

# **WHAT ARE CHILD PROTECTION NETWORKS?**

## **Global Mapping and Analysis in view of actions on Monitoring and Reporting of Child Rights Violations in Conflict-Affected Areas**

February 2006<sup>1</sup>

UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre  
in collaboration with  
Humanitarian Policy and Advocacy Unit, Office of Emergency Programmes  
Child Protection Section of Programme Division

Beth Verhey, Consultant

### **Executive Summary**

The phrase “child protection network” has increasingly been used to refer to a variety of structures involved in child protection programming, policy and coordination work. This has especially gained currency in global discussions on monitoring and reporting regarding children and armed conflict. In particular, Security Council resolution 1612 (2005) establishes a child rights violations monitoring and reporting mechanism in which “task forces”, at the country level, are proposed to draw from “child protection networks”.<sup>2</sup>

In view of the increasing look to child protection networks (CPNs) to play a specific role in monitoring and reporting (M&R) of rights violations, UNICEF commissioned this analysis to develop an overview of what CPNs are, what they are not, and what questions and risks need to be considered regarding CPN roles in M&R. The resulting CPN study found wide diversity in the structure and purpose of CPNs and indicates that significant investments are needed at the field level, both in human resources and in infrastructure, for the specific skills and tasks in M&R work on child rights violations.

The study found that child protection networks (CPNs) range from regional fora, to inter-agency coordination groups, to thematic working groups to community-based structures. CPNs are most often informal, voluntary and established for specific purposes. The purpose of most CPNs is a forum for sectoral coordination, information sharing, and harmonization of programme approaches, identifying gaps in programme coverage and deliberating needs for policy or advocacy action. Importantly, most CPN members expressed concern that CPNs are not prepared to undertake explicit roles in monitoring, reporting and follow up on rights violations and would not be an appropriate mechanism for the task. Key findings identified in this rapid global analysis include:

---

<sup>1</sup> As efforts to implement Security Council resolution 1612 (2005) were underway during this analysis, it is important to emphasize that this report reflects the situation of “child protection networks” as of December 2005. A presentation on this analysis was presented at the “Technical Forum on Monitoring and Reporting” hosted by UNICEF Innocenti in Florence on December 9-10, 2005. Additional time for country inputs was agreed, reflecting the report date of February 2006.

<sup>2</sup> Security Council resolution 1612 (2005) refers to the monitoring and reporting action plan adopted in A/59/695-S/2005/72, “Children and armed conflict, Report of the Secretary-General”, 9 February 2005. It is the action plan in this Secretary General’s report, rather than the Security resolution, that includes specific proposals on the role of child protection networks. “Task forces on monitoring and reporting should be constituted and, whenever possible, draw particularly from child protection networks on the ground” paragraph 83 of S/2005/72.

1. *CPNs are very rarely a country-wide framework in terms of issues, participants or geographical coverage.* Most CPNs identified were inter-agency coordination structures bringing together international child protection actors and some civil society organizations focused on one or more particular themes or issues. No CPNs were found to address all six of the grave violations established for monitoring and reporting under Security Council resolution 1612. Liberia was the only example found where a full breadth of child protection actors work together within a country-wide framework. This full breadth of actors includes the transitional Government, UNICEF, international NGOs, a number of national NGOs and community based structures called ‘child welfare committees’. However, the Liberia network focuses on traditional child protection work in conflict situations – recruitment and demobilization and reintegration, sexual violence and exploitation. Collecting information on other violations would require coordination with other sectors, such as education and health.
2. *CPNs rarely include M&R work.* While monitoring in the form of information sharing and referrals between child protection actors is a consistent feature of CPNs, the structures themselves rarely feature monitoring roles or reporting to other channels or structures. In the Liberia example, a small sub-set of the CPN members participate in the M&R task force and they are at the early phases of developing a standard report form to facilitate monitoring and reporting across the network. In Haiti, the effort to establish a ‘task force’ has found it most practical to first focus on synthesizing M&R information and work between UNICEF and different sections of the peacekeeping mission, MINUSTAH. Similarly, the notable M&R work in Nepal and Sri Lanka has found it most effective to develop concrete M&R activities, projects and partners rather than working within the framework of CPNs.
3. *The specific mandate, skills and human resources for M&R of rights violations have not been built up sufficiently in CPN structures or child protection organizations, including UNICEF.* In this sense, while information sharing, analysis, programme response and advocacy are consistently present in CPN models, M&R of rights violations, especially in the context of reporting to the Security Council, requires a degree of investigation and documentation skills often absent in such actors and structures. In terms of mandates for M&R of child rights violations, CPN participants emphasized that work on rights violations requires an appropriately mandated and skilled external actor with the independence to consider violations by all parties and actors. Field-based NGOs and civil society groups interviewed for this analysis emphasized the need for UNICEF, OHCHR, peacekeeping missions and external human rights organizations to take a lead role, whereas their own role in M&R raised issues of security and exposure for staff and beneficiaries.

While interviews for this analysis tended to emphasize the constraints and limits to the role of CPNs in M&R on rights violations in the context of implementing Security Council resolution 1612, they also stressed that CPNs are vital to child protection programming and should be consulted as each country determines the best arrangements and modalities to implement resolution 1612. This is especially important as the same sources of information inform programming and response as well as reporting of rights violations to external structures such as the Security Council. In other words, CPNs and child protection actors should be consulted at the field level on appropriate modalities to follow up resolution 1612, but CPNs are not the basis from which the task forces should be established. Investments are needed in terms of human resources and skills at the field level to improve M&R on rights violations. These investments particularly apply to UNICEF which is mandated to provide leadership of these issues and is present in all field situations. At the same time, consultations at the field level for establishing task forces and modalities on child rights violations must engage peacekeeping operations and Office of Human Rights field presences where relevant.

## Table of Contents

Background .....	4
Methodology and scope of the CPN study .....	4
What are child protection networks .....	6
Some points about community child protection structures .....	11
Other issues raised – learning from other efforts .....	12
Conclusions and recommendations .....	13
Abbreviations .....	15
Annex I - Table of Key CPN Features .....	16
Annex II – Sample CPN Terms of Reference – Liberia .....	21

## **WHAT ARE CHILD PROTECTION NETWORKS?**

### **Global Mapping and Analysis in view of actions on Monitoring and Reporting of Child Rights Violations in Conflict-Affected Areas**

#### **Background**

The need to improve monitoring and reporting (M&R) of egregious child rights violations in situations affected by conflict arose as a recommendation of the 1996 Graça Machel report on the impact of armed conflict on children.<sup>3</sup> Since then, governments, the United Nations (UN) and non-governmental actors have undertaken a variety of initiatives on this issue. In particular, the September 2000 Winnipeg International Conference on War-affected Children, attended by delegates from 143 countries and co-sponsored by the Government of Canada and UNICEF, called for the development of a monitoring and reporting system.<sup>4</sup> More recently, in response to the 2003 General Assembly request for an “assessment of the UN system’s response to children affected by armed conflict”, the Secretary General’s report notes that monitoring and reporting efforts remain “piecemeal and ad hoc”.<sup>5</sup>

As such, considerable attention and momentum for the establishment of an M&R mechanism to address egregious child rights violations has built within the UN system.<sup>6</sup> Security Council resolution 1539 (2004) on Children and Armed Conflict requested that an action plan be developed with regards to an M&R system. Subsequently, the February 2005 “Children and armed conflict, Report of the Secretary-General” included an action plan.<sup>7</sup> Currently, a number of steps are being undertaken to implement the monitoring and reporting mechanism (MRM), following the adoption of Security Council resolution 1612 on 25 July 2005.<sup>8</sup>

Amongst follow up steps to resolution 1612, and in view of increasing attention to child protection networks (CPNs), UNICEF commissioned a rapid global analysis to strengthen understanding of the various forms of CPNs, how they operate and whether and in what ways CPN’s may be appropriate for roles in the monitoring and reporting of child rights abuses.

#### **Methodology and scope of the CPN study**

In view of contributing to the immediate implementation of the M&R mechanism established under Security Council resolution 1612, the CPN analysis was undertaken within a tight timeframe over October to December 2005. Field missions were undertaken to Haiti and Liberia. In addition, international meetings in Nairobi and Florence afforded the opportunity to meet with field colleagues and

---

<sup>3</sup> A/51/306 “Impact of Armed Conflict on Children: Report of the expert of the Secretary-General, Ms. Graça Machel, submitted pursuant to General Assembly resolution 48/157”, 26 August 1996.

<sup>4</sup> “The Machel Review, 1996-2000” as annexed to A/55/749; and the “Winnipeg Agenda for War-Affected Children” (Annex to A/55/467-S/2000/973).

<sup>5</sup> A/59/331 “Comprehensive assessment of the United Nations system response to children affected by armed conflict”, Report of the Secretary-General, 3 September 2004.

<sup>6</sup> Within, and in collaboration with, the UN system, UNICEF has a key role to play in this work. UNICEF’s Medium Term Strategic Plan and Core Commitments for Children in Emergencies guide the organization’s commitment to the monitoring and reporting of abuses perpetrated against children in conflict areas.

<sup>7</sup> A/59/695-S/2005/72, “Children and armed conflict, Report of the Secretary-General”, 9 February 2005

<sup>8</sup> S/Res/1612 (2005), 26 July 2005.

partners on CPN experience in Nepal, Somalia, South Sudan, and Sri Lanka. Other methodologies included phone interviews; in particular with UNICEF staff and operational NGOs from Côte d'Ivoire and the Democratic Republic of Congo. Desk review materials complemented these interviews.

As such, the CPN analysis was able to include a representative sampling of CPN experience from key conflict affected countries, including those identified as priorities for implementation of Security Council resolution 1612. Resolution 1612 asks that implementation of the M&R mechanism stage its focus on particular countries. First priority is given to the five countries most recently listed by the Secretary General regarding the violation of recruitment and use of children by armed groups: Burundi, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of Congo, Somalia and Sudan.<sup>9</sup> Resolution 1612 then refers to other countries, not on the Council's Agenda, which have been reported as recruiting and using children: Colombia, Myanmar, Nepal, Philippines, Sri Lanka and Uganda.

While work to follow up resolution 1612 is an originating focus of the CPN analysis, this review also prioritized the identification of CPN experience itself. As such, country selection considered countries on the Council's Agenda that feature other child rights violations and important CPN work: Afghanistan, the Eritrea – Ethiopia situation, Haiti, Iraq, Liberia, the occupied Palestinian territory, Sierra Leone and Timor-Leste. This was important to the depth and breadth of the analysis, as CPNs may be focused on a variety of child rights violations. As part of the process leading to the M&R mechanism established under Security Council resolution 1612, and as conveyed in the Secretary-General's fifth report on children and armed conflict of February 2005, six egregious rights violations have been designated for priority attention: "a) killing and maiming of children, b) recruiting or using child soldiers, c) attacks against schools or hospitals, d) rape or other grave sexual violence against children, e) abduction of children and f) denial of humanitarian access".<sup>10</sup>

Field missions and countries of focus for interviews were thus selected bearing in mind the breadth of this framework. Liberia was selected as having the most substantial, country-wide CPN to examine and for its relevance for Côte d'Ivoire and the sub-region. Haiti was selected for regional representation and as the only country known to have already set up an M&R 'task force' following the February 2005 Secretary General's report. Interviews then prioritized the five countries for the first phase of implementing resolution 1612 – Burundi, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of Congo, Somalia and Sudan – and countries noted for M&R experience – Nepal and Sri Lanka – in order to explore the role of CPNs within those contexts.

The following questions about CPNs were developed as a framework to guide field missions and interviews. As this was a qualitative analysis, these questions were not administered as a survey, but provided an introduction to stakeholders about the kinds of questions to be addressed.

- 1) How, why, when was the network/structure/working group initiated?
- 2) How formal is the network/structure/working group? (*Are there terms of reference? Are there minutes or other reports kept?*)
- 3) Who are members of the network/structure/working group?
- 4) Who convenes or chairs the group and how often does it meet?
- 5) Which issues are regularly addressed within the network/structure/working group? What is the nature of the discussions? (*Focused on a particular theme or issue such as family tracing,*

---

<sup>9</sup> Since November 2002, the reports of the Secretary General on children and armed conflict to the Security Council have featured two annexes listing parties who recruit and use children. These annexes are commonly referred to as 'Annex I' for the list of parties in situations on the Council's agenda, and 'Annex II', for parties in situations not on the Council's agenda. The eleven countries listed here form the third such list and are from the most recent report, A/59/695-S/2005/72, "Children and armed conflict, Report of the Secretary-General", 9 February 2005.

<sup>10</sup> A/59/695-S/2005/72, "Children and armed conflict, Report of the Secretary-General", 9 February 2005.

*disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR), sexual violence? Information sharing, building agreement on policy or approaches, making plans about gaps in programme coverage or discussing strategy for advocacy? Are individual cases discussed, addressed?)*

- 6) Does the network/structure/working group have experience in monitoring, reporting and following up rights violations? Is this focused on individual cases or other kinds of information? Does the network/structure collect data, reports, case information or does this rest with individual members? *(Please describe some examples of rights violations that have been addressed by the network/structure/working group.)*
- 7) When there are cases of concern, to who does the network/structure/working group make reports? What kinds of follow up is expected, hoped for?
- 8) How does the network/structure/working group address and manage: “sensitive issues”; confidentiality; and; protection/security of staff, children and sources of information?
- 9) What are some of the overall strengths and weaknesses of the network/structure/working group?
- 10) Other comments, observations or information to report. *(Has there been any particular training related to rights monitoring and reporting?)*

## **What are child protection networks**

In reality, the phrase “child protection networks” is used by different actors to refer to a great diversity of structures. Child protection networks (CPNs) range from regional fora, to capital-based coordination or inter-agency working groups to community-based structures.<sup>11</sup> CPNs are most often informal, voluntary and established for specific coordination and thematic purposes. Membership or participants consistently includes UNICEF and international NGOs and some national NGOs. Other UN agencies, such as UNHCR, peacekeeping missions, OHCHR or OCHA are also often involved. While informal and voluntary, CPNs are increasingly finding it useful to convene more formally with terms of reference, taking of minutes, clear chairmanship roles, regular meetings and some degree of agenda setting and work planning. This has followed the evolution of increased attention to humanitarian coordination generally and a growing level of leadership by UNICEF in convening the child protection related structures.

It is important to stress that CPNs are widely viewed as useful and essential, especially to programme standards and coordination, but most CPN members stressed that CPNs are not prepared or appropriate to undertake more explicit roles in monitoring, reporting and follow up on rights violations. The purpose of most CPNs is to create a forum for information sharing, harmonization of programme approaches, identifying gaps in programme coverage and advancing common policy or advocacy actions. The great majority of CPNs are thematic or single-issue based. While they share information and may highlight situations of rights violations, they do not report such rights violations systematically. Rather, they retain reports within their internal channels or liaise with specific organizations for case referral as part of response. The CPN itself is more of a discussion forum for ideas or guidance, perhaps identifying joint action or identifying an issue from which the group plans policy development or advocacy actions.

Thus the interface of CPNs and work on monitoring and reporting of child rights violations is at very early stages; requiring country level consultation and decision-making on a progressive basis. This is highlighted because of current attention to establishing country level task forces on monitoring and

---

<sup>11</sup> This CPN analysis focused on country level structures rather than regional coalitions relevant to the idea of CPNs. For example, among regional structures, the Great Lakes Child Protection Network has often been noted. Some of the names of CPN structures found at country level include: child protection working group, psychosocial forum, separated children task force, GBV and sexual exploitation and abuse working group, DDR sub-group, children associated with armed groups coalition, ‘*plateforme*’, ‘*collectif*’, consortium, child welfare committee, and community child protection network.

reporting of child rights violations and expectations that CPNs would form the basis for the establishment of such task forces.

The following key findings and issues raised in this rapid global analysis are elaborated in this section:

1. Three forms of CPNs emerge at the country level with thematic working groups comprising the great majority:
  - a. Country-wide structure
  - b. Thematic working groups
  - c. Community-based structures
2. Very few CPNs include a monitoring and reporting function. While they engage in information sharing, it was felt that the level of documentation and investigation required for reporting rights violations to the Security Council required more dedicated work and resources. Yet CPN members emphasized that there should be clear collaboration modalities between their membership and persons charged with monitoring and reporting because M&R must be integrated with response capacities and frameworks.
3. No CPNs cover the breadth of issues or channels of information for the six grave violations identified in resolution 1612 for reporting to the Security Council.
4. Most CPN members have programme operations that raise concerns of protection, security and exposure of children, their families and communities and staff in terms of how they manage the interface with reporting on rights violations.

The idea of CPNs proposed and described in the action plan for an M&R mechanism in the Secretary General's 2005 report<sup>12</sup> is that of a country wide structure. Such a country-wide structure was only identified in Liberia for this analysis. Efforts to establish a country-wide CPN structure in Somalia are gaining momentum. The Child Protection Action Network in Afghanistan has been mentioned as another comprehensive structure, but further information was not received in the timeframe of this analysis.

The Liberia Child Protection Network involves a full breadth of child protection actors working together within a country-wide framework. This includes the transitional Government, UNICEF, international NGOs, a number of national NGOs and community based structures called 'child welfare committees'. It extends geographically through a 'lead-agency-per-County' model. Indeed the level of commitment of the Liberia network's members to working together in the model of a CPN is impressive. One of the reasons highlighted for this success was UNICEF's commitment and contribution of resources in leading and convening the CPN. Many members cited negative experience from past DDR exercises where child protection actors were not coordinated as an incentive in recognizing the benefits of committing to the CPN model.

The Liberia network also features as one of the few CPNs that include a specific monitoring and reporting function. However, the M&R task force is fairly new and is in the first stages of establishing its scope and working methods. Guidelines and a draft reporting form have been prepared; the reporting form is currently being circulated for testing and feedback to network members, including national organizations working directly with child welfare committees. UNICEF has also established a database for management of rights violation case reporting.

---

<sup>12</sup> A/59/695-S/2005/72, "Children and armed conflict, Report of the Secretary-General", 9 February 2005.

However, the Liberia network builds on the traditional focus of child protection work in conflict situations – underage recruitment and DDR, sexual violence and exploitation. Collecting information on other violations would require coordination with other sectors, such as education and health. Further, the work of the Liberia network on sexual violence and exploitation of girls was acknowledged to be disconnected from a separate, inter-agency gender-based violence task force. In other words, knowledge and response capacities would be improved through better integration of these structures.

The issue of linkages between different rights and protection related structures and mechanisms arose throughout this analysis. Specifically for child rights violations, notable gaps were found between child protection, human rights and gender-based violence actors, work and structures. In this sense, child protection networks are often insufficiently linked to child-focused work and information being done by local, more general human rights organizations and actors addressing gender-based violence or sexual exploitation and abuse.

With regard to another constraint, Liberia colleagues stressed a need for violations reported to the Security Council working group to be drawn from, and to recognize, evolving local priorities and issues outside of the six grave violations established under Security Council resolution 1612. In particular, they stressed that most of the violations they are currently addressing, such as gender-based violence and abuse, are not per se committed by members of an armed group – and thus not identified for reporting to the Security Council -- but are important to address. This constraint was raised consistently in interviews and discussions for this analysis and underscores the need for M&R work on rights violations reported to the Security Council to be integrated with broader child protection and rights structures and mechanisms in a given country.

Turning to Somalia, the ‘child protection network’ is a project between UNICEF and NOVIB and is taking care to contribute to, and integrate with, the inter-agency protection working group structure led by OCHA. The Somalia network is building on UNICEF work during 2003 -2005 to conduct a national child protection study and subsequent interest and efforts by local civil society organizations to join together as regional child protection networks. Ten such regional child protection networks resulted with the most active being the Child Rights Forum in Somaliland that benefits from the field presence of international NGOs such as Save the Children. UNICEF and NOVIB are now working on organizational capacity building and establishing a common rights violation reporting tool for these 10 community child protection networks, including how the ten regional networks will in turn relate to the more grassroots community level to both receive reports of violations and facilitate response. As such, the Somalia CPN experience highlights the timeframe and process necessary in conflict situations to establish child protection networks or structures and undertake monitoring and reporting functions.

Thus monitoring and reporting functions can be seen as fairly nascent in the Liberia and Somalia CPN structures. Beyond the Liberia and Somalia examples, monitoring and reporting rarely features in CPN structures. While monitoring in the form of information sharing and referrals between child protection actors is a consistent feature of CPNs, the structures themselves rarely include active monitoring activities or reporting to other channels or structures. Even in the Liberia example, only a small sub-set of the CPN members participate in the M&R task force and they are in the early phases of developing a report form to facilitate monitoring and reporting across the network.

In Haiti, the effort to establish a ‘task force’ has found it most practical to first focus on synthesizing M&R information and work between UNICEF and different sections of the peacekeeping mission, MINUSTAH. Instructively towards lessons learned, the Haiti ‘task force’ has already prepared a draft report in accordance resolution 1612, but learned in their information gathering that they had insufficient systems for information gathering, and evaluating the reliability of information, outside of Port-au-Prince. The structure of MINUSTAH human rights presences in all Departments of Haiti is central to this effort.



Efforts to assess linkages with existing child protection related structures, civil society groups or establish new models are in early stages. For example, one of the most effective networks in Haiti concerns trafficking – ‘*Collectif contre la Traite et le Trafic de Personnes, en particulier des Enfants*’ and opportunities are being assessed through field visits and partner work on children’s clubs. A draft terms of reference has been developed for an ‘*Observatoire*’ on child rights and discussions are ongoing to improve the system and establish it more firmly within the country.

Similarly to the decision of the Haiti task force, experience in the Democratic Republic of Congo, Nepal and Sri Lanka provides experience where specific child rights violation M&R work occurs outside CPN structures. This is especially noteworthy as DRC has consistently featured on the Security Council’s agenda and in the reporting on parties recruiting and using children. DRC has a plethora of CPN related structures, but these are largely thematic working groups, led by international NGOs, UNICEF, other UN bodies or the government. The main themes of the working groups include street children, separated children, juvenile justice, sexual violence and children associated with armed forces or groups. It is felt that the depth of discussion required to coordinate a specific theme requires such focused structures. The most active of CPN structures is the children’s unit of the DDR Commission. This is led by CONADER, the government inter-ministerial DDR Commission, with technical support from UNICEF.<sup>13</sup> However, while CONADER hosts the children’s inter-agency meetings regularly; there have been difficulties in replicating the structure in the Provinces for more de-centralized discussion and coordination. Similarly, UNICEF and international NGOs interviewed noted that efforts to establish a more formal CPN structure linking Kinshasa and Provinces was unsuccessful due to varying presences of organizations geographically and some disagreements about who would, or could, take the lead in a given area. Other CPN structures have been established at Provincial levels; in part due to the practicalities of humanitarian and protection work in territories held by different groups.

More specifically on M&R in DRC, the child protection section in the peacekeeping mission, United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, MONUC, leads monitoring and reporting on child rights violations. Information sources include UNICEF and international NGOs; and MONUC child protection staff take reports directly from local organizations or individuals. As compared to information sharing on rights violations discussed within CPN structures, MONUC child protection staff investigate reports of violations for more in-depth information and verification. Information of child rights violations is then compiled into reports for advocacy and for input into MONUC’s bi-monthly, regular reporting to the Security Council. However, priority and space constraints have resulted in only limited inclusion of child protection in the final Security Council reports on DRC. In view of this experience, DRC child protection actors emphasized a need for more strategic thinking and follow up as to how country specific Security Council resolutions could better reflect child protection concerns.

Discussions with colleagues in other country situations raised similar concerns that M&R work focused on reporting to the Security Council Working Group be strategically linked with country-based advocacy and ongoing child protection work. For example, South Sudan raised an example where negotiation at a more quiet level with local actors was successful in gaining the release of a group of recruited children. In this example, they felt that offers of intervention by higher international and political actors would have undermined the leverage of key local actors. Other interviews stressed that country level discussion

---

<sup>13</sup> UNICEF led the children’s DDR structure until 2003 when the government established the inter-ministerial DDR commission – CONADER (Commission Nationale de Désarmement, Démobilisation et Réinsertion). In addition to CONADER and UNICEF, regular participants in the children’s group include the International Committee of the Red Cross, a child protection advisor from MONUC, Save the Children UK, the NGO Group of CARE, International Foundation for Education and Self-Help and International Rescue Committee, the Belgian Red Cross and a few national organizations.

on rights violation information should engage country-based embassies, influential donors and presences such as the European Union for interventions as well as the Security Council.

Monitoring and reporting work on child rights violations in Nepal and Sri Lanka has often been noted in international workshops and discussions. Similarly to DRC, child protection actors in Nepal and Sri Lanka have found it most effective to develop concrete M&R projects and partners rather than work within the frame of CPNs.

In Sri Lanka, UNICEF has undertaken individual case work to monitor, document and respond to cases of child recruitment since 2002. The overall work related to children affected by armed conflict involves a number of partners, but UNICEF found they had to undertake the recruitment casework themselves as it required an organization with a clear international, neutral and credible mandate.<sup>14</sup> Since the early phases of the work partners have included UNHCR, the Sri Lanka Monitoring Mission,<sup>15</sup> Save the Children in Sri Lanka and some community organizations, but the majority of cases of recruitment are reported directly to UNICEF by parents.

A “Reference Group” in Sri Lanka can be considered a form of CPN, but Sri Lanka colleagues emphasized that the group is informal and based on trust, including a specific decision to not take minutes. The group convenes select international and national children and armed conflict actors to discuss developments and strategize and does not undertake more specific coordination or information sharing roles. Other forms of CPNs in Sri Lanka have included psychosocial forums, which were especially strong after the Tsunami.

For replication and lessons learned, it is important to note that efforts in Sri Lanka to expand monitoring and reporting to other child rights violations have struggled. In collaboration with a number of partners, UNICEF led an effort to establish a system of synthesizing information and a standardized form, with a lighter level of information than UNICEF undertakes on recruitment cases. This system seeks to synthesize information at District level, under District Child Protection Committees. Many months of discussion and effort resulted in the system being established but actual reporting from the system has remained very limited. In part, this is a matter of trust in terms of a given organization being willing to share elements of their case information with another organization or a coordinating body.

Drawing from the Sri Lanka experience, UNICEF started an M&R project in Nepal in April 2005. The project was modeled on Security Council resolution 1539 (April 2004) such that four violations were selected as the most relevant for Nepal: recruitment and use of children by armed forces and groups, abduction of children, disruption of schooling and children held in detention facilities. The project has monitors in 28 Districts who are drawn from two national NGO partners. In complement to this, the Watchlist and Save the Children US have started an M&R project covering an additional 6 Districts. Towards replication of this experience, it is important to highlight that the process of identifying and selecting the two partners took some six months before launching the project and that capacity building is an ongoing aspect of the project.

While the M&R work in Nepal and Sri Lanka functions outside of a CPN, both are also setting up a task force to follow up Security Council resolution 1612. In Nepal, the task force is led by UNICEF and the

---

<sup>14</sup> Since 2003, work in Sri Lanka, including monitoring and reporting on recruitment, has been undertaken under the “Action Plan for Children Affected by Armed Conflict”. The “Action Plan” was agreed by the two parties, the Government of Sri Lanka and the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam, during a series of peace talks and UNICEF was agreed to lead coordination and implementation of the “Action Plan”.

<sup>15</sup> The Sri Lanka Monitoring Mission is an international cease-fire observer mission established under the Norwegian government’s role in facilitating peace talks for Sri Lanka.

OHCHR. In fact the large field presence of OHCHR will provide an interesting model as experience evolves on monitoring and reporting child rights violations.<sup>16</sup> The OHCHR field presence in Nepal is still getting established, but already has a strong collaborative relationship with UNICEF and is expected to be able to provide additional options for interventions and coverage. Other CPNs in Nepal include: “National Coalition for Children as Zones of Peace”,<sup>17</sup> a working group on children associated with armed forces and groups, and a child protection sub-group under the UN protection working group.

As noted above, the Sri Lanka experience highlights how work on rights violations requires an appropriately mandated and skilled external actor with the independence to consider violations by all parties and actors in a conflict. Field-based NGOs and civil society groups interviewed for this analysis consistently emphasized the need for UNICEF, OHCHR, peacekeeping missions and external human rights organizations to take a lead role, in particular where their own role in M&R raised issues of security and exposure for staff and beneficiaries. For example, in the Darfur situation, child protection issues are considered highly sensitive. UNICEF reports that as they have struggled to establish or extend activities to adolescents, potential partners are, understandably, reluctant due to significant security, logistical and other constraints. In Nepal, some monitors have received threats to stop their work and experience has found that monitors who have relatives on both sides of the conflict feel the most comfortable in this monitoring and reporting work. In DRC, tense discussions were required when CONADER insisted that they hold the database on demobilized and reintegrated children established by a sub-set of international NGOs and have access to its confidential information. International NGOs expressed serious concern as to how CONADER would ensure the confidentiality of the case information; especially in view of the Ministry of Defense being part of the inter-ministerial structure and CONADER being a temporary institution.

Overall, this analysis found that the skills and human resources for M&R of rights violations have not been built up in CPN structures or traditional child protection organizations, including UNICEF. In this sense, while information sharing, analysis, programme response and advocacy are consistently present in CPN models, M&R of rights violations, especially in the context of reporting to the Security Council, requires a degree of investigation and documentation skills often absent in such actors and structures.

### Some points about community child protection structures

Most CPNs identified were inter-agency coordination structures bringing together international child protection actors and some civil society organizations focused on one or more particular themes or issues. A growing number of countries also feature experience with community based child protection structures. These community based structures can be described as ‘networking together’ different segments of society (within a village or designated urban area) rather than bringing together different international and civil society organizations.

Interviews with colleagues experienced with community child protection networks in Côte d’Ivoire and DRC emphasized that such networks, due to their knowledge and proximity to violators and duty-bearers, are at especially high risk of retribution and other risks related to exposure, protection and confidentiality in reporting rights violations. Especially in active conflict situations, a community committee may find ways to report to an external actor, but such channels must be well-managed; they require building up

---

<sup>16</sup> The other country with a significant OHCHR presence is Uganda such that Nepal and Uganda will provide interesting comparative experience on child rights violations in situations where peacekeeping missions are the other main actor to UNICEF.

<sup>17</sup> A “Children in Conflict Coordination Committee” under the Ministry for Social Welfare is currently not functioning.

trust and respecting confidentiality. For example, in Côte d'Ivoire, Save the Children Sweden and UK relayed that they found community committees open to mobilizing and advocating directly on issues like access to education but still fearful and reliant on external actors to take up issues such as recruitment and sexual violence. It was also emphasized that M&R work within community networks requires a fairly lengthy and sensitive process, including time to build up the community's understanding of child rights.

Similarly, there has been a growing level of attention to adolescents in conflict situations and efforts to support children's or youth clubs, committees, councils or other such forums. The Liberia Child Protection Network includes an emphasis that partners establish children's clubs in parallel with the child welfare committees. UNICEF experience in South Sudan has also come to find youth networks effective, with more than 1,000 youth now involved. For example, the youth groups convene around sports and drama with training inputs on protection and youth leadership. The youth dialogue amongst themselves to identify issues and then raise awareness in the community through skits. Colleagues in South Sudan highlighted how this facilitates the acknowledgement of rights issues in the community and a sense of ownership to address the issue. Comparatively, earlier experience in Sudan with community committees required a lot of investment, found the identification of issues formulaic and that it was difficult to get beyond initial denials of the existence of rights violations.

### Other issues raised – learning from other efforts

While this analysis focused on child protection networks in view of work on monitoring and reporting, discussions often raised related lessons to be learned from recent work on sexual abuse and exploitation and how child rights violations are treated and managed in international transitional justice processes. One of the key lessons highlighted by work on sexual abuse and exploitation is the time and investment, including dedicated staff and other resources, involved in establishing and implementing a reporting mechanism. Instructively, work to develop and implement such a reporting mechanism has been ongoing since 2002 when the Inter-Agency Standing Committee<sup>18</sup> adopted core principles and a plan of action on "Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse in Humanitarian Crises".

Similarly there is a growing recognition of the special efforts needed to protect children in their role as victims or witnesses in various justice processes such as truth commissions, special courts or the International Criminal Court. Monitoring and reporting work from situations of armed conflict is increasingly being sought as case information, leads and other support to such processes. This has in turn raised difficult considerations for organizations in regards to the protection and confidentiality of their beneficiaries. This raises important issues of the security and exposure of children, their families and communities and staff of organizations. For example, organizations providing health care and other support to victims of sexual violence have been asked to release case names and information to prosecutors and staff of special courts or other justice mechanisms. Similarly there have been difficult discussions where judicial mechanisms want access to databases of demobilized child soldiers.

During the timeframe of this analysis, UNICEF Innocenti hosted an expert discussion on transitional justice and children which recognized that, in some situations, child protection agencies might provide confidential information used solely for the purpose of generating investigative leads, but those agencies/organizations require safeguards confirming that such information and collaboration will remain confidential and will not be further disclosed. The meeting recognized that a tension often exists between

---

<sup>18</sup> The Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) is comprised of both members (FAO, OCHA, UNDP, UNFPA, UNICEF, UNHCR, WFP, WHO) and standing invitees (ICRC, ICVA, IFRC, InterAction, IOM, SCHR, RSG/IDPs, UNHCHR, and the World Bank). ICRC, a standing invitee, maintains its independence from policy statements issued by the IASC and its subsidiary bodies.

the protection of children and their participation in justice-seeking processes and stressed that informed consent is critical for the involvement of children as witnesses. An underlying challenge is that ongoing conflict and post-conflict situations rarely provide the context in which a child can receive accurate information or make appropriate decisions in giving such consent. The meeting further recommended that child protection agencies may play the role of an intermediary between children and the justice-seeking process.

It is important to note that monitoring and reporting to the Security Council working group as envisaged in resolution 1612 is oriented to political accountability as compared to the individual judicial accountability addressed in the discussion above. There is also ongoing discussion as to the degree to which monitoring and reporting on the six grave violations should be based on individual case documentation and verification, and the concomitant investigative capacity that would be necessary. Discussions for this analysis emphasized that the focus of M&R work under resolution 1612 is more on triangulating and verifying sources of information and establishing trends, so as to ensure something is not an isolated incident, of violations by party.

## **Conclusions and recommendations**

Child protection networks are essential to programming coordination and processes, however, this analysis found that they should not form the basis of country-level task forces for monitoring and reporting on rights violations to the Security Council Working Group. The M&R ‘task force’ in most situations will need to be a more dedicated structure. Child Protection Networks should be actively and regularly consulted on the appropriate way to proceed at each country-level.

This analysis suggests it would be useful to approach monitoring and reporting as a task rather than as a mechanism. Such a task would be designated and resourced; and would then ‘network’ with a variety of colleagues, counterparts, sectors and child protection related working groups and structures as information sources. For UNICEF in particular, a number of field colleagues suggested that the cross-sectoral and policy nature of such monitoring and report work is better placed under the Senior Programme, Deputy or Representative offices as compared to the Child Protection section. This model was adopted in Sri Lanka and found to be both effective and the right decision.

Also for UNICEF in particular, it may be helpful to recall that the organization’s “Core Commitments for Children in Emergencies” already establishes the information trends and analysis roles expected of the organization. In this sense, monitoring and reporting on the rights violations under resolution 1612 represents an additional channel for reporting and perhaps a more systematic manner in which such monitoring and reporting work is undertaken. It is recognized that further investments are needed in human and other resources to improve UNICEF capacity to undertake these roles in conflict situations and may be helpful to see such investments in this broader organizational frame as well as the more immediate pressure to implement resolution 1612.

As noted, the M&R task under resolution 1612 requires specific skills, mandate and resources. In terms of mandate, there is wide consensus that such a task is best designated to, or collaboration between, UNICEF, the Resident Representative system, field presences of the OHCHR or UN peacekeeping missions, as is already established for Security Council resolution 1612. In terms of skills and resources, especially in view of the level of investigation and documentation necessary for substantiating reports to the Security Council, investments are needed both in training and in staff and database resources. In the examples where specific monitoring and reporting work on rights violations is relatively well-established, it is instructive to recognize the resources already in place. In the DRC, this primarily entails a significant deployment of MONUC child protection advisers, many with human rights training and experience, and

in Nepal in Sri Lanka, this entails relatively well-financed projects. For example, in Sri Lanka, the “Action Plan” is a broad and complex programme for children affected by armed conflict, including health, education and socio-economic reintegration activities, but the component of maintaining capacity to receive and follow up individual cases of recruitment has required resources nearing \$1 million per year.<sup>19</sup> It will certainly not always be the case that such capacity for individual case violation work is necessary by UNICEF, but it is important to bear in mind the resources necessary for such work when establishing mechanisms and infrastructure to implement resolution 1612.

While this analysis found that country task forces for M&R should be established separately from CPNs, pro-active consultation and collaboration between the task force and CPNs in a country is essential. This derives from the reality that both structures need to work with the same sources of information and to manage potential consequences in terms of protection and confidentiality. ‘Ground rules’ need to be established at country level in terms of channels for information sharing and agreeing on the veracity of information before it is reported to higher channels. In most situations, CPN membership should continue to be broad while the M&R task force should be selective as to any members outside of the UN system.<sup>20</sup> In most situations, the minutes or reports of meetings of a CPN structure can be agreed to be shared with the M&R task force as a source of information that is already non-confidential and such minutes or reports are already circulated. In addition to this, in most situations to date, individual CPN members are deciding to share information through an agreed confidential modality with the task force. In a few situations, individual CPN members have agreed to be part of the task force.

---

<sup>19</sup> The financial resources in Sri Lanka include maintaining a transit centre and it is important to stress that the work includes follow up of cases, not just monitoring and reporting.

<sup>20</sup> It is recognized that resolution 1612 refers to the cooperation of national Governments in establishing the M&R mechanism. Some country situations have raised concerns about this in terms of the independence required in monitoring and reporting on rights violations regardless of which party to a conflict may be responsible. As this analysis has focused on the relevance of civil society actors and phrase “draw from child protection networks”, this conclusion and recommendation focuses on the UN system obligation to implement resolution 1612 and report to the Security Council.

## Abbreviations

CPN	Child Protection Network
DDR	Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration
DRC	Democratic Republic of Congo
GBV	Gender-based Violence
M&R	Monitoring and Reporting
MINUSTAH	United Nations Mission in Haiti
MONUC	United Nations Mission in Democratic Republic of Congo
NGO	Non-governmental organization
NOVIB	Oxfam Holland
OCHA	United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
OHCHR	United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund

## Annex I - Table of Key CPN Features

Country	CPN related structures	Includes M&R?	Other notes
<b>Côte d'Ivoire</b>	<p>Only ad hoc meetings regarding issues of children associated with armed forces and groups, DDR and separated children.</p> <p>Save the Children Sweden and Save the Children UK have extensive efforts with community child protection committees in the North and West respectively.</p>	No	More generally, a Protection Sector Group chaired by ONUCI meets regularly and a Protection Working Group chaired by OCHA meets because of INGO concerns to discuss sensitive protection issues with the Sector group which includes Ministries, security forces, donors and sometimes journalists.
<b>Democratic Republic of Congo</b>	<p>Main active structure is the children's sub-group under CONADER – the national DDR Commission.</p> <p>Save the Children UK, in North and South Kivu, and CARE, in Maniema, have made the most extensive investments in establishing community based child protection networks.</p> <p>Other relevant structures include: Provincial Child Protection Councils (which have occasionally been active in the last five years under the Social Welfare and Gender Ministries); the National Coalition to Stop the Use of Child Soldiers; and other street children, separated children and sexual violence structures which function at different Provincial and local levels.</p>	<p>No</p> <p>MONUC child protection undertakes the main work in M&amp;R, consulting regularly with UNICEF, NGOs and others and receiving reports from a variety of sources. The main reporting occurs in their bi-monthly inputs for MONUC regular reporting to the Security Council.</p>	



Country	CPN related structures	Includes M&R?	Other notes
<b>Haiti</b>	<p>MINUSTAH and UNICEF have established a Task Force for M&amp;R under Security Council resolution 1612.</p> <p>Other structures:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Observatoire des droits de l'enfant en Haiti</li> <li>2. COHADDE</li> <li>3. Psychosocial Forum</li> <li>4. Collectif contre la Traite et le Trafic de Personnes, en particulier des Enfants</li> <li>5. Federation des enfants de la rue</li> <li>6. Plan Haiti Children's clubs</li> <li>7. CARE community structures working on HIV/AIDs - "Community Solidarity Networks"</li> </ol>	<p>Currently the Task Force is starting with a more focused forum for M&amp;R synthesizing information within the UN system. Investigation has been most active in Port au Prince. A draft terms of reference has been developed for the "Observatoire" and discussions are ongoing about how it can best fulfill its longer term role in M&amp;R and advocacy on child rights.</p>	

Country	CPN related structures	Includes M&R?	Other notes
<b>Liberia</b>	<p>Child Protection Working Group (CPWG)</p> <p>Other relevant structures include the GBV task force and Protection Core Group.</p> <p>The CPWG framework includes country level child protection coordination meetings and community-based structures called ‘child welfare committees’.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>One of the task forces of the CPWG is M&amp;R. The task force is currently finalizing a reporting form on rights violations to be used throughout the network and input into a UNICEF managed database.</p>	<p>Only example of country-wide CPN.<sup>21</sup> CPWG members include a broad range from government ministries, UN, INGOs, national NGOs and more district-based civil society groups.</p> <p>CPWG Task Forces:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Child Welfare Committees and Child Rights Clubs</li> <li>➤ Task Force on Monitoring and Reporting on Child Rights violations</li> <li>➤ Admission and Disciplinary Committee</li> <li>➤ Committee to lead Documentation on experiences and lessons learnt</li> <li>➤ Reintegration Core Group</li> <li>➤ Inter-Agency Task Force on Separated Children</li> <li>➤ Street Children</li> <li>➤ Orphanages</li> <li>➤ HIV/AIDS</li> <li>➤ Juvenile Justice Forum</li> </ul>

<sup>21</sup> Some comments were received that the Afghanistan “CPAN” – Child Protection Action Network – may be another exceptional example of a country-wide CPN but desk review materials were not received in time for inclusion in this analysis.

Country	CPN related structures	Includes M&R?	Other notes
<b>Nepal</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Children in Conflict Coordination Committee (A Ministry for Social Welfare led body that is currently not functioning.)</li> <li>2. National Coalition for Children as Zones of Peace</li> <li>3. Working group on children associated with armed forces and groups</li> <li>4. Child Protection sub-group under UN protection working group</li> </ol>	No	<p>UNICEF has established an M&amp;R project with two national human rights NGOs covering 28 Districts.</p> <p>In a complementary effort, the Watchlist and Save the Children US have started an M&amp;R project covering 6 Districts.</p> <p>UNICEF and OHCHR now also lead a Task Force following resolution 1612.</p>
<b>Somalia</b>	<p>In Somaliland, Child Rights Forum</p> <p>In South and Central Somaliland, UNICEF and NOVIB are building a CPN from preliminary work with 10 communities.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>The UNICEF – NOVIB project is specifically building an M&amp;R function. The project involves building the capacity of select civil society organizations and child protection advocates and developing a mechanism of M&amp;R.</p>	
<b>Sri Lanka</b>	<p>Few CPN structures exist. A “reference group” convenes international and national children and armed conflict actors informally to discuss issues and strategize.</p> <p>Other forms of CPNs in Sri Lanka have included psychosocial forums, which were especially strong after the Tsunami.</p> <p>A separated children group and database was also mobilized after the Tsunami.</p>	No	<p>UNICEF led M&amp;R in Sri Lanka is an activity focused on underage recruitment and features individual case documentation, database management, response and follow up. This is an agreed activity under an overall children affected by armed conflict programme, the “Action Plan”.</p> <p>An effort to adopt an M&amp;R system covering other violations and involving a wider body of partners has taken months to establish and has resulted in limited reporting to date.</p>

Country	CPN related structures	Includes M&R?	Other notes
<b>Sudan</b>	In the North, including for Darfur, UNICEF leads a Child Protection Working Group (CPWG). Within this framework, UNICEF convenes a CPWG in each of the three Darfur States. In the South, UNICEF leads a Child Protection Working Group and is developing community-based youth models.	No	The Darfur CPWG structures have tried to adopt a common incident reporting form but synthesized and regular reporting has been limited.

## Annex II – Sample CPN Terms of Reference – Liberia

### Child Protection Working Group Terms of Reference and Workplan for 2005 For discussion and review by the body 1 February and for adoption 1 March 2005

#### Terms of Reference:

The Child Protection Working Group was established by UNICEF in August 2003 to mobilise care and support to children who have been affected by the conflict. The Child Protection Working Group (CPWG) brings together approximately 40 international and national actors working in child protection, including NGOs, UN Agencies, representatives of the Ministry of Gender and Development, the Ministry of Health and Social Welfare, the Ministry of Justice and the Office of the Chief Justice. The ICRC and the Liberian National Red Cross, associations such as the YMCA, YWCA, Boy Scouts and Girl Guides, faith-based organisations, donors, and in some cases journalists, are also encouraged to attend.

#### Objectives:

1. To increase the protection of children from abuse, violence, exploitation and discrimination through identification of critical child protection issues and the development of appropriate response strategies.
2. To plan and undertake coordinated responses to child protection issues through the development of guidelines and standards, by capacity building of Child Protection Agency (CPA) staff and strengthening community support networks.

➤ *Suggested change of name: Child Protection Network or Child Protection Forum*

#### Operational guidelines:

##### Membership

- All member agencies are to:
  - Work with children/ have mandates related to children
  - Be registered with the Government (MPEA/ MOFA)
  - Write a letter applying for membership, including details on areas of focus and mission statement and copies of registration materials.
- The Admission and Disciplinary Committee will vet applications for membership in the Child Protection Network, with representatives of the Committee making at least one visit to their office. The Committee will complete an NGO Evaluation Form (to be developed by the Committee)

##### Conduct, behaviour and disciplinary measures

- The Admission and Disciplinary Committee is responsible for monitoring the work of member agencies, including the Code of Conduct. Staff who are not compliant will face disciplinary action, beginning with a letter of query, investigation, and, when appropriate, sanction from the Network.
- Member agencies will invite Committee members to major meetings to observe organisational conduct and behaviour.

##### Meeting Procedures:

- Meetings are to be chaired by the Ministry of Gender and co-chaired by UNICEF until such time that the Ministry is to take over full responsibility. It is proposed that the meetings are convened at the MGD from 1 March onward.
- Each agency should submit a form to update what their organisation is doing, details of which will be included in the minutes. Only key events should be raised in the meeting. The meetings represent an opportunity to share information, experiences, lessons learnt.
- There will be a theme for each meeting to facilitate substantive dialogue and learning. Mini-trainings are to be held in this meeting time.
- The information shared at meetings will also help the Children's Unit at the Ministry of Gender to stay abreast and provide the required follow-up and advocacy on emerging child rights issues.

- Agencies should submit an update on activities in details three days to meeting date. Events raised in meetings should focus on major issues and activities.
- Meetings should employ a framework of questions that might be asked to probe a particular issue. (*SDP to expand on meaning.*)
- Minutes for all meetings are shared with participants ahead of the next meeting, and will serve as working documents for all members.

## Workplan

### *Priorities for 2005*

1. Reintegration
2. Advocacy for prevention of sexual abuse and exploitation
3. Capacity building, including:
  - Training and standardisation of materials to improve the knowledge base on child rights and child protection
  - Training of care givers and social workers
  - Training of trainers among member agencies
4. Children in institutional care and children without primary care givers

The Child Protection Network will also led observance of several international child rights days, including:

- 15 May- Day of the Family
- 16 June- Day of the African Child- opportunity to lobby for ratification of the African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child
- 19 November- World Day against Child Abuse?
- 20 November World Children's Day
- 1 December- World AIDS Day
- 14 December- International Children's Day of Broadcasting

IN all work agencies will focus on monitoring progress of the Millennium Development Goals: how are they being achieved in our communities?

The Ministry of Gender and Development will also establish the Child Protection Network at the county level.

### *Task Forces and Committees:*

- **Child Welfare Committees and Child Rights Clubs:** To be led by CCF. Each member agency is to establish 2- 3 CWCs in each community in which they are working. See draft guidelines below- first training to be held at next meeting 1/3/05.
- **Task Force to support the UN Study on Violence:** Provide the necessary information and follow-up
- **Task Force on Monitoring and Reporting on Child Rights violations:** working closely with the Ministry of Gender Children's Unit and the National Child Rights Observatory Group
- **Admission and Disciplinary Committee:** To vet membership applications and to monitor work and staff conduct, ensuring compliance with the Code of Conduct.
  - Decide on membership 1/2/05: To include MGD, UNICEF, ANPPCAN, Other national and international agency...
- **Committee to lead Documentation on experiences and lessons learnt:** to be led by SDP
- **Reintegration Core Group**
- **Inter-Agency Task Force on Separated Children**
- **Street Children**
- **Orphanages**
- **HIV/AIDS**
- **Juvenile Justice Forum**

In February, all Committees and Task Forces are asked to meet and develop their plans of action for the year. This information, with details of members and regularly scheduled meetings should be submitted to UNICEF no later than 21 February 2005, to be compiled and shared at the next meeting, 1/3/05.

## **PROCEDURE FOR STARTING A CHILD WELFARE COMMITTEE (CWC)**

### **Submitted by the Christian Children's Fund**

#### *Guiding Principles:*

- Child Participation- We envision a child process of reducing risks to children/youth and ongoing child/youth leadership and participation in reducing risks.
- Ethics- All activities should increase children's well-being and should not put children at risk or damage children's rights.
- Inclusivity- An attempt should be made to structure the CWCs and associated activities to include children and youth as well as adults and to represent diverse sub groups- including different ethnic groups- within the village.
- Partnership- child protection work involves sharing with and mutual contribution by local communities. The CWC members are volunteers, not CPA staff. To express its appreciation and enable their work, CPA can provide logistical support, trainings, etc, but not financial remuneration.
- Gender- The formation of CWCs should allow equal representation of men and women.

#### *Steps:*

1. CPA trainers meet with village leaders, elders, teachers to explain the purpose of the activity.
2. CPAs have sessions with the children. In the process of risk mapping, the children are invited to individually draw a map of their village and what happens there. The children will draw the risks, i.e. where children are afraid. Children will show the protection strategies that would help reduce risks
3. The children decide on the method of presenting their results to the community, where two or three main risks are emphasised. Various methods are possible, including role-play, poetry and songs.
4. CPA practices their presentation with children.
5. A day is organised for the children to present their results to the community.
6. Children present their result to the community. At the community presentation, volunteers are requested to address the risks.
7. CWCs are formed from volunteers of children, youth and adults. CWCs would represent different ethnic groups, different parts of the community, and poor people.
8. CWCs meet with community.
9. CWCs develop action plan for addressing children's risks.
10. CWCs facilitate and monitor implementation of the action plan and share with the community.
11. CWCs monitor results and share them with the community
12. CPA provides regular follow up support throughout the process