International Public Policy Forum
Qualifying Round Essay

Hope Haven Christian Secondary School
1234 IPPF Drive
Kigali City, Gasabo District Zip 0000
Republic of Rwanda
0782747257

***Note: Evaluations and awards will be sent to the address provided. Please provide a separate mailing address, if needed.*

On the topic:
Resolved: The Group of 20 Nations should levy a global education tax equal to 1% of each member country's gross domestic product to establish a dedicated international organization that supports the provision of universal, free, quality primary and secondary education.

Composed by:
Baraka Benito Martinez, barakamartinez411@gmail.com
Cyuzuzo Ntegano Sabrina, nteganocyuzuzo@gmail.com
Gwiza Franco, gwizafranco@gmail.com

In our honor, we pledge that we have received no unauthorized assistance on this work.

Word Count:2996 (not including the Cover Pages or Works Cited pages)

Submitted by:
Coach's Name: Umwari Abie Benie
Phone Number: +250 780269676
E-mail Address: umwariabi1010@gmail.com

Primary Student Contact Name: Gwiza Franco
Student Phone Number: 0798434591
Student E-mail Address: gwizafranco@gmail.com

A Global Tax Solution for Achieving Universal Quality Education

Introduction

UNESCO warns of a "learning crisis": where millions of children attend school but leave illiterate. In 2023, the organization reported that 251 million children remain out of school, and more than 600 million fail to reach minimum learning standards even after years in class. This is not a tragedy of fate but a failure of priorities due to a global $97 billion funding shortfall (UNESCO, Education Financing).

Although UNESCO recommends that nations invest 4–6% of their GDP and 15–20% of their public budgets in education, most fall short. Only 34 out of 171 countries meet both targets, while a staggering 59 of them fail to meet either. As average global education spending declines, the world fails to deliver its promise of universal, quality education.

The World Bank estimates that developing nations lose up to $129 billion annually in potential earnings due to poor learning outcomes (State of Learning Poverty 2023). Illiteracy and innumeracy impede innovation, limit productivity, and heighten vulnerability to unemployment.

The global education crisis is not a local issue—it's a global risk. If we fail to solve it, we all pay the price in instability, lost opportunity, and global inequality. Whether it's pandemics, climate change, or artificial intelligence, the future will require educated populations everywhere to participate in finding solutions. If we don't invest globally, we're wasting human potential and denying children their basic dignity and humanity. Investing globally reduces instability, mitigates migration pressure, expands new markets for G20 nations, and strengthens cooperation on global public goods like climate action.

Having witnessed this catastrophic threat that spares no corner of the globe, the world rose in alarm and tried to act but the global responses have been patchy and underfinanced. Even with the work of UNESCO, UNICEF, and the GPE, education financing at the global level falls short by over $97 billion a year (UNESCO, Education Financing). Aid fragmentation makes matters worse, and domestic financing in low-income nations is too limited to fund essential resources. Consequently, millions of children are denied the skills they need to gain a foothold in modern economies, ensnaring them in poverty traps and dependency cycles. The world's promise to children is currently failing by a gap, yet the G20, with its collective $96.7 trillion GDP (OECD, G20 GDP Growth 2025), possesses the means to meet this gap ten-fold.

Education is the strongest instrument that mankind possesses to achieve equality, development, and opportunity, yet the promise of education is an illusion for millions of children. Even with the world's promise to achieve SDG4; quality, inclusive, and equitable education for everyone by 2030—it is far away from reaching it. Hence, this essay affirms that the G20 should levy a global education tax equal to 1% of each member country's GDP to establish a dedicated international organization that supports the provision of universal, free, quality primary and secondary education as only through this unified financial commitment and the creation of a dedicated international organization can the world ensure that all children, gain access to free, quality education.

Section I: Defining Terms and Burdens.

In order to assess the solution — that G20 countries will dedicate 1% of their GDP to developing and maintaining an international agency that will provide free primary and secondary education throughout the world — we will need clear definitions and burdens of interpretation.

As defined by UNESCO, "education" is a process that induces acquisition and learning of knowledge, skills, values, and habits under schemes that are both non-formal and informal as well as formal ones. The proposal's focus is almost solely in relation to formal basic education

— that is, systematic, officially sanctioned elementary and secondary schooling that provide students with basic literacy, numerical, and life skills. By this definition, tertiary or post-school education is ruled out, with focus instead on universal provision of the basic levels of learning that form a basic human right.

An "international organization" is defined as a permanent institutional agency that is formed by a group of independent states, internationally accepted as a matter of law, and conceived with a common purpose across borders (United Nations Charter, 1945). By this definition, the planned education organization, the Global Education and Equity Fund (GEEF), would operate similarly to ones already in existence like UNESCO, the World Bank, or the Global Fund — streamlined and re-engineered with a distinctive mandate to finance, coordinate, and provide education activities across the globe.

"1% of GDP" is a treaty-based (mandatory) inter-country contribution at the level of G20 member states, and any willing state that is computed every year according to their existing economic activity. Sovereignty is preserved because membership in the G20 is voluntary — but once you're in, you share global obligations. Sovereignty is preserved because membership in the G20 is voluntarily backed by treaty signing — but once you're in, you share global obligations

Ultimately, the affirmative side is to show that forming this organization and making a 1% G20 contribution are morally permissible, are financially viable, and provide a significantly higher level of increased global accessibility to quality education than the status quo. The negative, on the other hand, has the burden of showing that either such a plan is adverse to either national or world interests, will not have its desired effects, or is detrimental to a better existing or alternate mechanism.

The solution keeps the debate in the realm of comparative analysis — not is education worthwhile (which is not questioned) but is this particular mode of international cooperation by fiscal engagement and institutional building the fairest and best way forward?

By defining these terms and burdens, we anchor the discussion in intellectual clarity, ensuring the solution is assessed as a systematic, quantifiable, and communal investment.

Section II: Mandatory Global Education Tax Provides Reliable, Equitable Funding

The persistence of the world education crisis stems from systemic financial disparities: high-income countries spend an average of $8,000 per student annually, while poor countries spend a mere $48 (UNESCO GEM Report 2023). This 160-fold discrepancy ensures 617 million children fail to acquire simple literacy and numeracy skills.

Aid fragmentation exacerbates the problem. Education receives less than 10% of global development assistance, and the unpredictable nature of this funding—such as the 7% drop in ODA between 2019 and 2022—discourages long-term reform. Instead of sustainable systems, recipient countries are left reliant on fragile, short-term project-based financing. This deficit violates international obligations under Article 26 of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights, transforming the funding crisis into a core issue of global equity. Conversely, the World Bank notes that each extra year of schooling raises individual earnings by 10%, with nations reaching universal secondary education cutting poverty rates by more than half (Education Overview).

An education tax at the international level is the game-shifting financing tool required. The G20 nations, which control a majority of global economic output, can close the education gap with a 1% GDP contribution. With a combined GDP of nearly $97 trillion, this mechanism would account for $967 billion annually (OECD, G20 GDP Growth 2025). This figure does not just meet the $97 billion annual shortfall—it exceeds it tenfold, providing a sustainable reserve to fully fund global infrastructure, teacher training, and resources.

This is a proposal to rethink education financing as a long-term international investment rather than periodic charity. Funds will flow through the GEEF, which distributes funds based on reported results. Recipient countries will become eligible based on demonstrating domestic effort in the form of co-financing, anti-corruption efforts, policy reform and the accountable results for the past investments. This will make international funds catalysts rather than substitutes for national effort and help in reducing the aid fragmentation which will eventually lead to better results and efficiency.

The economic argument for such investment is compelling. Education is a very high-return investment, according to the World Bank: up to a 10% return in economic benefit is generated by a single-dollar expenditure on quality education in the form of productivity, innovation, and consumer spend (Education Overview).

A 1% GDP tax is deemed too high by commentators, yet this line of reasoning neglects both ability and benefit. Most G20 countries spend significantly larger percentages of GDP on defense or fossil fuels subsidies. A small fraction of such spending on education would achieve significantly higher stability and prosperity globally. Furthermore, the levy is scalable—payments self-adjust with GDP performance to remain flexible in times of economic decline. In this manner, the GEEF provides predictability without getting rigid, sustainability without coercion.

Section III: Governance, Accountability, and Feasibility for Operations

The GEEF must be backed by a global treaty where G20 nations—and any willing country—commit stable, mandatory funding to end the education crisis. This is the only way to move from short-term charity to a long-term, fair, and reliable system that truly supports every child's right to learn. Funds will flow through the Global Education and Equity Fund (GEEF), the new education dedicated international body, which distributes funds based on reported results (performance-based funding).

A critical element of the new organization's design is the foundational commitment to strategic coherence and the elimination of institutional redundancy. This will be realized by formalizing a mandate of deep collaboration with existing global education bodies, such as UNESCO and the World Bank. Collaboration extends beyond mere data-sharing; it is a mechanism for immediately capitalizing on existing institutional memory, validated research, and proven technical capacity. By actively seeking to integrate the seasoned technical workers and professional staff from these partner organizations, the new body ensures that it is not forced to "start from scratch". Instead, it begins its operations with a fully-formed foundation of expertise, thereby fast-tracking implementation and securing the highest degree of policy alignment with the broader global development agenda.

A Board of Directors with representatives from beneficiary and donor countries, civil society groups, and education specialists would govern the GEEF. Decisions would be consensual with agreed priorities guiding both implementation and financing. Annual independent audits and blockchain-followed financial flows would promote transparency with spend monitored by the public in real-time.

Administrative efficiency is the focus of design. Operating costs for the GEEF would be capped at 7%—a benchmark adopted by the Global Fund and Gavi, the most successful international financing organizations in the world. Provincial offices would provide localized responses with streamlined organizational hierarchies.

To ensure accountability, disbursements against funds will be linked to performance measured against quantifiable outcomes like a rise in levels of literacy, school completion rates, and quality training for teachers and global comments on the websites. Failure to deliver will have funds retained provisionally, upholding fiscal prudence and regulatory requirements

It is true that there will be concerns about inefficiency, bureaucracy, and corruption due to previous disappointments with international aid. The GEEF, nonetheless, would not be a copy of such weaknesses but an improvement with a results-based approach to governance. Its executing organ—the International Education Foundation (IEF)—will work with already existing organizations like UNESCO, UNICEF, and the World Bank to avoid duplication.

Section IV: Political Will and Strategic Cooperation

There has to be political willingness on the side of donor countries contributing funds and on the side of recipient countries making reforms.

Resistance among donor countries is usually due to concerns about sovereignty and opportunity cost. Instead of financing foreign causes with national funds, many are skeptical that this can be at odds with internal interests. But education investment abroad is a direct expression of donor interests. Educated citizens in developing nations bring new markets, reduce instability, and cap migration pressure—all positive outcomes for the economy of donor countries. By building shared prosperity, G20 ensures their own long-term security and economic stability. Fiscal sovereignty is not breached as entry into the G20 would be voluntary, on the basis of international consensus not coercion. Also, contributions would adjust automatically with changes in GDP so that no country will incur excessive burdens during times of downturn. Political viability then depends not on coercion but persuasion.

Recipient nations also show increased willingness to collaborate in sustainable development. Most have already ramped up domestic expenditure on education and introduced reforms to increase effectiveness. Nevertheless, budgetary constraints persist. The co-financing approach of the GEEF gives recipient governments ownership: they have to maintain or boost their budgets for education to derive full benefit. This approach creates reciprocal accountability—donor countries provide capital, while the recipients provide policy commitment and openness.

Political will is also a function of moral consensus. Education promotes human rights, strengthens democracy, and encourages inclusive growth—all universally shared values. The GEEF therefore identifies political feasibility with universal morals, hence making international cooperation not just possible, but inevitable.

Critics often argue that G20 nations allocate far less than 1% of their GDP to foreign aid, particularly for education, and therefore cannot be expected to support such a large financial commitment. However, this perspective overlooks the inefficiency of the current fragmented aid system. Many G20 countries already fund various education initiatives through bilateral or multilateral aid channels, often without coordination, long-term planning, or measurable outcomes. By uniting these efforts under a dedicated, accountable international organization funded through a predictable 1% GDP contribution, the policy would offer greater impact and coherence and save the numerous wasted aid. Moreover, this mechanism does not require an indefinite commitment. If implemented effectively over a 15- to 20-year period, it can help stabilize education systems in lower-income countries by building infrastructure, training teachers, and expanding access — leading to long-term self-sufficiency. In this way, the policy offers not only an investment in global education, but also a pathway for G20 nations to eventually reduce future aid spending.

Concerns about the economic strain on developing G20 members are understandable — and they can be eased with pragmatic policy stepsConcerns over fiscal strain on developing G20 members are mitigated by adopting a 10–15 year phased ramp-up period for contributions and offering transitional support, ensuring the investment does not displace existing national budget commitments. And finally, giving countries like Indonesia and South Africa visible roles in the new body's governance would let their on-the-ground experience shape policy, lending the initiative authenticity and ownership.

Section V: Refuting Counterarguments and Enhancing the Argument

To begin with, many people might think that using this model would put the sovereignty of a state at risk. Let’s clarify the misunderstanding. The international body proposed isn’t some unelected global government with taxing power. It’s an administrative institution—like the Global Fund or the Green Climate Fund—that coordinates funding and ensures transparency. No country is being taxed directly by an outside authority. In other words every G20 would be able to make this decision through their normal government approval mechanisms.That means full democratic control remains intact; without cooperation, nations actually lose sovereignty. They become vulnerable to cross-border crises that they cannot control alone—like refugee flows, health emergencies, or radicalization.

The argument that a 1% GDP contribution is too costly neglects both ability and benefit. This levy is trivial relative to the sums spent on military or fossil fuel subsidies by most G20 nations, yet provides up to a 10% economic return per dollar invested. Furthermore, the GEEF’s result-based structure warns against dependency, transforming traditional aid into partnership by conditioning assistance on local effort, institutional reform, and measurable outcomes. This mirrors the success of result-based financing in international health funds like Gavi, ensuring empowerment, not reliance.

Furthermore, many people might think that it might lead to the dependency among states. However, it warns against dependency, whereas the result-based structure of the GEEF transforms traditional aid into partnership. Assistance is conditional on effort at the local level, institutional reform, and measurable results. Therefore, the GEEF embodies empowerment instead of dependency, and cultivates reciprocal progress and mutuality in accountability.

On top of that, this body would struggle with bureaucracy which would eventually lead to inefficiency. It's true that some international bodies struggle with bureaucracy, but this is not an inevitability. The proposed education fund would adopt best practices from successful organizations like the Global Fund or Gavi, which use real-time data, independent audits, and clear performance targets to ensure efficiency. In fact, a single dedicated organization reduces fragmentation, duplication, and confusion—common problems in the current global education aid landscape, which involves multiple agencies and NGOs with overlapping mandates. The GEEF corrects this by integrating existing institutions, employing digital monitoring, and maintaining a 7% administrative ceiling and internal audits for efficiency. However the current system's inefficiency is far worse: fragmented aid with unclear accountability wastes billions and leaves millions of children without education. A centralized, well-governed body is the solution.Centralization cuts confusion, not speed

Finally, a few commentators worry that international financing will impose uniform curricular content. But the mandate of the GEEF is universal coverage, not uniform curricular content. Governments can shape their curricular content at their pleasure; this actually respects the sovereignty of recipient nations. Unlike traditional aid, which can come with strings attached or bypass national education ministries, this funding would be aligned with country-led education strategies but aligned on core global learning goals — like basic literacy, numeracy, and critical thinking — in line with SDG4. Assistance with infrastructure, teacher upgrading, and accessibility are financed with due recognition of cultural sovereignty. They thereby protect both world equity and local diversity.

Conclusion

The global education crisis is a challenge, not a destiny, solvable not by more knowledge, but by coordinated political will. The 1% global education tax, administered under the Global Education and Equity Fund, is a structured, accountable, and sustainable solution.

By converting charity into investment, the GEEF structure aligns donor and beneficiary interests, reconciling sovereignty with solidarity to convert economic capability into human capability.

Learning is not education—it is emancipation. Education is the basis of justice, efficiency, and peace. Segregated efforts are no longer an option; only the coordinated, enlightened obligation of the G20 can bridge the gap between education's promise and its performance. Spending a single percent today can reap a century of change, solidifying the G20's moral mandate and ensuring the promise of education is, at last, a universal reality—not merely a privilege of geography.

Works Cited

International Task Force on Teachers for Education 2030 (Teacher Task Force - TTF), and UNESCO. *Global Report on Teachers Addressing Teacher Shortages and Transforming the Profession*. 26 Feb. 2024.

OECD. "International Aid Falls in 2024 for First Time in Five Years, Says OECD." *Oecd.org*, 2024, www.oecd.org/en/about/news/press-releases/2025/04/official-development-assistance-2024-figures.html.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). "GDP and Non-Financial Accounts." *OECD*, 2024, www.oecd.org/en/data/datasets/gdp-and-non-financial-accounts.html.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). "G20 GDP Growth - Second Quarter of 2025." *Oecd.org*, 2025, www.oecd.org/en/data/insights/statistical-releases/2025/09/g20-gdp-growth-second-quarter-2025.html.

UNESCO. *CLOSING the GLOBAL SDG4 FINANCING GAP: ACCELERATING SUSTAINABLE FINANCING SOLUTIONS for EDUCATION*. 11 Feb. 2025.

---. "Education Financing." *Unesco.org*, 2023, www.unesco.org/sdg4education2030/en/education-financing.

---. "Global Education Monitoring Report Summary, 2024/5: Leadership in Education : Lead for Learning." *Unesco.org*, 2024, unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000391758.

---. "Global Education Monitoring Report, 2023: Technology in Education: A Tool on Whose Terms?" *Unesco.org*, UNESCO, 2023, unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000385723.

United Nations. “United Nations Charter.” *United Nations*, 1945, www.un.org/en/about-us/un-charter/full-text.

World Bank. “70% of 10-Year-Olds Now in Learning Poverty, Unable to Read and Understand a Simple Text.” *World Bank*, 23 June 2022, www.worldbank.org/en/news/press-release/2022/06/23/70-of-10-year-olds-now-in-learning-poverty-unable-to-read-and-understand-a-simple-text.

---. “Education.” *World Bank*, 25 Mar. 2024, www.worldbank.org/en/topic/education/overview.