 | 60 | 1 | 8 | 41 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Poland | POL | 43 | 24 | 19 | 9 | 15 | 0 | 5 | 13 | 1 |
| Portugal | PRT | 24 | 12 | 12 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 0 |
| Qatar | QAT | 56 | 21 | 35 | 14 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 4 |
| Republic of Korea | KOR | 76 | 11 | 65 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 40 | 13 |
| Republic of Moldova | MDA | 16 | 16 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-----|----|----|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|
| Romania | ROU | 36 | 22 | 14 | 13 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 4 |
| Russian Federation | RUS | 13 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 |
| Rwanda | RWA | 51 | 32 | 19 | 22 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 |
| Saint Kitts and Nevis | KNA | 30 | 17 | 13 | 11 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Saint Lucia | LCA | 65 | 39 | 26 | 11 | 21 | 7 | 4 | 19 | 3 |
| Saint Vincent and the Grenadines | VCT | 52 | 26 | 26 | 6 | 16 | 4 | 10 | 12 | 4 |
| Samoa | WSM | 4 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| San Marino | SMR | 36 | 15 | 21 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 |
| São Tomé and Príncipe | STP | 21 | 13 | 8 | 9 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| Saudi Arabia | SAU | 63 | 50 | 13 | 13 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Senegal | SEN | 22 | 12 | 10 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 1 |
| Serbia | SRB | 42 | 28 | 14 | 15 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 5 |
| Seychelles | SYC | 46 | 13 | 33 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 9 | 13 | 11 |
| Sierra Leone | SLE | 14 | 11 | 3 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Singapore | SGP | 16 | 4 | 12 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 2 |
| Sint Marteen | SXM | 28 | 18 | 10 | 11 | 7 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 0 |
| Slovakia | SVK | 38 | 10 | 28 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 0 |
| Slovenia | SVN | 47 | 21 | 26 | 8 | 13 | 0 | 5 | 21 | 0 |
| Solomon Islands | SLB | 7 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Somalia | SOM | 19 | 19 | 0 | 15 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| South Africa | ZAF | 60 | 15 | 45 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 25 | 12 |
| South Sudan | SSD | 54 | 33 | 21 | 24 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 |
| Spain | ESP | 15 | 10 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| Sri Lanka | LKA | 71 | 49 | 22 | 21 | 20 | 8 | 0 | 17 | 5 |
| Sudan | SDN | 23 | 16 | 7 | 7 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| Suriname | SUR | 57 | 36 | 21 | 20 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 13 |
| Svalbard | SJM | 29 | 5 | 24 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 22 | 0 |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Sweden | SWE | 24 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 14 | 0 |
| Switzerland | CHE | 6 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Syrian Arab Republic | SYR | 29 | 11 | 18 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 |
| Tajikistan | TJK | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Thailand | THA | 52 | 16 | 36 | 13 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 11 |
| Timor-Leste | TLS | 40 | 11 | 29 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 21 | 3 |
| Togo | TGO | 14 | 11 | 3 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Tokelau | TKL | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Tonga | TON | 3 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Trinidad and Tobago | TTO | 66 | 26 | 40 | 13 | 5 | 8 | 0 | 35 | 5 |
| Tunisia | TUN | 32 | 17 | 15 | 13 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| Türkiye | TUR | 49 | 28 | 21 | 13 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 |
| Turkmenistan | TKM | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Turks and Caicos Island | TCA | 40 | 29 | 11 | 14 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 |
| Tuvalu | TUV | 12 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 |
| Uganda | UGA | 83 | 60 | 23 | 24 | 26 | 10 | 0 | 23 | 0 |
| Ukraine | UKR | 36 | 18 | 18 | 16 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 9 |
| United Arab Emirates | ARE | 62 | 15 | 47 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 5 |
| United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland | GBR | 27 | 16 | 11 | 9 | 7 | 0 | 9 | 2 | 0 |
| United Republic of Tanzania | TZA | 15 | 11 | 4 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| United States of America | USA | 71 | 0 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 39 | 13 |
| Uruguay | URY | 40 | 10 | 30 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 10 | 20 | 0 |
| Uzbekistan | UZB | 12 | 11 | 1 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Vanuatu | VUT | 4 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|---------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|----|
| Venezuela | VEN | 71 | 61 | 10 | 14 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Viet Nam | VN M | 31 | 7 | 24 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 6 | 11 |
| Yemen | YEM | 19 | 14 | 5 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 |
| Zambia | ZM B | 28 | 15 | 13 | 6 | 9 | 0 | 9 | 3 | 1 |
| Zimbabwe | ZWE | 44 | 34 | 10 | 15 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 1 |
| Mauritania | MR T | 23 | 23 | 0 | 18 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

(UNESCO, Education: From School Closure To Recovery, 2023).

APP.D UNESCO'S LIVE DATA TO MONITOR TEACHERS AND CONTINUITY OF EDUCATION

Table 4 UNESCO VACCINATION MAP

| Region | Country | Teacher prioritization in vaccination plans | % of teachers partially vaccinated (with at least one dose except for J&J/Janssen COVID-19 vaccine) | % of teachers fully vaccinated | Vaccination data reference date |
|----------------------------------|---------------------|---|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Central and Southern Asia | Afghanistan | Not specified | | | |
| Europe and Northern America | Albania | Group 3 or lower | | | |
| Northern Africa and Western Asia | Algeria | Not prioritised | | 9% | 16-Sep-21 |
| Europe and Northern America | Andorra | Not prioritised | | | |
| Sub-Saharan Africa | Angola | Group 3 or lower | | | |
| Latin America and the Caribbean | Anguilla | Not prioritised | | | |
| Latin America and the Caribbean | Antigua and Barbuda | Group 2 | | | |
| Latin America and the Caribbean | Argentina | Group 3 or lower | 70% | 48% | 1-Sep-21 |
| Northern Africa and Western Asia | Armenia | Group 2 | | | |

| | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------|------|-----|-----------|
| Latin America and the Caribbean | Aruba | Not specified | | | |
| Oceania | Australia | Not prioritised | | | |
| Europe and Northern America | Austria | Not specified | | 82% | 9-Sep-21 |
| Northern Africa and Western Asia | Azerbaijan | Group 2 | 82% | 63% | 16-Sep-21 |
| Latin America and the Caribbean | Bahamas | Not specified | | | |
| Northern Africa and Western Asia | Bahrain | Not specified | | | |
| Central and Southern Asia | Bangladesh | Not specified | | | |
| Latin America and the Caribbean | Barbados | Not specified | 90%* | | 22-Apr-21 |
| Europe and Northern America | Belarus | Group 1 | | 50% | Oct. 21 |
| Europe and Northern America | Belgium | Not prioritised | | | |
| Latin America and the Caribbean | Belize | Group 2 | 85% | 60% | 30-dec-21 |
| Sub-Saharan Africa | Benin | Not prioritised | | | |
| Europe and Northern America | Bermuda | Group 1 | | | |
| Central and Southern Asia | Bhutan | Not prioritised | | | |
| Latin America and the Caribbean | Bolivia (Plurinational State of) | Not prioritised | 93% | 80% | 30-dec-21 |
| Europe and Northern America | Bosnia and Herzegovina | Not specified | | 47% | 10-Sep-21 |
| Sub-Saharan Africa | Botswana | Not prioritised | | | |
| Latin America and the Caribbean | Brazil | Group 3 or lower | | | |
| Latin America and the Caribbean | British Virgin Islands | Not prioritised | | | |
| Eastern and South-Eastern Asia | Brunei Darussalam | Group 2 | | | |
| Europe and Northern America | Bulgaria | Not specified | | 30% | 17-Sep-21 |
| Sub-Saharan Africa | Burkina Faso | Not prioritised | | | |
| Sub-Saharan Africa | Burundi | Not prioritised | | | |
| Sub-Saharan Africa | Cabo Verde | Group 1 | 64% | | 5-Sep-21 |

| | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------|-----|-----|-----------|
| Eastern and South-Eastern Asia | Cambodia | Group 1 | | 95% | 17-Sep-21 |
| Sub-Saharan Africa | Cameroon | Not specified | | | |
| Europe and Northern America | Canada | Group 2 | | | |
| Latin America and the Caribbean | Cayman Islands | Group 2 | | | |
| Sub-Saharan Africa | Central African republic | Not prioritised | | | |
| Sub-Saharan Africa | Chad | Not prioritised | | | |
| Latin America and the Caribbean | Chile | Group 1 | | 98% | 30-dec-21 |
| Eastern and South-Eastern Asia | China | Not prioritised | | | |
| Latin America and the Caribbean | Colombia | Group 1 | | 90% | 5-Oct-21 |
| Sub-Saharan Africa | Comoros | Not prioritised | | | |
| Sub-Saharan Africa | Congo | Group 2 | | | |
| Oceania | Cook Islands | Not prioritised | | | |
| Latin America and the Caribbean | Costa Rica | Group 3 or lower | 97% | | 1-Sep-21 |
| Sub-Saharan Africa | Cote d'Ivoire | Group 1 | | | |
| Europe and Northern America | Croatia | Not specified | | 58% | 1-Sep-21 |
| Latin America and the Caribbean | Cuba | Not specified | | | |
| Latin America and the Caribbean | Curaçao | Not prioritised | | | |
| Northern Africa and Western Asia | Cyprus | Not prioritised | 82% | 79% | 17-Sep-21 |
| Europe and Northern America | Czechia | Not specified | | | |
| Eastern and South-Eastern Asia | Democratic People's Republic of Korea | No data | | | |
| Sub-Saharan Africa | Democratic Republic of the Congo | Not prioritised | | | |
| Europe and Northern America | Denmark | Not prioritised | | | |
| Sub-Saharan Africa | Djibouti | Not specified | | | |

| | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|------------------|------|------|-----------|
| Latin America and the Caribbean | Dominica | Not specified | | | |
| Latin America and the Caribbean | Dominican Republic | Not specified | | 100% | 30-dec-21 |
| Latin America and the Caribbean | Ecuador | Group 3 or lower | 90% | 80% | 1-Sep-21 |
| Northern Africa and Western Asia | Egypt | Not specified | | | |
| Latin America and the Caribbean | El Salvador | Not specified | | | |
| Sub-Saharan Africa | Equatorial Guinea | Not specified | | | |
| Sub-Saharan Africa | Eritrea | Not prioritised | | | |
| Europe and Northern America | Estonia | Not specified | | | |
| Sub-Saharan Africa | Eswatini | Group 2 | | 50% | 16-Sep-21 |
| Sub-Saharan Africa | Ethiopia | Group 2 | | | |
| Europe and Northern America | Faroe Islands | Not prioritised | | | |
| Oceania | Fiji | Not prioritised | | | |
| Europe and Northern America | Finland | Not prioritised | | | |
| Europe and Northern America | France | Group 3 or lower | | 90% | 30-dec-21 |
| Sub-Saharan Africa | Gabon | Not specified | | | |
| Sub-Saharan Africa | Gambia | Group 3 or lower | | | |
| Northern Africa and Western Asia | Georgia | Group 2 | | 72% | 30-dec-21 |
| Europe and Northern America | Germany | Group 2 | | | |
| Sub-Saharan Africa | Ghana | Not prioritised | 80% | | 21-apr-21 |
| Europe and Northern America | Gibraltar | Not prioritised | | | |
| Europe and Northern America | Greece | Not specified | | | |
| Europe and Northern America | Greenland | Not specified | | | |
| Latin America and the Caribbean | Grenada | Not specified | | | |
| Latin America and the Caribbean | Guatemala | Group 3 or lower | 100% | | 5-Oct-21 |
| Sub-Saharan Africa | Guinea | Not specified | | | |

| | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------|-----|------|-----------|
| Sub-Saharan Africa | Guinea-Bissau | Not prioritised | | | |
| Latin America and the Caribbean | Guyana | Not specified | | 50%* | 2-Sep-21 |
| Latin America and the Caribbean | Haiti | Not prioritised | | | |
| Latin America and the Caribbean | Honduras | Group 2 | | 80% | 30-dec-21 |
| Europe and Northern America | Hungary | Not specified | 80% | | Nov.21 |
| Europe and Northern America | Iceland | Not specified | | | |
| Central and Southern Asia | India | Not prioritised | 92% | | Nov.21 |
| Eastern and South-Eastern Asia | Indonesia | Group 2 | 81% | 72% | 30-dec-21 |
| Central and Southern Asia | Iran (Islamic Republic of) | Not specified | 92% | 80% | 30-dec-21 |
| Northern Africa and Western Asia | Iraq | Not specified | | | |
| Europe and Northern America | Ireland | Not prioritised | | | |
| Northern Africa and Western Asia | Israel | Not specified | | | |
| Europe and Northern America | Italy | Group 3 or lower | 92% | 86% | 4-Sep-21 |
| Latin America and the Caribbean | Jamaica | Group 2 | | 60% | 30-dec-21 |
| Eastern and South-Eastern Asia | Japan | Not prioritised | | 62% | 30-Aug-21 |
| Northern Africa and Western Asia | Jordan | Not specified | | | |
| Central and Southern Asia | Kazakhstan | Group 1 | | 93% | Aug.21 |
| Sub-Saharan Africa | Kenya | Group 1 | 33% | | 2-Jun-21 |
| Oceania | Kiribati | No data | | | |
| Northern Africa and Western Asia | Kuwait | Not specified | 96% | 90% | 18-Nov-21 |
| Central and Southern Asia | Kyrgyzstan | Group 1 | | 52% | Aug.21 |
| Eastern and South-Eastern Asia | Lao PDR | Group 3 or lower | 96% | 92% | 13-dec-21 |
| Europe and Northern | Latvia | Not specified | | | |

| | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------|--|------|-----------|
| America | | | | | |
| Northern Africa and Western Asia | Lebanon | Group 2 | | | |
| Sub-Saharan Africa | Lesotho | Group 2 | | | |
| Sub-Saharan Africa | Liberia | Not prioritised | | | |
| Northern Africa and Western Asia | Libya | Not prioritised | | | |
| Europe and Northern America | Liechtenstein | Not data | | | |
| Europe and Northern America | Lithuania | Not specified | | | |
| Europe and Northern America | Luxembourg | Group 3 or lower | | | |
| Sub-Saharan Africa | Madagascar | Not prioritised | | | |
| Sub-Saharan Africa | Malawi | Group 2 | | | |
| Eastern and South-Eastern Asia | Malaysia | Group 2 | | 99% | 7-dec-21 |
| Central and Southern Asia | Maldives | Group 3 or lower | | | |
| Sub-Saharan Africa | Mali | Not prioritised | | | |
| Europe and Northern America | Malta | Group 2 | | | |
| Oceania | Marshall Islands | Not prioritised | | | |
| Sub-Saharan Africa | Mauritania | Not specified | | 80% | 16-Sep-21 |
| Sub-Saharan Africa | Mauritius | Not specified | | | |
| Latin America and the Caribbean | Mexico | Group 3 or lower | | 100% | 1-Sep-21 |
| Oceania | Micronesia (Federated States of) | No data | | | |
| Europe and Northern America | Monaco | Not specified | | | |
| Eastern and South-Eastern Asia | Mongolia | Not specified | | 97% | 6-jan-22 |
| Europe and Northern America | Montenegro | Not specified | | | |
| Latin America and the Caribbean | Montserrat | Not prioritised | | | |
| Northern Africa and Western Asia | Morocco | Group 1 | | 99% | 16-Sep-21 |
| Sub-Saharan Africa | Mozambique | Group 2 | | | |
| Eastern and South- | Myanmar | Not prioritised | | | |

| | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|--|------|-----------|
| Eastern Asia | | | | | |
| Sub-Saharan Africa | Namibia | Group 2 | | | |
| Oceania | Nauru | Not prioritised | | | |
| Central and Southern Asia | Nepal | Not prioritised | | | |
| Europe and Northern America | Netherlands | Not prioritised | | 90%* | 9-Sep-21 |
| Oceania | New Zealand | Not prioritised | | 100% | Dec-21 |
| Latin America and the Caribbean | Nicaragua | Not specified | | | |
| Sub-Saharan Africa | Niger | Not prioritised | | | |
| Sub-Saharan Africa | Nigeria | Not prioritised | | | |
| Oceania | Niue | No data | | | |
| Europe and Northern America | North Macedonia | Not specified | | 75% | 30-dec-21 |
| Europe and Northern America | Norway | Not prioritised | | | |
| Northern Africa and Western Asia | Oman | Not specified | | 87% | 22-Sep-21 |
| Central and Southern Asia | Pakistan | Group 3 or lower | | | |
| Oceania | Palau | No data | | | |
| Northern Africa and Western Asia | Palestine | Not specified | | 99% | 16-Sep-21 |
| Latin America and the Caribbean | Panama | Not specified | | 86% | 5-Oct-21 |
| Oceania | Papua New Guinea | Not prioritised | | | |
| Latin America and the Caribbean | Paraguay | Group 2 | | | |
| Latin America and the Caribbean | Peru | Group 3 or lower | | 86% | Dec.21 |
| Eastern and South-Eastern Asia | Philippines | Not specified | | 40% | 3-Aug-21 |
| Europe and Northern America | Poland | Not specified | | | |
| Europe and Northern America | Portugal | Not specified | | 100% | Oct.21 |
| Northern Africa and Western Asia | Qatar | Group 1 | | 95% | 20-Sep-21 |
| Eastern and South-Eastern Asia | Republic of Korea | Group 2 | | | |

| | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------|-----|-----|-----------|
| Europe and Northern America | Republic of Moldova | Group 3 or lower | | | |
| Europe and Northern America | Romania | Not specified | | | |
| Europe and Northern America | Russian Federation | Group 1 | | 70% | Dec-21 |
| Sub-Saharan Africa | Rwanda | Group 1 | | | |
| Latin America and the Caribbean | Saint Kitts and Nevis | Not specified | | | |
| Latin America and the Caribbean | Saint Lucia | Not specified | | | |
| Latin America and the Caribbean | Saint Vincent and the Grenadines | Not specified | | | |
| Oceania | Samoa | Group 2 | | | |
| Europe and Northern America | San Marino | Not specified | | | |
| Sub-Saharan Africa | São Tomé and Príncipe | Not prioritised | | | |
| Northern Africa and Western Asia | Saudi Arabia | Group 3 or lower | | 96% | 30-dec-21 |
| Sub-Saharan Africa | Senegal | Not prioritised | | | |
| Europe and Northern America | Serbia | Not specified | | 56% | 30-dec-21 |
| Sub-Saharan Africa | Seychelles | Not prioritised | | | |
| Sub-Saharan Africa | Sierra Leone | Group 2 | | | |
| Eastern and South-Eastern Asia | Singapore | Group 2 | | | |
| Latin America and the Caribbean | Sint Marteen | Not prioritised | | | |
| Europe and Northern America | Slovakia | Not specified | | | |
| Europe and Northern America | Slovenia | Not specified | | | |
| Oceania | Solomon Islands | Not specified | | | |
| Sub-Saharan Africa | Somalia | Not specified | 37% | | 11-May-21 |
| Sub-Saharan Africa | South Africa | Group 2 | | 89% | 30-Sep-21 |
| Sub-Saharan Africa | South Sudan | Not prioritised | | | |
| Europe and Northern America | Spain | Group 2 | | | |
| Central and Southern Asia | Sri Lanka | Not specified | | | |

| | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--|------------------|-----|-----|-----------|
| Northern Africa and Western Asia | Sudan | Group 2 | | | |
| Latin America and the Caribbean | Suriname | Not prioritised | | | |
| Europe and Northern America | Svalbard | No data | | | |
| Europe and Northern America | Sweden | Not prioritised | | 97% | Dec-21 |
| Europe and Northern America | Switzerland | Not prioritised | | | |
| Northern Africa and Western Asia | Syrian Arab Republic | Group 2 | | | |
| Central and Southern Asia | Tajikistan | Group 1 | | | |
| Eastern and South-Eastern Asia | Thailand | Not prioritised | | 88% | 22-Sep-21 |
| Eastern and South-Eastern Asia | Timor-Leste | Group 2 | | 81% | 24-aug-21 |
| Sub-Saharan Africa | Togo | Not specified | | | |
| Oceania | Tokelau | No data | | | |
| Oceania | Tonga | No data | | | |
| Latin America and the Caribbean | Trinidad and Tobago | Group 2 | | | |
| Northern Africa and Western Asia | Tunisia | Not specified | | | |
| Northern Africa and Western Asia | Turkey | Group 2 | | | |
| Central and Southern Asia | Turkmenistan | Group 1 | | | |
| Latin America and the Caribbean | Turks and Caicos Island | Not specified | | | |
| Oceania | Tuvalu | No data | | | |
| Sub-Saharan Africa | Uganda | Group 1 | 73% | 32% | 17-dec-21 |
| Europe and Northern America | Ukraine | Group 3 or lower | 96% | 91% | 11-jan-22 |
| Northern Africa and Western Asia | United Arab Emirates | Group 1 | | 98% | 30-dec-21 |
| Europe and Northern America | United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland | Not prioritised | 93% | 70% | 21-Jun-21 |
| Sub-Saharan Africa | United | Not prioritised | | | |

| | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|--|-----|-----------|
| | Republic of Tanzania | | | | |
| Europe and Northern America | United States of America | Group 2 | | | |
| Latin America and the Caribbean | Uruguay | Group 2 | | 71% | 1-Aug-21 |
| Central and Southern Asia | Uzbekistan | Group 1 | | 60% | Oct. 21 |
| Oceania | Vanuatu | Not prioritised | | | |
| Latin America and the Caribbean | Venezuela | Not prioritised | | 12% | 27-Aug-21 |
| Eastern and South-Eastern Asia | Viet Nam | Group 3 or lower | | | |
| Northern Africa and Western Asia | Yemen | Not prioritised | | | |
| Sub-Saharan Africa | Zambia | Not specified | | | |
| Sub-Saharan Africa | Zimbabwe | Group 2 | | | |

* Unclear if the figure represents fully or partially vaccinated teachers
(UNESCO, Education: From School Closure To Recovery, 2023).