CHILD PROTECTION COORDINATION WITHIN THE CLUSTER APPROACH

An Inter-Agency Survey

March 2008

This document summarizes the main findings of an inter-agency survey on child protection coordination within the cluster approach that took place from 30 November to 20 December 2007 and covered Cote d'Ivoire, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Lebanon, Liberia, Mozambique, the Philippines, Somalia and Uganda.

Contents

Child Protection Coordination within the Cluster Approach:
An Inter-Agency Survey

INTRODUCTION

With the introduction of the cluster approach as a key element of the humanitarian reform agenda in 2005, new approaches to sectoral coordination have been developed to improve predictability and accountability for humanitarian action. Several evaluations have been undertaken to date on how clusters are being implemented and progress towards these goals, including review of the protection cluster at field and at global levels.[1]

The global Protection Cluster Working Group (PCWG), as originally established in 2005, comprised nine separate "areas of responsibility" in a unique architecture[2] which was intended to recognize the broad scope of protection as well as the existing technical coordination mechanisms within these areas. The nine areas of responsibility were subsequently reduced in a protection cluster working group retreat in November 2007 to five in order to allow for clearer accountability structures. The inclusion of these elements was considered essential to build a strong foundation for more comprehensive protection strategies with all relevant actors, as well as ensure adequate attention to speciality areas, such as child protection and gender based violence.

Although the protection cluster as a whole has been reviewed as part of the 2007 IASC evaluation and through a variety of real-time evaluations in specific crises, the areas of responsibility have not been well documented to date. As a result, little is known about how child protection is managed, coordinated and organized within the cluster approach. Historically, effective child protection coordination mechanisms pre-date the cluster approach and actors within such structures had rarely partnered with broader protection coordination mechanisms. The protection cluster is the first systematic attempt to bring a diverse profile of protection actors together, including child protection actors in this way.

With the anticipated scaling up of the cluster approach in 2008, there is interest in identifying the various ways in which these new mechanisms are functioning and to better understand opportunities, challenges, roles and shared responsibilities that this new partnership allows. There is an expectation that much could be learned from current coordination practice in "clusterized" countries. A review of how child protection actors are working within broader protection coordination structures will better allow protection actors and child protection advocates to identify joint priorities for policy, technical guidance, or operational support, as well as areas for separate child protection collaboration.

---

[1] Among these are the November 2007 IASC external evaluation and November 2006 IASC Interim Self-Assessment of Implementation.

[2] The current 5 areas of responsibility and their focal point agencies include: Child Protection (UNICEF), Land, Housing and Property Rights (UNHABITAT), GBV (UNFPA/UNICEF), Rule of Law (UNDP/OHCHR), Land Mines (UNMAS). The decision of the PCWG retreat to reduce the number of areas of responsibility remains to be endorsed by the IASC Principles.

In response to this identified need, the child protection membership of the global Protection Cluster Working Group[3] agreed in the fall of 2007 to support an exploratory survey on child protection coordination and the cluster system. The International Save the Children Alliance, International Rescue Committee, UNHCR, OCHA and UNICEF volunteered to conduct interviews and work as an interagency survey team. UNICEF contracted the Women's Commission to oversee the interagency survey, conduct additional case interviews and to draft the compiled report.

AIMS OF THE SURVEY

The survey was designed to be a very light tool to gather baseline information about current child protection coordination mechanisms, perceived relationships between these mechanisms and the protection cluster, and priorities for field support. It was anticipated that this would then provide indications of how the Child Protection Working Group of the PCWG could provide guidance to field-based colleagues in implementing cluster work, and inform a field-based perspective within the PCWG on opportunities or challenges that the introduction of the cluster approach has brought about for child protection coordination mechanisms and actors.

The timing of the survey was determined to allow for preliminary results to be shared with participants and inform the Annual Planning Workshop of the Child Protection Working Group in Geneva, 16-18 January 2008. Final results will be used to inform other stakeholders about child protection within the cluster approach as well.

METHODOLOGY

In order to undertake the survey, a generic questionnaire was drafted to allow for comparative results in the surveys[4]. As mentioned above, a cross-agency team of surveyors was set up comprising UN agencies (OCHA, UNICEF and UNHCR) and NGOs (Save the Children Alliance, International Rescue Committee, Women's Commission for Refugee Women and Children). Within the team it was agreed that the interviews would be confidential, in order to allow for candor. Between November 30th and December 20th 2007, 8 countries were surveyed,[5] and a total of 25 people from UNICEF, UNHCR, OCHA, IRC, the International Save the Children Alliance, NRC, and national NGOs were interviewed[6]. Although most of the interviews took place by phone, some were conducted in person. On average, the interviews took between 1 and 1 ½ hours. All interviewees were field-based, with the exception of a small number of participants who have recently returned from field postings.

---

[3] Current membership includes: International Save the Children Alliance, International Rescue Committee, World Vision International, Terre des Hommes, Women's Commission on Refugee Women and Children, OCHA, UNHCR and UNICEF (as the Child Protection focal point agency). ICRC also participates as an observer.
[4] See questionnaire in Annex 1
[5] Originally, 9 countries were foreseen. However, it proved impossible to interview counterparts in Colombia within the given timeframe. The Women's Commission received a questionnaire from UNHCR Colombia in February 2008. The results therefore reflect mainly the survey of the 8 countries, where several people were interviewed.
[6] See list of interviewees and countries in Annex 2.

The survey was developed primarily as an exploratory tool of how child protection coordination is currently functioning at the field (capital and sub-office) level. With this in mind, many of the survey questions were open to allow for perception and impressions. While these responses were triangulated to a certain degree, the survey methodology did not include cross-checking all information with other sources. The results should not, therefore, be seen as an evaluation of child protection mechanisms nor of field-based protection clusters; rather, the results should be seen as a mapping of concerns, opportunities, weaknesses, and gaps which can be addressed to improve predictability, accountability—and eventually perceived impact—of the new coordination structures[7].

The information collected may therefore be quite subjective. However, in order to diminish the impact of the subjectivity, the same questionnaire was used throughout and a minimum of three different sources were interviewed per country (UNICEF, UNHCR or OCHA and at least one NGO). Where the views are similar, one can assume that this is a fairly accurate reflection of a situation, even though the samples are admittedly small. Where the views differ, they have been left as such in the summary, noting that more in-depth research may be warranted to verify information or to more clearly identify the reason for the discordance. In cases where the discordance was consistent, such as situations where NGOs had a consistently different impression from UN actors, this has been recorded as well.

The survey also sought to reduce the degree of subjectivity by seeking concrete indicators, such as outputs, inter-agency tools or strategies, inter-agency assessments, and other concrete examples of cooperation and coordination within child protection coordination and with the protection cluster [8]. Finally, the interviewees were systematically asked what their requests and recommendations would be to the global PCWG and to the Child Protection Working Group[9]. Both lists of tools and recommendations were completed during the Annual Planning Workshop of the Child Protection Working Group.

To complement the questionnaire, a desk study produced country briefs for each country, drawing on public UNICEF and OCHA sources and humanitarian appeals [10].

SURVEY CONSTRAINTS

Eight countries were identified for their diversity of experience, representing half of the 16 countries where the cluster approach has been implemented. Seven of these countries are ongoing cluster operations (Côte d'Ivoire, DRC, Liberia, Uganda, Mozambique[11], Philippines and Somalia), and one was ex post facto (Lebanon). Three of the countries surveyed have UN peacekeeping missions (Côte d'Ivoire, DRC and Liberia). Two are primarily responding to

---

[7] See compiled chart of findings in Annex 3.
[8] See list of documentation and tools received from the field in Annex 4.
[9] See specific recommendations in Annex 5.
[10] See country briefs in Annex 6.
[11] Although Mozambique phased out its initial cluster after the 2006 floods, it maintained the cluster approach throughout 2007, as part of the country team's emergency preparedness and re-instituted the cluster following the floods in 2008.

disasters (Mozambique and Philippines) while the other six are responding to conflict-generated complex emergencies.

The interview phase of the survey faced several challenges in reaching key informants due to logistical constraints such as poor phone connections with deep field offices, tight time-frames due to the holiday season, and other similar issues. Furthermore, there was an unexpected lack of systematic information at field or global levels on field-based child protection actors and whom to interview within the non-UN community. Despite these constraints, the survey group felt it was nevertheless important to gather information to the degree possible and ensured that responses were indeed collected according to the agreed methodology.

Although it was known that child protection coordination mechanisms vary widely, the range and complexity of the structures was underestimated. Structures varied significantly even within countries, such that the survey would have benefited from more extensive interviews at national and local levels, also with more national and local actors, to better map these variations.

The complexity of the budgeting and financial records did not allow for clear conclusions in terms of an increase or decrease of funding of child protection activities under the cluster approach. The fact that child protection projects are rarely coded as such, but have to be deduced from more generic project descriptions coupled with the inherent challenges of the Financial Tracking Service (FTS)[12] meant that it was extremely difficult to get a clear picture of what was being funded for child protection under humanitarian financing systems. This has led to the observation that more research will be necessary in this area, so as to inform the humanitarian reform process (particularly the humanitarian finance pillar): the existing structures seem to be increasingly complex without sufficient tracking mechanisms to determine whether child protection or other areas of work are adequately funded. Nonetheless, an attempt was made to compile what could be determined as child protection activities in the survey countries, and to match the reported funding received to what had been requested. Due to the complexity of this exercise, it has been postponed to be released at a later date.

Despite these constraints, the survey team found that several observations can be made to achieve the aims of informing planning processes, mapping initiatives, and identifying priorities for additional research, guidance, or support.

MAIN FINDINGS

> *There is a recognized tension between the fear of the child protection agenda being diluted within the broader protection agenda and the opportunities to contribute and shape it*

One of the most consistent and significant findings of the survey was that the majority of child protection actors felt that meaningful participation in the protection cluster was challenging and that there is a strong need to safeguard space for child protection as a stand-alone area of responsibility. Interviewees commonly reported that child protection issues become invisible

---

[12] Such as the voluntary nature of the information

within the overall protection agenda due to competing priorities and different conceptual and opertaional frameworks. Furthermore, several interviewees expressed concern that child protection was not being taken on board by the larger protection group or given adequate attention within the protective response.

Most interviewees felt that it was necessary to maintain a separate space for specialised child protection work. This included organizing or maintaining separate working groups or ensuring that child protection is highlighted in general protection work. In those contexts where child protection is a standing item on the protection working group agenda (DRC, Mozambique, Uganda) interviewees noted this as a positive means of maintaining visibility and awareness of child protection concerns among all actors, even if challenges for mainstreaming remained.

> *While interviewees noted both opportunities and challenges in the cluster approach, it remains too early to determine its value added to pre-existing child protection coordination mechanisms.*

The surveys did not offer a unanimous response as to the value added by the cluster approach to child protection coordination mechanisms. In all the countries surveyed, child protection coordination structures had been set up prior to the introduction of the cluster approach. In most cases, they had been created in the late 1990s or early 2000s. In introducing the cluster approach and coordination around broader protection issues, these functioning structures should be taken into account. Likewise, long-standing coordination fora among child protection actors at an institutional and headquarters level should also be recognized for the wealth of experience, mechanisms, and outputs which have resulted.

Generally, interviewees were still exploring the value added of working within the broader protection cluster. Some interviewees felt that there was great potential for improved coordination, particularly between child protection and other protection actors, but more time will be needed to determine impact on advocacy and programming. In some cases, positive examples of collaboration were cited, including stronger and more coherent advocacy or creating new partnerships across protection sectors (ie. UNDP rule of law activities and UNICEF-managed juvenile justice programmes). Others seemed to struggle with finding examples of effective coordination within the broader protection forum, and, in some cases, even within the UNICEF led child protection reponse under the cluster.

Among the UNICEF interviewees, most seemed to feel that their involvement in the protection cluster had been useful in terms of networking and information exchange with other protection actors. However, given that child protection coordination structures had already been in place before the emergencies (with partners and/or with the government), many felt that the new structures, bringing child protection directly under the umbrella of the protection cluster, had not necessarily added value or introduced new perspectives.

In some cases, interviewees noted that these structures did leverage non-child protection actors to engage more in child protection with positive outcomes. In most cases, the involvement in the protection cluster seems to have been useful in terms of more comprehensive advocacy efforts, as it brought in a broader range of actors and a more unified protection voice.

From the perspective of protection cluster leaders, the involvement of child protection actors in the protection structures often led to very positive outcomes, helping to structure the protection debates around operational activities and providing a good foundation for partnerships.

In the DRC, for example, it was felt that the set up of a Child Protection Working Group under the protection cluster in the eastern part of the country had not only given greater visibility to child protection issues/concerns within the broader protection cluster, but has also thereby increased the chances that child protection projects are prioritised for limited humanitarian funding through the Pooled Fund and CERF mechanisms.

International NGOs often indicated that they were comfortable with the child protection coordination structures in place, although in some cases concrete recommendations for improvement were put forth. Their involvement in the overall protection coordination structures varied greatly; in some cases INGOs did not have access to coordination structures, while in others they withdrew from the protection cluster as it provided no additional value for their targeted child protection work.

National NGOs interviewed seemed to be more challenged in their participation. This was partially due to language barriers and partially due to the fact that they were not well informed about the cluster approach. In some cases, national NGOs were not allowed to participate by cluster members. Somalia offers an interesting exception, as the structures in place were set up mainly for and with national NGOs prior to the cluster approach.

> *Conversely it was felt that the inclusion of child protection actors in the protection cluster allows for an enhanced protection response*

However, the majority of the interviews of the broader protection actors show that they felt the inclusion of child protection actors in the broader protection cluster had enhanced the overall protection response, mainly because the clear focus and the prior coordination experience child protection actors brought the group. In the case of Lebanon, one of the interviewees went even further, saying that the inclusion of the child protection actors in the protection cluster could have been even more beneficial to them, had they wished.

> *For coordination to happen, proper resources must be dedicated*

Overall, the interviewees pointed out the fact that the additional coordination tasks that had been triggered with the introduction of the clusters, required additional personnel resources, which all too often had not been matched. In some cases, interviewees expressed frustration with the amount of time devoted to having to develop coordination structures which seemed to distract from programming, thus reflecting the lack of additional resources that would have been necessary. The attempt to quantify the time resources needed for coordination, as reflected in the country profiles, show that although the estimates varied and would merit further research, in most cases, the coordination became an additional task. The interviewees pointed out that there was a correlation between the amount of staff time that the agencies concerned were willing to

dedicate to the coordination functions and the quality of the coordination and overall relationships. The more staff time was dedicated and budgeted for, the better the coordination, in terms of predictability, and output, both at the national and at the operational field level. In the contexts where specific resources were identified for the coordination tasks, such as in Uganda, Lebanon, Mozambique or in the Philippines, it was felt tha the child protection coordination had been more meaningful and successful, as could be evidenced through increased joint activities and tools developed[13].

This can be shown for instance by the example of Uganda where the fact of having dedicated personnel and financial resources for child protection coordination allowed for the development of common tools and standards, whereas in another context such as Somalia, where no additional resources have been alloted to child protection, this has not been possible.

> *Diverse models of coordination exist*

In the surveyed countries, it became quite apparent that the country context and the prior working methods resulted in the establishment of diverse coordination structures, as well as country specific strategies for linking pre-existing structures to new coordination mechanisms (protection cluster, 1612 monitoring and reporting, government counterparts, etc.) and were less linked to the introduction of a uniform cluster model.

o *Structures*

The survey had anticipated two variations in coordination structures: (a) a subworking group model where child protection is coordinated within a separate coordination structure, and maintains formal reporting lines to the broader protection cluster or (b) a focal point model, where UNICEF and other agencies advocate for child protection issues within the protection cluster without the formal establishment of a separate child protection body.

In reality, the survey found at least four models.
1) *Separate Child Protection Working Group/Subcluster Model*: Separate child protection working groups – whether labelled as a subcluster, subgroup or working group- are organized at both the national and field levels. Uganda adopted a child protection subcluster model.
2) *Focal Point Model:* UNICEF—alone or with other child protection actors—advocates for child protection concerns within the UNHCR-led protection cluster. In Somalia, for example, child protection actors opted for a focal point model because of the limited number of child protection actors in country and at the Nairobi level where national coordination efforts are managed by international actors.
3) *Mixed Model*: (a) Focal Point at National Level, Child Protection Working Group/Subcluster at the operational/field level. DRC opted to maintain a focal point model at the national level because of existing child protection mechanisms, but organized subclusters at the field level due to the large number of child protection-specific NGOs. It is important to note that the establishment of separate child protection working structures – whether at the national or field level- often required substantial negotiation and

---

[13] See Annex 4

discussion between UNICEF and the UNHCR led protection cluster[14]. (b) Child Protection Working Group at national level and Focal Points within the protection clusters at the operational or field level. Lebanon had a Child Protection Working Group in Beirut, but Child Protection Focal Points within the protection cluster in Tyre.

4) ***Child Protection Agency-led Protection Cluster***: In the case of Mozambique, UNICEF and Save the Children co-chaired the protection cluster. In this case, child protection was strongly prioritized with the protection cluster and no separate working group was established for the area of child protection[15]. UNICEF Philipines also co-chaired the protection cluster with the Government at the national level, which consequently took on a strong child protection focus.

In addition, the degree of connectivity between field- based child protection structures and national structures varied greatly. Uganda and Liberia, for example, developed a detailed communication strategy between field-based child protection mechanisms and national-level child protection structures. By contrast, Lebanon field and national child protection structures operated fairly independently. In other countries, integration of field based structures happens more informally via internal UNICEF reporting mechanisms or personal contacts.

In general however it was felt that the more clearly identified a child protection structure was, in terms of model, terms of reference and goals, the more likely the child protection response became complementary to the overall protection response. This was particularly highlighted in Uganda and DRC, where it was stated that the clear child protection coordination structure had led to a better integrated protection response, and that therefore protection had become more dynmaic and was enhanced. Where the links between the child protection coordination structures and the protection coordination were weak or very informal, the mutual impact and benefit were far less obvious.

o ***The composition of the child protection coordination structures varies greatly***

The membership differed ranging from an exclusively UN membership to the inclusion of local and national NGOs. The majority of the child protection coordination structures included a mix of international NGOs and UN; in some cases national or local NGOs (Somalia, Lebanon, Philippines) or even government or UN peacekeeping missions (Mozambique, Liberia, DRC) were included. In some contexts (Côte d'Ivoire, Lebanon), the participation of donors was specifically mentioned.

In certain contexts where the government was included (Liberia, Philippines, Uganda), it was seen to contribute to greater efficiency in terms of concrete impact on the child protection and its coordination, even if at the beginning it had been necessary to agree on "ground-rules" concerning confidentiality and protection of sources.

---

[14] Although some limited IASC guidance is available re: accountability lines between focal point agencies for areas of responsibility and the protection cluster lead, formal reporting lines and requirements remains unclear due to agency mandates and ambiguous language adopted in the December 2005 IASC Principles Note.
[15] Note on natural disasters and challenges related to UNICEF led protection clusters

In the contexts where the military and political components of the UN missions were included, it seems to have been perceived as helpful. But the lingering unease over the risk of having humanitarian interests being subjected to or overruled by political interests was frequently mentioned.

The participation of donors was perceived as ambiguous at best or as potentially counter-productive or intimidating due to the power they potentially wield to influence the (child)protection agenda according to their funding criteria and not necessarily according the needs on the ground.

o **Chairing**

The Chairs of the child protection coordination mechanisms varied as well. In certain cases, it was UNICEF alone, such as in Liberia and Uganda in the capital. In others, it was the government together with UNICEF, such as in the Philippines at the national level and Uganda at the district level. In yet others, NGOs chaired the child protection coordination, either together with UNICEF such as in Mozambique or alone in the provinces such as in Liberia or in one district in Uganda[16], thus playing a significant and often overlooked leadership role. Finally, another model exists in the DRC, where although UNICEF is the lead focal point in the protection cluster in Kinshasa, it shares the chair of the child protection working group on a provincial level with the provincial MONUC Child Protection Adviser (UN Peacekeeping Mission) on issues related to grave child rights violations (monitoring and reporting) and advocacy.

➢ *Current structures still need strengthening to withstand the influence of personalities*

It became clear through the interviews that personalities still play an important role in the efficiency and effectiveness of coordination structures, as well as the delicate interaction between different coordination structures (protection and child protection-specific). Although this can be expected, it does highlight a need for clear guidance in order to limit negative effects of poor leadership or poor participation by members as predictability and scope of the group will be otherwise compromised. In addition to the need for guidance for the child protection coordination structures as to how to coordinate the child protection response, it was also felt that guidance on how to establish clear communication lines as well as on terms of reference would be helpful.

Whereas it may be too early to judge whether this is a systemic issue or part of the growing pains of the humanitarian reform, this finding suggest the need for additional guidance and clarity at the global level to outline clear mandates and expectations in order to strengthen accountability of all actors including UNHCR, UNICEF and NGOs as cluster lead, focal point agencies for the areas of responsibility, or cluster members in light of the Principles of Partnership to which the international humanitarian community has subscribed.

---

[16] In Uganda, at the district level, the Government co-chairs with UNICEF, with the exception of Teso region where CCF is co-chairing with the Government because UNICEF does not have a permanent presence there.

> ➤ *There is a multiplicity of child protection structures and reporting procedures*

It was striking to discover the existence of multiple child protection decision-making structures (UNICEF, peace-keeping mission CPAs, UNDP, governments, child protection in emergencies coordination structures) as well as monitoring and reporting procedures (child protection in emergencies, Security Council 1612 Monitoring and Reporting, non-emergency child protection activities). This was not necessarily percieved as negative, as the varying structures contribute to specific mandates and can indeed lead to positive synergies. However, in situations where there is limited personnel, particularly in contexts of unexpected crises, capacities are stretched and the overall coordination and coherence is affected, especially when the various monitoring and reporting procedures are done by groups with different compositions.

> ➤ *Prior existing child protection coordination structures have mostly been integrated into or linked with the cluster approach*

In all cases, except for one (DRC), previous humanitarian child protection structures have either been integrated within or linked to protection clusters. The only exception is where the current work does not cover previously covered issues (DRC, Mozambique). Uganda provides an interesting example of how prior—and separate—psycho-social coordination mechanisms at the district level transformed into more child protection working groups as a result of activating the child protection sub-cluster. Interviewees reported that they found this had led to a more coordinated and systematic approach to child protection such as the development of national standards on establishing community-based child protection systems. By contrast, in the case of Somalia and Côte d'Ivoire, pre-existing networks remain the locus of child protection decision making, but channel information to the broader protection cluster via informally shared membership or via the focal point agency

> ➤ *There is a lack of institutional guidance on how the area of responsibility of child protection and its coordination fits within the cluster approach:*

Most of the interviewees, with the exception of OCHA and UNHCR[17], stated that they had received little or no guidance on how to implement the cluster approach, or how to coordinate and integrate child protection into the broader protection mechanisms. Most striking, none of the UNICEF staff interviewed received guidance on how to fulfil their role as the focal point agency for child protection within the protection cluster. International NGO partners also have not received adequate guidance from their respective agencies on their role as protection cluster participants.

In addition, despite increased expectations for better coordination and responses under the cluster approach, only UNICEF Uganda dedicated a full time staff member to child protection coordination under the cluster system. In all other cases, limited UNICEF staff time was earmarked for coordination.

---

[17] Some UNHCR staff still reported a need for more guidance and noted the lack of adequate understanding among partners about the cluster approach.

Despite the lack of support and guidance, a variety of functioning structures emerged, without prescriptive guidance other than generic IASC TORs for clusters. Regardless, lack of clear guidance and support seemed to run contrary to the cluster spirit of promoting more predictable and effective emergency responses.

> *The objectives of the clusters and how they relate to the areas of responsibility remain unclear in operational contexts:*

The wide variation in responses as to value added by strengthening coordination between the protection cluster and child protection coordination mechanisms clearly highlighted that many still do not understand the aim of the cluster approach- nor the rationale behind the architecture of the protection cluster. Some saw child protection coordination a mechanism for meaningful coordination, some simply as an information-sharing platform, and still others as a mere fund-raising tool. Not everyone saw it as a tool to foster integrated protection responses or harmonise approaches, let alone joint prioritisation within the protection cluster as a whole, or the areas of responsibility.

The diversity of the responses, although certainly due to differing challenges and contexts, also mirrors the lack of clarity around what "protection" work and "child protection in the humanitarian context" actually consists of. This is also reflected in several contexts where the interviewees expressed their frustration at the fact that cross-cutting issues, such as psycho-social care (Lebanon, Somalia and Uganda), could not be adequately catered for in the protection cluster, nor in any other cluster.

Within the child protection coordination structures, it would appear that the closer the body was to field operations, the more relevant the mechanism became in terms of coordination, joint planning and activities (Uganda, Liberia, and DRC). The further it moved from immediate child-focussed needs, the more the coordination structure seemed to be removed from joint programming to become a tool that was merely useful for advocacy, networking or information sharing purposes (i.e. Somalia). In some contexts, international NGOs mentioned the ambiguity of having UN agencies both as a channel for pooled or CERF funding and the operational and substantive lead agencies at the same time.

CONCLUSIONS

The survey has shown that much still needs to be done to promote more a predictable, effective and reliable response for child protection coordination in emergencies, as well as better integration of child protection within the overall protection cluster structures. The data would warrant further research, but as such has served as a first base-line study of what is currently being done in a variety of situations.

For copies of the full report on the Child Protection Coordination Inter-Agency Survey, please visit the Child Protection Working Group section of the Humanitarian Reform website. (http://www.humanitarianreform.org/Default.aspx?tabid=430)

ANNEX 1

QUESTIONAIRE FOR CHILD PROTECTION ACTIVITIES SURVEY (GENERIC)

BASELINE AND BACKGROUND:
Country:
Date of interview:
Person interviewed: HC/Head of Protection Cluster/Child Protection Focal Point/NGO
Name of interviewee:
Date of posting in the field:
Date of involvement in the protection cluster:

I. DESCRIPTIVE OVERVIEW:
Structure:

> *By getting a clear picture of how the protection cluster is actually organised, and then comparing with the Child Protection set-up, it will be possible to gain a clearer picture of how the interaction works and could work.*

I.I   *Protection structures before the protection cluster was introduced:*

➢ How was CPIE organised before the protection cluster was introduced? Whom was it managed by?

➢ How was the broader protection coordinated?

I.II   *Current structures:*

➢ How is the protection cluster organized at the national level?

➢ How is the protection cluster organised at the field level?

➢ In what manner is child protection represented within that structure?

    o **Sub-group model**: Formal sub-group with representation at the protection cluster?

        ▪ Who coordinates the group?
            • At national level:
            • At field level:
        ▪ What ToRs if any have been developed for the sub-group? *Please share*
        ▪ By whom have they been developed?

- o *Focal point model*: No formal meetings on child protection, but designated CP advocate or expertise within the protection structure?

  - ▪ Who acts as focal point? How does the focal point represent other child protection actors?

- o Have the CP actors developed a joint workplan?

➢ Links with Pre-Existing CPIE coordination structures
  - ▪ Describe what other structures are in place and how (if at all) they link into the protection work
    - At national level:
    - At field level:

  - ▪ If there is a difference between the two, please explain

II. Specifics for Child Protection:

The aim of these questions is to see how the activities are distinguished and coordinated between the protection cluster and the child protection cluster, as well as whether the new Child Protection Area of Responsibility has superseded other pre-existing coordination and responsibility arrangements.

➢ What kind of guidance or information on the roles and responsibilities of the focal point agency/person for the Area of Responsibility for Child Protection have been established?

➢ What staff time is dedicated to the coordination activities for the participation in broader protection coordination activities?

➢ What staff time is dedicated to the coordination in the Area of Responsibility of Child Protection?

- o Is the staff seconded or part of the organisation?

- o If seconded, from where?

- o If no specific dedicated personnel, what percentage of time is used for Child Protection Coordination activities?

➢ How is Child Protection information channelled to the Protection Cluster?

- o At the national level?

- o At the field level?

III. Partnerships:

- ➢ Partnerships
  - o Membership in CP coordination meetings (field and national level); if there are no CP specific structures, please fill out concerning the participation of CP actors in the protection coordination structure:

	National	Field
INGOs		
Local NGOs		
ICRC		
UN agencies		
Government		
Other		

  - o In your opinion, are there other agencies that are not present and that should be involved in cluster work?

  - o **FOR NGOS:** Do you feel that you are actively part of decision making process around key child protection decisions (within the broader protection forum as well as any child protection specific group)? *Please explain*

  - o **FOR UNICEF/HCR:** How do you feel about the quality of engagement from the INGOs and national NGOs (within the broader protection forum as well as any child protection specific group)? *Please explain*

IV. Locus of interagency CPIE Decision Making

- ➢ Where are key interagency Child Protection decisions made on at the national level?

	CP Structure	Protection Cluster	Agency/organisation	Elsewhere (please specify)
Technical concerns				
Policy				
Advocacy				
CP Strategy				
Other				

➤ Where are key interagency Child Protection decisions made at the field level?

	CP Structure	Protection Cluster	Agency/organisation	Elsewhere (please specify)
Technical concerns				
Policy				
Advocacy				
CP Strategy				
Other				

V. Interagency Child Protection Activities initiated, managed within the Protection Cluster (field and national level)

➤ Has an Interagency CP Needs Assessment been conducted by the CP membership of the cluster?
    If yes:
    o By whom?

Interagency	CP Structure	Protection Cluster	Independent agency (1 or several)

    o What was the focus of the assessment?
    o What tools were used? *Please share tools*
    o Did CP information results feed into a broader protection needs analysis?

    If no:
    o Was a needs assessment conducted by the broader protection cluster?
    o What tools were used? *Please share tools*
    o Was child protection integrated into this assessment?
    If responses are negative, what were the obstacles?

➤ What other information management tools have been used to assist Child Protection actors develop a more coordinated response?   (i.e. 3 Ws, child specific geo references, others) *Please share tools*

➤ Have any interagency child protection monitoring and reporting systems been established? What is the purpose and scope of this system?

➤ Is there a broader protection monitoring and reporting system?

- o Does the Child Protection M&R system link in with it? (*If no why not?*)
- o If there is no child protection specific M&R, are child protection concerns integrated into this broader protection M&R?
- o How does the broader protection M&R system link into the child protection M&R system?

➢ Have any joint interagency Child Protection trainings as a result of decision within the protection cluster?

➢ Are there any broader protection trainings? If so, was child protection adequately represented?

➢ What other interagency child protection initiatives have been initiated as a result of the cluster? *Please give examples*

VI. Perceptions of Value Added/No Value Added

➢ What has changed since the cluster approach was adopted? *Please give 1-2 examples*
- o
- o
- o

➢ In your perception, what has the added value of the broader protection coordination been for child protection?
- o Successful collaboration:
- o Challenges:

➢ In your perception, how successful have you been in getting the protection cluster to take up child-specific protection issues on board?

➢ In your perception what is the added value of engaging with the broader protection cluster?

➢ When no value added, impression on why approach not working:

VII. Field Needs/Recommendations for global

➢ What support would you wish for from the global CP membership of the PCWG? (Guidance, coordination training, tools, deployment, technical advice, etc.)

➢ What are your recommendations to the child protection membership of the PCWG for moving forward in efforts to build more predictable response to child protection concerns?

VIII. Sources of information on the humanitarian reform:
The aim of these questions is to establish the interviewee's knowledge about humanitarian reform and whether he/she has received the necessary information and tools.

➢ What is the interviewee's primary source on clusters and the reform?

➢ Has the interviewee participated in a workshop or received other information on the Humanitarian Reform?

➢ What staff time is dedicated/budgeted for to support the protection coordination activities? If there are specific ToRs, please send a copy.

➢ What other clusters have been established?

IX. Questions by the interviewee

X. Additional interviewer's notes and comments:

Follow-up:

ANNEX 2

LIST OF ORGANISATIONS INTERVIEWED IN EACH COUNTRY

Country	Interview 1 (UNICEF)	Interview 2 (UNHCR/OCHA)	Interview 3 (NGO)	Other interviews
Côte d'Ivoire	Yes	OCHA	IRC	UNHCR, NRC
DRC	Yes	UNHCR, Cluster lead	SC, UK	
Lebanon 2006	Yes (3)	UNHCR, Cluster lead OCHA, Surge for protection cluster	Yes	
Liberia	Yes		IRC	
Mozambique	Yes		SC	
Philippines	Yes	OCHA	NNGO	
Somalia	Yes*		CCBRS	
Uganda	Yes	UNHCR	SCiU	

ANNEX 3

COMPILED CHART OF FINDINGS

	Côte d'Ivoire	DRC	Lebanon2006	Liberia
Name	CPF/FPE (Child Protection Forum)	CP Working Group	CP Sub-cluster/Working group	CWC (Child Welfare Committees)
Link to Protection Cluster	CP standing item of PN agenda; structures pre-exist Protection Cluster or Network	Focal point for CP in PC CP = standing item of PC	Updates by Sub-Cluster lead during PC meetings; e-mails	Participation of CP lead agencies & Ministry of Gender from county levels
Membership	UNICEF, SC/UK, SC/S, IRC, UNHCR, OCHA, donors	UNICEF, UNHCR, MONUC CP, SCF, WV, AFSI, NRC, Caritas, Cajed, PAMI, Don Bosco, Children's Voices	UNICEF*, UNHCR*, UNFPA, OCHA, UNDP, WHO, UNODC, SC, EMDH, CARE, ANERA, TdH, InterSOS, Right to play (RTP), IRC, MAG, IMC, WV, CRS, MSF-CH, Samidoun, Arab Resource Collective, Atafaluna, ARCPA, ICRC, LRC, IOM, GoL, donors	UNICEF, UNHCR, UNDP, UNMIL; SC, IRC, WVI, CCF, Samaritan Purse; Search, Find, CAP, Don Bosco, WANEP; Government & ICRC
Observers	ICRC; Government on an ad hoc basis	No	Not mentioned	Not mentioned
Structure	Sub-group of Protection Cluster	At national level: focal point; otherwise: CP WG = working group of PC	Sub-group of Protection cluster	
ToRs	No	Drafted by UNICEF and MONUC CP, consulted with other members of CP WG	No/Yes	Yes; Also: guidelines, referral forms; Stand-by emergency response teams
Chair	UNICEF	UNICEF (represents CP WG and 1612 TF)	UNICEF (Capital and field)	UNICEF with Ministry of Gender (at national level) Lead CP agency (at county level)
Capital based		No	CP Sub-Cluster with lead participating in PC; Focus on advocacy and policy planning	No

Field based; links to capital structure	CPF exist at field level, but not necessarily as a separate structure Links unclear	Feeds into PC (and 1612 TF) phone calls and minutes	Post-emergency: 1 CP WG established with rotating chair - lead participates in PC meetings in capital Focus on implementation	Through participation of county lead CP agencies and Ministry of Gender/Child Welfare
Other CP structures	MONUCI CP; SC 1612 Monitoring (UN only)	Child DDR Commission ; Commission de la protection de l'énfance ; Commission provinciale de lutte contre les violences sexuelles ; SC 1612 Task Force (UNICEF & MONUC CP)	No	DDR coordination (2004) (lead INGO CP in each county) - has been subsumed into broader protection network; TF coordinated by Ministry of Gender on institutionalisation; links into PC network
Priorities	Children in armed conflict	Emergency protection issues; IDP children	UXOs,	Not clear from interviews
Existence of CP structures prior to PC		Yes; still exist and focus on structural/chronic issues: - Child DDR Commission - Commission de la protection de l'énfance - Commission provinciale de lutte contre les violences sexuelles	Not really, but CP coordination; meetings started prior to PC given urgency	
Guidance received		None; personal UNICEF initiative	Discussions with HQ; informal guidance over phone; IASC Website, some written guidance	None

	Mozambique	**Philippines**	**Somalia**	**Uganda**
Name		CP Committee	CP focal point/CP networks	CP Sub-cluster/CP Sub-groups
Link to Protection Cluster	Cluster leads are CP leads	Focal point model: GoP and UNICEF for UN	Through CP focal point	CP standing item on PC agenda; updates through chair of sub-cluster; regular contacts PCWG chair

Membership	UNICEF, WFP, UNFPA, UNAIDS, Save, Concern, Samaritan's Purse, TdH, Oxfam & HelpAge (occasional), government & police (no local NGOs; perceived as a gap)	Plan International, SC-US, WV, UNICEF, IOM, GoP (CP focal point)	At field level: active local NGOs & Somali RC, GoS; Also: SC-UK, NRC, DRC UNDP, UNICEF staff	UNICEF, OHCHR, UNFPA, OCHA, UNDP, IOM, WVI, IRC, CCF, SCiU, AVSI, COPI, Caritas, Warchild Holland, Trans-Cultural Psychosocial Support Organisation, GoU, national NGOs at district level, HCR mainly at district level
Observers		Not mentioned	ICRC not member but collaboration on specific issues	ICRC
Structure		Focal point in capital, separate structures at provincial, municipal and village level	Focal point at capital; field structures	Sub-cluster/Sub-groups
ToRs	Yes; received them (UNICEF interview)	Yes, developed by GoP	Not mentioned	Generic ones used; specific ones to be determined in 2008
Chair	UNICEF-SC	GoP & UNICEF	N/A (UNICEF focal point as there are no other CP actors present in NBI	UNICEF/Local district: GoU & UNICEF
Capital based	Yes; in the field, coordination is government led; not enough other humanitarian actors to warrant separate structures	Yes	Focal point in PC at capital	UNICEF chairs sub-cluster
Field based; links to capital structure	N/A; cluster leads receive updates from colleagues in the field	Yes, through reporting lines of GoP (and of UNICEF)	Links through participation in PC at field level; Institutional reporting lines with UNICEF in NBI; No formal representation agreement w/ other local NGOs	GoU & UNICEF chair sub-group; info fed back through UNICEF & GoU
Other CP structures	OVC; GBV (UNFPA led)	None mentioned	SC 1612 (dual reporting system); Rights monitoring system (HURIDOCs) by Oxfam	SC 1612 (no links to PC)
Priorities		Not clear from interviews	Not clear from interviews	

Existence of CP structures prior to PC	Working groups on thematic issues (orphans, vulnerable children, GBV, legal reform)	Close cooperation between UNICEF and GoP; CP committees pre-exist at different levels; source of UNICEF regular planning	Only at field level (CP networks)	Existed at district level, but not at national level
Guidance received	Yes (not clear from interviews from whom)	Yes, Regional emergency advisor & colleagues with prior cluster experience	None	None specifically; meeting with other CP cluster colleagues from DRC & Chad to share tools and practices

ANNEX 4

LIST OF DOCUMENTATION AND TOOLS RECEIVED FROM THE FIELD

CÔTE D'IVOIRE:
None

DRC :
- ➢ Needs Assessment Tool (done by the protection cluster)
- ➢ ToRs for child protection working groups
- ➢ Standards of protection for IDPs in camps ("Standards de protection dans les sites de déplacés")
- ➢ Referral forms (« Formulaires de référence »)

LEBANON:
- ➢ CP RA tool adapted and developed by CP Sub-Cluster (September 2006)
- ➢ Rapid assessment form on CP training needs (December 2006)
- ➢ UNHCR developed a Protection Assessment tool

LIBERIA:
- ➢ CP Monitoring tools
- ➢ ToRs

MOZAMBIQUE:
- ➢ UNICEF developed child protection and protection assessment tools
- ➢ Inter-agency reporting procedures for women and children to report abuses in camps
- ➢ Tracing forms in Portuguese

PHILIPPINES:
- ➢ Manual developed by National Disaster Coordinating Committee on disaggregated data for child protection in emergencies

SOMALIA:
- ➢ SOP for GBV casework

UGANDA:
- ➢ Needs analysis tool developed for assessing floods
- ➢ Conducted IA assessment of children in North left in so-called "mother camps" as families return closer to farm lands and leave children behind where there are services, through the CP sub-cluster
- ➢ In Lira, Save the Children and the district government led an assessment of street children and developed an interagency plan for family tracing and reunification
- ➢ Developed standard form for monthly reporting for child protection committees

- Mapping of services at the district level to strengthen/facilitate referrals system
- Developing 5 modules for training community based groups on child protection
- Developing minimum standards for community based child protection structures
- Rules on confidentiality (developed by protection cluster)

ANNEX **5**

SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE FIELD AND THE ANNUAL PLANNING WORKSHOP OF THE CHILD PROTECTION WORKING GROUP

GUIDANCE & POLICY:
- Need for a CP conceptual framework that goes beyond worst forms of abuses
- Strategy/policy development for child protection
- Models of responses depending on scale of emergency (ex. on how to set up child-friendly spaces)
- Guidance on role of focal points
- Guidance on data collection priorities (differing views among agencies)
- System & standards (CCCs)
- Broad agreement from HQ on what the key issues are (also inter-agency)
- Guidance on advisability of inter-agency needs assessment
- Need to have both PC and specific CP group
- Need for clearer definition of protection and of CP and accountability
- Guidance on clusters, etc. (need especially for L-NGOs)
- Orientation on cluster approach, especially as related to CP
- Technical standards that are more relevant to emergencies that are not in conflict-setting
- Guidance on protection needs associated with HIV/AIDS and prevention
- Guidance on how/whether to engage government in protection
- Clear guidelines for protection
- Guidance on ToR & how to overcome mandate focus
- Specific guidance on children and justice, programmatic guidelines
- Technical support in all fields/issues of child protection
- Develop strategy in service provision and coordination of child protection activities
- Advocating within the cluster for development strategy and policy for child protection
- Guidance on inclusion of authorities, L-NGOs
- Conceptual framework on CP, inclusive of risk categories as well as broader considerations of holistic protection of children.
- Communication lines to PCWG for input

CAPACITY-BUILDING:
- Coordination training
- Insertion of CP in IDP protection training
- Training on cluster approach and skills for CP lead
- Support for capacity building of government to take lead role
- Training modules on protection cluster (capacity building of government)
- Field level training on CP and broader protection issues

TOOLS:
- Guidelines for specialised areas

- Child protection check-list
- Practical tools: 1 pager on cluster
- User-friendly versions of existing tools in appropriate languages

INFORMATION MANAGEMENT:

- Protection assessment tools
- Standardised needs assessment tools
- Introducing effective M&E system and training to the field staff
- Establishment of focal point/person and data base system in the cluster coordinate and collect for child protection information
- Guidance on links to 1612 task force and mechanisms

KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT:

- Establishment of child protection resource centre in the country for advocacy, training, researching, documenting and disseminating related protection issues for the longer-term sustainability
- Assist in improving information sharing system
- Concrete case studies from other contexts
- Good practice and lessons learned in effective coordination mechanisms elsewhere
- Organize experience sharing in regional and international levels for child protection
- Exposure visits in regional and international levels

DEPLOYMENT & TECHNICAL SUPPORT:

- Rapid deployment from HQ
- Additional human resources in case of emergency
- Availability of experts on specific thematic areas such as DDR, juvenile justice, etc. and for M&R, transition from emergency to recovery

OTHER:

- Development of further advantageous initiatives on child protection
- Updates on developments and tools
- Mainstreaming and integrating child protection activities with other humanitarian endeavours

ANNEX **6.1**

COTE D'IVOIRE

I.   Background information

a. Humanitarian context

Due to the deteriorating politico-military crisis following the violence that erupted from the September 2002 coup that led to the country being split in two with the North under rebel control and the South under the government, Cote d'Ivoire remains one of the most complex protection crises in the region. Since 4th March 2007 with the signing of the Ouagadougou Peace Agreement (OPA) by the President and the Forces Nouvelles, the political context has improved significantly and the country is moving from a humanitarian to an early recovery and development scenario. However, the implementation of the Peace Agreement has suffered several setbacks, including the challenges of slow redeployment of public administration in former rebel zones, poor basic social services, insufficient protection mechanisms and non-existent functional judicial systems. These continue to negatively affect the lives of children and women.

Due to the violence, the Ivorian crisis provoked the internal displacement of some 700,000 civilians in five over the eighteen administrative departments of the country. Particularly the West has suffered from the consequences of the conflict leading to an important number of Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) leaving the region to find refuge in the South, as well as from the north with thousands fleeing to the urban areas of Abidjan, Grand-Bassam and Yamoussoukro. Others have settled in communities of the same ethnic origin in the western and south-western parts of the country. There are about 8,000 IDPs in camps while the remaining have relied mainly on the goodwill of host families and receiving communities which has made their plight less visible to the humanitarian community as well as made it more difficult to reach them and assess their situation. With the long duration of the displacement, tensions have increased in the host communities due to the deteriorating economic conditions and increased competition for scarce resources. Small-scale displacement continues, following violent incidents in the "Zone de Confiance", the buffer zone between the north and the south patrolled by French troops and UN peacekeepers.

A major cause of concern have been the inter-community tensions, particularly in the west of the country that have been exacerbated by land disputes and differing political affiliations resulting in the mass displacement of communities including a large number of children. Some localized displacement had already occurred before 2002, due to these disputes and tension between local and migrant communities. This has been directly linked to the issue of nationality – one of the principal causes of the armed conflict in Cote d'Ivoire. An estimated 26% of the Ivorian population is of foreign origin, as migration has been a common phenomenon in the area. Access has remained difficult following security concerns and a climate of distrust. However, with the Peace Agreement signed, facilitating the safe and dignified return and resettlement of IDPs has become the focus of the humanitarian response.

The country faces severe challenges with the deteriorating economic climate and social indicators, notably in the West and North-West of the country. In these areas, some 10% of under-five children suffer from some form of acute malnutrition, and only 60% of the population has access to improved drinking water sources.[18] Overall access to and quality of health care is very low and preventable or easily treated diseases remain the main killers of children and women: 50% of all infants and 67% of pregnant women are not immunized against vaccine-preventable diseases. Malaria remains the principal cause of mortality in under-five children. Mortality rates include: infant mortality rate at 90 per 1,000 live births (in 2006); under-five mortality rate at 127 per 1,000 live births (in 2006); and maternal mortality ratio at 540 per 100,000 live births (between 2000 – 2005).[19] In the Centre and North regions, 80% of basic social service structures were not functioning because of the war. Efforts by the international community have helped

---

[18] Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey 2006, see UNICEF Humanitarian Action Report 2008, Cote D'Ivoire.
[19] From *The State of the World's Children 2008* and *Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey 2006*, see UNICEF Humanitarian Action Report 2008, Cote D'Ivoire

to improve access to basic social services in the North, East and West regions of the country, where healthcare services are provided by rehabilitated health infrastructures. In the poor districts of Abidjan, *s*anitary conditions – including the dumping of toxic waste – remain fragile.

Cote D'Ivoire is the West Africa country most affected by the HIV/AIDS pandemic, with an estimated prevalence rate at 4.7%. The increasing feminization of the epidemic means that the rate is at 6.4% for women, and a high number of some 450,000 children are orphaned by HIV/AIDS.[20].

The basic lack of right to education for approximately 700,000 children, mostly displaced children, remains a challenge due to the shortage of teachers, the deterioration of school infrastructures, high drop-out rates, and a lack of certification of education.[21] An alarming 45% of all school-aged children remain out of school, with 59% of boys and 51% of girls enrolled in school, and significant disparities between rural and urban areas.

The peacekeeping operation, the United Nations Operation in Code D'Ivoire (UNOCI) was created with UN Security Council Resolution 1528 in 2004 under Charter VII. This replaced the former UN mission MINUCI.

In terms of natural disasters, Cote D'Ivoire faced the effects of the floods in August 2007. While the region faces floods every year in the rainy season from May to October, 15 countries in West Africa, including Cote D'Ivoire suffered from some of the worst floods in 35 years.[22]

b. Protection concerns

Persistent violations of human rights and humanitarian law, including gender-based violence, affect particularly internally displaced persons. With inter-community tensions, widespread impunity, weakened traditional protection structures, and increased poverty; protection remains a priority action sector.

Some IDPs living in poor districts of Abidjan are exposed to violent attacks at any time or repeated destruction of their property without any sign of protection from Government forces. In addition to their precarious condition, IDPs in Abidjan are now particularly affected by the dumping of toxic waste at various sites in the city.

Gender-based violence

The politico-military crisis in Côte d'Ivoire led to the weakening of basic social services and traditional protection structures and to increased poverty, leaving children and women more vulnerable to all kind of sexual exploitation, abuse and violence. Rape and other serious incidents of sexual violence against children, especially girls, take place with alarming frequency in a climate of impunity. Children often suffer sexual abuse and have no access to medical, psycho-social or legal assistance and cases are often ignored or tolerated. This is closely linked to an increase in STI transmission rates.

The abduction of children is often associated with trafficking and forced prostitution. Between Côte d'Ivoire and the countries of the Mano River Union (Sierra Leone, Liberia and Guinea), crossing borders is frequent, favoured by cultural and ethnical values and languages shared by communities from each side, by intensive trading including illicit trafficking, and border permeability. Children living in border areas are particularly exposed to exploitation, violence and abuse; these risks are multiplied in the context of armed conflict.

Since the beginning of the crisis and in spite of the signing of the OPA, women and girls are reportedly subjected to sexual abuse. Generalized violence, sexual abuse, rape and the exploitation of children have become commonplace. With the relative absence of any form of administration in the Central, Northern and Western zones, and the decay of

---

[20] UNICEF Humanitarian Action Report 2007
[21] UN SC Report of the SG on children and armed conflict in CDI, August 2007
[22] OCHA Natural Disaster Bulletin no. 8/October 2007

legal institutions, women and children's vulnerability has increased. They are also particularly vulnerable to the overall deteriorating economic conditions and have reportedly resorted to prostitution/ survival sex to support their families.

Crimes committed against children, particularly rape, are generally perpetrated by civilian criminals who may include elements of the armed groups taking advantage of the insecure environment.[23]

In terms of harmful traditional practices, the national rate of female genital mutilation (FGM) among women between 15 – 49 years of age is estimated to be at 36.4%, with significant regional differences (12.6% in the Centre and the East and 88% in the West and North).[24]

c. Child protection concerns

In the prevailing state of insecurity, breakdown of law and order and the administration of justice have led to the most basic rights of children being violated. This includes an alarming rate of violence against children at the community-level. There is also a persistent culture of impunity for crimes against children.[25] Children are facing several urgent humanitarian challenges:
1. The protection of IDPs and host families - especially in Government-controlled areas in the West and in the Zone of Confidence;
2. Children associated with armed forces, estimated at around 4,000 (2003).[26]
3. The increasing number of cases of gender-based violence and child survivors of rape and other forms of sexual violence, including exploitation and abuse in a climate of impunity.

i. Children in Armed Conflict:
The militarization of the civilian population, including children, has been ongoing in a divided country and a context of inter and intra community conflicts. Armed groups have recruited children, including girls. A Prevention, Demobilization and Reintegration (PDR) programme has been implemented, and psychosocial and educational activities for vulnerable children have been developed. However, these actions only reached a small number of children and they need to be extended.

ii. Security Council Resolution 1612:
Cote d'Ivoire was designated as a priority situation for the first phase of implementation of the monitoring and reporting system of Security Council Resolution 1612 (2005). The Security Council Working Group (SCWG) receives a bimonthly "horizontal note" covering concerns. Under concerted pressure from the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Côte d'Ivoire and from UNICEF, the armed group 'Force Nouvelles' submitted an action plan to prevent recruitment and to release children associated with their forces.[27] In September 2007, the UN Special Representative for Children and Armed Conflict Radhika Coomaraswamy recently visited CDI, and obtained commitments from the Government and non-Government actors with regard to the protection of children and, more specifically, in relation to sexual violence and children associated with armed groups and armed forces. The Government has committed itself to setting up of an inter-ministerial structure and ensuring that these issues are given priority and receive the necessary resources, in collaboration with international community and civil society. In addition, a national action plan to end sexual violence will be developed with the assistance of United Nations system. Negotiations are also underway to establish a charter for the protection of children and to reform the justice system, taking the needs of children into account.

---

[23] UN SC Report of the SG on children and armed conflict in CDI, August 2007

[24] CAP Cote D'Ivoire 2008, p.8

[25] UN Security Council Report of the Secretary-General of children and armed conflict in Cote D'Ivoire, 30th August 2007

[26] CAP 2007, p.20

[27] Office of the Special Representative to the Secretary General on Children in Armed Conflict
http://www.un.org/children/conflict/english/17oct2007stateme223.html

II.   Child protection in emergencies – coordination structures

Highlights:

Model used: Sub-working group model (Child protection coordination structures are a sub-body of the protection cluster)

Locus of decision taking on child protection issues: CPF takes the lead

Staff time dedicated to child protection coordination (UNICEF, NGO)

a.   Child protection coordination structures pre-dating the introduction of the cluster approach

i.   Protection Network:

A protection network has existed since April 2005 under the chairmanship of OCHA. This transitioned into the protection cluster working group (PWG) in 2006 upon the recommendation of the Emergency Relief Coordinator (ERC).

Members of the Protection Network (PN) included:
Chair: OCHA
Government: None
UN: FAO, UNFPA, UNHCR, UNICEF, UNOCI (Human Rights Division, Child Protection Adviser, Gender Adviser), WFP
Other organizations: IOM, ICRC as observer

INGOs: CARE, IRC, Save the Children (SC-UK, SC-Sweden), Solidarités
LNGOs: No information

ii.   Child Protection Forum (CPF):

A Child Protection Forum existed within the Protection Network and continues to function in Abidjan as a sub-body of the Protection Cluster since 2006. Meetings are scheduled twice a month and on an ad hoc basis when required. While priority areas have included forced labour, trafficking, protective education environment, juvenile justice, birth registration, unaccompanied and separated children, SGBV, the real focus has remained on Children Associated with Armed Forces (CAAF).[28]

Members of the CPF: The TORs do not state an official chair, but refers to a rotating chair among members.
Current chair: UNICEF
Government: No participants
UN: OCHA (joined in 2007), UNHCR
Other organizations: ICRC as an observer
INGOs: IRC, SC-Sweden, SC-UK
LNGOs: No information

---

[28] According to the perceptions of some interviewed, this focus on CAAF has overshadowed other issues.

TORs: for the CPF have been in existence since February 2006[29] with the primary focus being Children Associated with Armed Forces (CAAF).

b. Child protection coordination structures and the protection cluster

Since the adoption of the Protection Cluster, the CPF has been formally included as a sub-body in the TORs, However, there are no means of ensuring regular reporting or inclusion other than overlapping membership. Since September 2007, there has been an effort to address wider child protection issues. [30]

i. Child protection and general protection coordination at national level:

1. Protection Cluster Working Group (PWG)

Under the leadership of UNHCR, the Protection Cluster was established as the first and only cluster in CDI in August 2006. This followed from the violence that took place in mid-January in Guiglo which resulted in displacement and human rights violations of IDPs. The events drew the Emergency Relief Coordinator (ERC) Jan Egeland to visit Cote D'Ivoire in February and recommending the establishment of a Protection Working Group for IDPs. UNHCR convened a meeting that same month and drew up a funding proposal that was supported through the CERF to respond to the protection needs in monitoring, liaison, and capacity-building of local authorities. In April 2006, Cote D'Ivoire received another high profile UN representative: the Special Representative of the Secretary General (SRSG) for the human rights of internally displaced persons Walter Kalin, who highlighted the need to address the challenge of internal displacement in the country.[31]

Members in Abidjan: The group meets on a monthly basis and includes the following:
Chair: UNHCR
Government: The original TORs mention the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Ministry of Solidarity and Victims of War, however, there is no government involvement in the cluster meetings
UN members: OCHA, ONUCI (Human Rights Department HRD), UNDP, UNFPA, UNICEF, UNHCR, WFP, later including FAO, UNAIDS, WHO,
Organisations: IOM, later including ICRC as an observer
INGOs: CARE, IRC, Save the Children UK and Sweden, Search for Common Ground, later including Afrique Secours et Assistance, Danish Refugee Council (DRC), Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC)
LNGOs: No local NGOs are present

TORs: The Cluster TORs were developed and later modified from "IDP Protection" to "Protection in March 2007.

2. Child Protection Forum

A Child Protection Forum existed within the Protection Network and continues to function in Abidjan as a sub-body of the Protection Cluster since 2006. Meetings are scheduled twice a month and on an ad hoc basis when required. Priority areas have included forced labour, trafficking, protective education environment, juvenile justice, birth registration, unaccompanied and separated children, SGBV.

Members of the CPF: The TORs do not state an official chair, but refers to a rotating chair among members.
Current chair: UNICEF
Government: No participants
UN: OCHA (joined in 2007), UNHCR

---

[29] Hard copy of TORs available.

[30] Based on perceptions from the interviews in CDI, the general view seems to be that this is a UN-led structure. The focus of the CPF has remained on Children Associated with Armed Forces (CAAF), without other issues being discussed

[31] UNHCR document : Stratégie de réponse a la problématique de protection des personnes déplacées internes en République de Côte d'Ivoire, 29 Avril 2006

> **Other organizations**: ICRC as an observer
> **INGOs**: IRC, SC-Sweden, SC-UK
> **LNGOs**: No information

TORs: for the CPF have been in existence since February 2006[32], with the primary focus being Children Associated with Armed Forces (CAAF).

Links with Child Protection actors: There is a formal link between the CPF and the Protection Working Group within mutual TORs - the former is included into the latter as a sub-body. However, there is no consistent focal point or reporting mechanism between the two structures. As child protection is *not* a stand-alone item on the agenda of the Protection Cluster, the issues are largely dependent on child protection actors providing a voice to child protection. In Guiglo, there is no separate CPF, and members participate in the broader protection coordination.

ii. Child protection and general protection coordination at the field level:[33]

There is some discrepancy regarding where the protection cluster is established at the field level, those groups noted included the locations of Guiglo, Bouake, and Tabou/San Pedro.

No information on the CPIE Coordination structures at the field level. It would seem that the child protection actors participate in the field level protection coordination mechanisms. There are no systematic reporting lines between the Abidjan CPF or the PWG and the field level. Thus, field level issues are not necessarily fed into strategic discussions at the national level. It appears that the field structures are more inclusive in comparison to the national level. However, in Guiglo (in mid-2007), no LNGOs or Government representatives were present at protection meetings.

c. Other child protection coordination mechanisms
i. UN Security Council Resolution 1612:

A monitoring and reporting national task force in relation to UNSC Resolution 1612 has been established since October 2006. However, this does not include NGOs.

> **Members of UNSC 1612 M&R**:[34]
> **Co-chairs**: UNICEF Representative and the DSRSG/HC.
> **Government**: None
> **UN**: integrated mission ONUCI/Child Protection section, other UN members
> **INGOs**: No NGOs
> **LNGOs**: No NGOs

CPF & 1612: The CPF has no formal links to the monitoring and reporting mechanism for SC Resolution 1612. Coordination occurs only when members overlap.

ii. Other

1. Governmental structure:

The Comité National pour la Protection de l'Enfance (CNPE) is chaired by the Ministry of Family and Social Affairs. The group has met only a few times so far. The aim of this body is to build coordination with Government and LNGOs. UNICEF supports the CNPE as part of its workplan for 2008.

---

[32] Hard copy of TORs available.

[33] The perceptions of those interviewed were that all structures function more effectively at the field level, particularly in Guiglo.

[34] Some interviewees perceived the political dimension brought in by ONUCI to be outweighing technical expertise in humanitarian issues

2. Commission d'Appui et de Vérification

UNICEF took the initiative to put in place a Commission d'Appui et de Verification in order to ensure the effective implementation of plans of action against child recruitment into armed forces which were signed by the armed forces of the Forces Nouvelles (FAFN). Members of the commission include: ICRC as an observer, IRC, OCHA, UNICEF, UNUCI, Save the Children Sweden and UK. [35]

3. Monitoring mechanism by NRC and UNHCR

A monitoring mechanism is being tested by NRC and UNHCR. However, children were not included in this until UNICEF highlighted the need to incorporate children in this mechanism.

d. Joint child protection activities and initiatives
i. Child protection specific

No joint Child Protection assessments have been undertaken. No inter-agency child protection trainings have taken place, although individual agencies have carried out their own trainings.

ii. With the inclusion of child protection actors

An inter-agency needs assessment composed of OCHA, UNHCR, UNICEF, IOM, and IRC took place between the 4th and 9th of April 2006 in the North ("zone de confiance", returnee location), as well as in displacement zone in the west to identify the protection concerns and look into durable solutions for return and reintegration of IDPs.

Training: Since the activation of the Cluster, joint training has been organized by OCHA, NRC and UNHCR on the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement for national and local authorities, civil society, members of the armed forces, the *Forces Nouvelles*, as well as for national and international NGOs

No workshop on humanitarian reform has been held perhaps due to the exceptional set-up of the One-Cluster approach in CDI, although OCHA's Humanitarian Reform Support Unit (HRSU) is planning to hold a workshop on the Cluster Approach in January 2008.

---

[35] See TORs on Commission d'Appui et de Vérification, October 2007

III. Funding of CPIE coordination activities

Summary from the CAP Review (2007):

Cote d'Ivoire	4 child protection projects
	39% of child protection request funded
	3 out of 4 projects received 0 funding
	48% of overall protection funded
7%	**of sector funding for child protection**
0.9%	**of total CAP funding for child protection**
13%	**of total CAP funding for overall protection**

In 2007, Cote d'Ivoire received a total **of $32.5 million** in humanitarian assistance. The largest amounts came from non-earmarked funds by the UN amounting to $8.9 million (28% of total funding); CERF allocations that reached $6.5 million or 20% of the grand total; and US funding of $3.9 million or 12% of the total amount. Most of this came through the CAP appeal, amounting to 92% of all humanitarian funding, while $2.7 million or 8% of the total funding was channeled outside of the CAP mainly through NGOs. Other humanitarian funding outside the Appeal amounted to $2.7 million but did not appear to fund child protection activities.[36] In sum, through inter-agency emergency funding mechanisms **child protection** appears to have been financially supported merely through the CAP, with only one out of the four submitted projects funded at $280,140 or 39% of the total child protection project requests, representing 7% of the Protection sector funding or 1% of the total CAP funding.

In 2006, Cote D'Ivoire received a total of $38.3 million in humanitarian assistance, of which the CAP covered $22.7 million or 59% of the total funding. The largest allocations in 2006 were received from ECHO at $8.3 million or 22% of the total funding, Sweden at $6.9 million or 18%, and the CERF at $5.8 million or 15%. **Child Protection** was funded through the CAP at $1.2 million, which represented 151% of the appealed amount, 34% of the Protection sector funding and 5% of the total CAP funding. Additional funds outside of the Appeal totaled to the amount of $14.8 million and appear to have included child protection projects amounting to **$3.6 million**. This includes: an IRC project "Protection of self demobilized children in Western CDI funded at $270,000; SC-UK "Assistance humanitaire aux enfants et familles affectes par les conflits arms l'Ouest de la CDI" for $311,710; IRC "To maximize protection of women and girls from GBV through improved survivor support etc" at $280,330; SC-Sweden "Humanitarian Support to children in conflict situation" at $2.7 million. [37]

a. **CERF**:

Following an outbreak in violence in Guiglo in January 2006, Cote D'Ivoire was among the first countries to accede to the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) when it was launched in March 2006. Since then, CDI has received a total of $14.3 million between March 2006 and January 2007 for both life-saving and under-funded interventions. This has included four allocations for **Protection/Human Rights/Rule** amounting to **$1.6 million or 11% of the total CERF funding**. **None of this funding has specifically targeted Child Protection**.[38]

---

[36] Judging from the project titles, no child protection projects were funded outside the CAP. Non-CAP funding amounting to $2.7 million assisted 10 projects and was channeled through CARE, ICRC, IRC, MSF, SC-UK, TdH, WFP, and the Swiss Embassy. See FTS Table H,
http://ocha.unog.ch/fts/reports/daily/ocha_R4_A736___08013107.pdf

[37] As there is no breakdown of the project or figures available, it is not clear that all these projects really are CP related.

[38] CERF website:
http://ochaonline.un.org/cerf/CERFFigures/CERFFigures/CountriesreceivingCERFfunds/tabid/1799/Default.aspx

In 2007, CDI received $8.5 million of CERF funding through the under-funded emergency window. This included one allocation to Protection through the IOM at $310,300 or a mere 4% of the total funding for that year.[39] Child Protection did not receive any funding through the CERF.

In 2006, CERF funding amounted to almost 16% of the total humanitarian funding received. The allocation of $5.8 million supported 13 projects through the rapid response and under-funded windows to respond to the least-funded sectors of protection, health, and sanitation sectors. Out of this sum, $4.7 million went to UN/IOM implementation; $1.1 million went to implementing partners.[40].Three allocations related to protection amounting to $1.3 million or 22% of the total funding received that year.[41] These projects focused on IDP protection. However, **none of the funding went towards Child Protection**.

b. Consolidated Appeals Process (CAP):

Since 2002, the Consolidated Appeals Process (CAP) of Cote D'Ivoire had not been adequately funded while some sectors remained under-funded.[42]

In 2007: Funding received through the CAP in 2007 amounted to 92% of all humanitarian funding received for CDI that year which totaled $32.5 million. However, the appeal was one of the least-funded of CAPs: out of the appeal for $56.4 million later revised downwards to $54.6 million, it was funded at $29.8 million or only 55% of the request. The largest allocations to the CAP came through was through un-earmarked funds by the UN amounting to 30% of the funding or $8.9 million; the CERF with 22% of the funding or $6.5 million; the US with 10% or $3 million.[43]

Funding for agencies: In terms of relevant agencies and organizations requesting for funding, through the CAP 2007, **UNHCR** as Cluster Lead for Protection, originally required $13 million to cover its five projects including one Protection related project for $6 million, which was revised down to $9.9 million.[44] UNHCR received 81% of the latter, or $8 million. **UNICEF** initially appealed for $19 million to cover 17 projects including three for Child Protection **activities the cost of which** amounted to $2.1 million**, with a drop in requirements falling to** $9.7 million, and UNICEF received a mere 46% of the latter or $4.5 million. **UNFPA** requested $3.5 million revised to $2.3 million to include funding for two Protection Cluster projects amounting to a total of $1.2 million.[45] UNFPA was funded at 47%. **NGO** projects comprised 19% of all projects within the CAP and eight NGO projects were funded amounting to $4.6 million or 15% of all CAP funding for 2007. The NGOs, DRC and NRC, which included protection related projects were relatively well-funded. Three NGO projects were included within the Protection Cluster requirements: DRC for $905,000, and two for NRC for a total of $2 million.[46] In total, DRC requested $2 million, revised to $1.2 million, and received $1.2 million or 91% of the requests. NRC requested a total of $2.6 million, revised upwards to $3.7 million, and received $2.7 million or 74% of the requested amount.

Protection Cluster funding: The component for **Protection/Human Rights/Rule of Law** within the CAP originally requested $14 million for 12 projects of which four were Child Protection ones. This figure was decreased however, by almost half to $8.7 million to cover 22 projects**. The Cluster received a relatively low amount of funding of $3.3

---

[39] Allocated in October to IOM; IDP protection related, see CERF website:
http://ochaonline.un.org/Default.aspx?tabid=1801

[40] IOM for protection, UNICEF for water and sanitation, WHO for health, FAO for food; and the following NGOs for protection: AWECO, GNSK Alpha, UVPAP, SODECI, Protection Apparatus

[41] 2006 CERF funding for Protection/Human Rights/Rule of Law included two IOM projects at $250,000 and $272,100, and a UNHCR project at $274,500 – specific information on these projects not available on the CERF website: http://ochaonline.un.org/Default.aspx?tabid=1800

[42] See CERF website,

[43] January 9th 2007, FTS: http://ocha.unog.ch/fts/reports/daily/ocha_R21_Y2007___08010307.pdf

[44] Protection of Internally Displaced Persons and provision of basic needs, see CAP Cote D'Ivoire 2007, p.8

[45] UNFPA Protection projects included support for war-displaced women at $770,000, and reconstitution of civil status facts for $430,000.

[46] DRC project on return assistance $905,000; NRC project on protection of returnees $1.5 million, as well as information, counseling and legal services $500,000

million or **38%** of the total request. In terms of percentage of funding in relation to requests, the Protection Cluster received the second lowest coverage after the Food Cluster. In all, the Protection Cluster received 13% of the CAP funding.

Child Protection funding: The financial tracking system for the CAP groups the protection projects by cluster and by sector with the latter including human rights and rule of law. Within the Protection Cluster and the Protection sector,[47] four projects are directly related to **Child Protection**[48] amounting to a total request for $1.8 million, revised downwards to **$714,280** to cover two projects. However, **only one out of four CP projects received funding at $280,000** or 39% of the required request. Within the framework of the Protection Cluster, this **sum for child protection represents 7% of the total Protection Cluster funding received or 0,9% of the total CAP funding in 2007.**

Project Title	Appealing agency	Original requirement	Revised requirement	Funding USD	% Covered
Protection, social and family care, reintegration of children directly victims of the conflict.	UNICEF	$537,140	$537,140	$280,140	52%
Fighting sexual violence against children in 11 districts of Western, Northern and Central Côte d'Ivoire.	UNICEF	$888,100	0 (Withdrawn)	$0	0%
Identification and prevention of children's rights violations along the border of Western Côte d'Ivoire.	UNICEF	$347,750	0 (Withdrawn)	0	0%
Protection from gender-based violence and support to girls' and women's rights during the peace and reconciliation phase.[49]	UNICEF	0	$177,138 (Additional project included in the West Africa CAP 2007)	0	0%

---

[47] Several projects notably on IDP protection are not directly related to child protection but benefit women and children. These have not been included in the calculations on specifically child protection activities: UNFPA "Pilot project on Reconstitution of civil status facts in the Departments of Bouaké, Man and Vavoua"; for reveised amount of $200,00, funded at 0%; IOM project on "Assistance to internally-displaced persons in Côte d'Ivoire, particularly in the West zone" which also covers 4,862 children (0-14 years), request for $1 million; NRC project "Protection of returned IDPs through reconstruction of housing and public infrastructure" of which the majority of beneficiaries were marked as women and children for $1.5 million;

[48] Some CP projects were in the original appeal but not in the revised version, and vice versa. See: CAP Cote D'Ivoire Mid-Year Review 2007: http://ochadms.unog.ch/quickplace/cap/main.nsf/h_Index/MYR_2007_CdIvoire/$FILE/MYR_2007_CdIvoire_SCREEN.pdf?OpenElement; see also CAP Cote D'Ivoire 2007

[49] This project was supplemented by components by UNFPA AT $177,140, UNDP AT $101,200 and UNIFEM AT $50,610 – but none received any funding

TOTAL	1 UNICEF project	$1,772,990	$714,278	$280,140	39%

In 2006, the CAP requested for CDI requested $40.5 million revised upwards to $43.5 million, and received $22.7 million, or 52%. The largest allocations were from the CERF at $4.9 million or 21% of the total funding received for the CAP, unearmarked funds by the UN at $4.6 million or 21%, and ECHO at $2.5 million or 11%,

Funding for organizations and child protection actors: CAP funding in 2006 was allocated unevenly among requesting organizations, and only one NGO (child focused NGO Enfances Meurtrie Sans Frontieres) requested funding through the CAP. UNHCR appealed for $9.7 million revised to $9.1 million and was well-funded receiving $8.3 million or 91% of its requests. UNICEF requested $16.2 million revised to $16.7 million and received $6 million, however, this was comparatively low-funded at 36% of its requests. UNFPA requested a smaller amount at $1.1 million but was not at all funded. EMSF as the sole NGO requested $1.3 million for education and health projects, but received no funding at all.

Protection sector: As in 2007, the Protection/Human Rights/Rule of Law sector was only funded at less than half of its requests: 38% or $3.5 million out of the requested $5.9 million revised to $9.3 million. However, Protection received one of the largest proportions of funding after multi-sector, and "sector not specified", and was significantly better financed in 2006 than in 2005 when the sector received merely 3% of its requested $2.7 million amounting to $85,000.[50] [51] Protection related projects were submitted by IOM, OCHA, UNFPA, and UNICEF – no NGOs were included in this sector.

Child Protection funding: In the CAP 2006, one out of the seven Protection sector projects was for child protection. This was a UNICEF led project that requested $1.9 million dropped in the revised CAP to $800,000, and was well-funded at 151% receiving $1.2 million. Within the Protection sector, child protection was relatively well-funded, as this sum represents a good 34% of the funding received within the Protection sector. Within the framework of the whole CAP funding, child protection funding amounts to just over 5% of the total financial assistance.

Project Title	Appealing Agency	Original Requirements	Revised Requirements	Funding	% Covered
Protection, social and family care and reinsertion of children directly victims of the conflict	UNICEF	$1,898,400	$797,690	$1,204,870	151%

c. Other funding

West Africa CAP 2007:

The West Africa Appeal for 2007 required $309.1 million revised to $360.4 million, and received $201.9 million or 56% of the requests. The sector on Protection/Human Rights/Rule of Law requested $14 million, revised to $17.1 million, and was covered at $1.9 million or a mere 11%.
$190.4 million, revised to $182 million, and

---

[50] As of January 13th, see Financial Tracking Service, Tables B, D,
http://ocha.unog.ch/fts/reports/daily/ocha_R3sum_A691___08013107.pdf
[51] It should be noted that some sectors receive bilateral or funds from other sources.

Child Protection: It must be noted that the Appeal does not always disaggregate which countries the funding is allocated to, so the child protection projects identified for CDI includes those that specifically mention CDI. The West Africa Appeal includes five UNICEF projects for child protection requesting a total of $2.4 million, revised to $.1.3 million. However, only two of these projects were funded amounting to a total of only $370,000 or 27% of the revised request. One project overlaps with the CDI CAP 2007: UNICEF project on GBV during the peace and reconciliation phase which requested $177,140 but was not funded at all.

Project Title	Appealing Agency	Original Request	Revised Request	Funding	% Covered
Monitoring Child Rights Violations on the borders of the Mano River countries and CDI	UNICEF	$636,650	$636,650	$157,500	25%
Strengthening the sub-regional initiative for the protection of children in the Mano River Union and CDI	UNICEF	$535,000	$535,000	$212,322	40%
Fighting sexual violence against children in 11 districts of Western, Northern and Central CDI	UNICEF	$888,100	$0	$0	0%
Identification and prevention of children's rights violations on the border of Western CDI	UNICEF	$347,750	$0	$0	0%
Protection from gender-based violence and support to girls' and women's rights during the peace and reconciliation phase in CDI	UNICEF	$0	$177,140	$0	0%
Total	5 UNICEF projects	$2,407,500	$1,348,790	**$369,822**	**27%** of revised request (2 projects)

UNICEF requests:

In 2007, UNICEF's request within its Humanitarian Action Report for CDI was for $19 million of which **$1.8 million was for Child Protection activities** covering capacity-building on sexual violence, sensitization of communities, reintegration of child victims of sexual abuse, provision of HIV test kits, PEP kits and STD drugs, support for recreational and non-formal educational activities; demobilization of children associated with armed groups, provision of medical and psychosocial care, and promotion of child rights to the military[52].

---

[52] The research was unable to ascertain how much was actually received from this amount.

IV.   Recommendations from the field

The interviews with various staff members from the UN, NGOs at Abidjan level highlighted the following recommendations:

a.   Guidance from global level:
- Guidance on inclusion of authorities and local NGOs in CPF & Protection Cluster;
- Good practice and lessons learnt in effective coordination mechanisms;
- Conceptual framework on Child Protection, inclusive of risk categories and broader considerations of holistic protection of children
- Guidance on strengthening linkages between 1612 task force, cluster, and child protection

b.   Priorities:
- Need for prioritization of issues within CPF
- Need for joint conceptual framework on child protection within PWG;
- Ensure space for CP within Protection Cluster;
- Strengthening of cluster leadership, coordination skills, and broadening of scope
- Strengthening verbal connectivity between field and national levels;

V.   Sources

Interviews with:
- UNICEF
- UNOCHA
- UNHCR

- NRC
- IRC

Open sources consulted:

- CAP

Consolidated Appeals Process, Cote d'Ivoire 2007
Consolidated Appeals Process, Cote d'Ivoire 2007 Projects
Consolidated Appeals Process, Mid-Year Review, Cote D'Ivoire 2007
Consolidated Appeals Process: Humanitarian Appeal 2008

- CERF

Website: http://ochaonline2.un.org/Default.aspx?tabid=9915

- Financial Tracking Service: http://www.reliefweb.int/rw/fts.nsf/doc105?OpenForm&rc=1&cc=civ&yr=2007

- Humanitarian Reform Support unit (HRSU) http://www.humanitarianreform.org/Default.aspx?tabid=310

- OCHA

OCHA Natural Disaster Bulletin no. 8/October 2007

- OHCHR:

Website: http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/ratification/11_b.htm

- Office of SRSG for Children in Armed Conflict

Statement: http://www.un.org/children/conflict/english/17oct2007stateme223.html
Website: http://www.un.org/children/conflict/pr/2007-09-07165.html
- UNICEF
Humanitarian Action Report 2007
Humanitarian Action Report 2008

- UNHCR document : Stratégie de réponse a la problématique de protection des personnes déplacées internes en République de Côte d'Ivoire, 29 Avril 2006

- UN Security Council
Report of the Secretary-General of children and armed conflict in Cote D'Ivoire, 30th August 2007

- Workshops:
Inter-Agency Workshop Outcome: "Strengthening Child Protection within the Cluster Approach – Lessons Learnt, Best Practices from the Field and the Way Forward" – Geneva January 16-18, "008

ANNEX 6.2

DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF CONGO

I.   Background information

a. Humanitarian context

The DRC is emerging from a decade-long conflict that has left over four million civilian deaths and an estimated 1,200 people - of which about 45% are children[53] - still die every day due to ongoing epidemics and conflict-related emergencies. Despite the transitional period following the 2006 elections that saw a relative stabilization in some areas and improved security situation, the surrender of some armed groups, and large-scale returns, political tensions resumed in February and March 2007 with the eruption of armed conflict in certain parts of North Kivu and South Kivu provinces in 2007. The situation remains volatile in eastern DRC, and the Northeast is DRC's most unstable region, where many of the 17,000 plus peacekeepers of the UN Organisation Mission in the DRC (MONUC) are deployed to protect civilians in Ituri, North and South Kivu, and Katanga.[54]

Humanitarian needs remain high, with access and insecurity being the two main challenges for humanitarian actors. Fighting between militia groups and the Armed Forces of the DRC (FARDC) has created population displacements of over 1.3 million people internally, of which 50% are children, and another 400,000 outside DRC. More than half or 529,000 IDPs have been newly displaced in the past six months. An increase in fighting in North Kivu has newly displaced more than 370,000 persons amounting to 800,000 IDPs in this province alone and has caused a surge in the recruitment and use of children by armed groups. The risk of IDP children being recruited into the armed forces is clear: The Annual Report of the Secretary-General to the Security Council on Children and Armed Conflict published in January 2008 raised serious concerns about increasing cases of recruitment or re-recruitment of children across borders and in refugee or internally displaced camps due to lack of security around the camps in DRC among other countries.[55] However, most of the (re)recruitment is taking place in insecure/conflict zones and not in camps; schools have been targeted for recruitment as well causing children not to go to school. Also, thousands of displaced children were unable to start the school year in September. More than 4.4 million school-aged children, including 2.5 million girls and 400,000 displaced children, are not enrolled in school.[56]

Widespread human rights violations have taken place including torture, forced labour, summary executions and rape. Women and children suffer from alarming rates of sexual violence, with children being a third of the victims. In just one province that of South Kivu, 35 women and children are raped every day of which 43% are minors.[57] While HIV prevalence is estimated at 5% nationally, the estimates are much higher in areas affected by conflict where the country is known as one of the countries with the worst incidence of sexual violence.

---

[53] According to the Watch List on Children and Armed Conflict.

[54] The DRC and five regional States signed the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement in July 1999. To maintain liaison with the parties and carry out other tasks, the Security Council set up MONUC on 30 November 1999, incorporating UN personnel authorized in earlier resolutions. In 2000, the Council expanded the mission's mandate and size. MONUC had an authorized strength of up to 5,537 military personnel, including up to 500 observers. In 2007, a new mandate was set out in SC resolution 1756. See:
http://daccessdds.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N07/380/50/PDF/N0738050.pdf?OpenElement

[55] Annual Report to the Security Council on Children and Armed Conflict:
http://www.reliefweb.int/rw/RWB.NSF/db900SID/EGUA-7BCSMX?OpenDocument

[56] UNICEF HAR 2008 (draft).

[57] CAP Plan d'Action Humanitaire 2008 RDC http://ochaonline.un.org/cap2005/webpage.asp?Page=1628

IDPs are highly vulnerable to violence, food insecurity, and disease. On average, one child in ten dies before reaching one year of age, and 20 in 100 children die before the age of five due to preventable diseases.[58] Malnutrition rates are rising rapidly in conflict affected districts of North Kivu. Over half the deaths of under-five children are attributed to malnutrition and micronutrient deficiencies; recent assessments indicate alarmingly high rates of malnutrition among IDP families, and 74 % of the Congolese population lives with food insecurity. Within the past decade, four million people have died from preventable diseases and malnutrition. Endemic diseases, such as Malaria, Plague, Cholera, and Ebola, Monkey Pox, and Sleeping Sickness continue to affect the country. Malaria is a major public health problem in DR Congo, affecting the vast majority of the Congolese population. Malaria remains the first cause of child morbidity and mortality, mostly among young children. DRC's maternal mortality ratio remains among the worst in Africa with 36,000 women dying at childbirth per year. Only 22% of the population has access to safe drinking water and 9% to protected water supplies and adequate sanitation facilities.

Attention has recently been drawn to the needs of victims of natural disasters particularly along the Congo River and in the eastern and southern Lake regions. At the end of 2006 and the beginning of 2007, the DRC experienced its worst floods in ten years, which affected approximately 200,000 people and destroyed crops on a massive scale in Equateur, Katanga, and Oriental Provinces.

b. Protection concerns

General protection concerns:
The human rights of Congolese civilians, including 1.2 million IDPs, are constantly threatened by armed militias, government forces, and even elements in their own communities. Serious violations, such as arbitrary executions, rape, torture and cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment are pervasive, committed mostly by the army, police and intelligence services. Armed groups operating in the country, both foreign and Congolese, have perpetrated massacres, arbitrary executions, abductions of villagers, and subjected women to systematic rape, sexual slavery and other forms of sexual violence with full impunity.[59] Based on information gathered from survivors during the provision of assistance, armed groups are allegedly responsible for the vast majority of child recruitment; also, in South Kivu for example, FDLR are seen as responsible for 80% of the sexual violence in many areas.

Gender-based violence:
The DRC is known to be one of the countries with the worst incidence of gender-based violence alarming rates of sexual violence prevailing in a climate of impunity in eastern Congo and incidents of GBV continue at an alarmingly high rate. Sexual violence is endemic, and women and children in North and South of Kivu continue to be vulnerable to alarming rates and brutality of sexual violence. Between January and August 2007, more than 12,226 survivors of sexual violence were registered - with children accounting for a third of the victims. The UN Special Rapporteur on Violence against Women notes that in South Kivu province alone, where 4,500 rape cases were recorded in the first six months of 2007, acts of rape and sexual slavery perpetrated by armed groups were aimed at the complete physical and psychological destruction of women, with implications for the entire society. Women are regularly gang-raped, often in front of their families and communities.[60] The UN Joint Action Against Sexual Violence in Conflict is focusing on DRC in 2008 with UNICEF leading the advocacy efforts with a new 18-month campaign entitled "*Stop raping our most precious resources: Power to women and girls of DRC*".

UXOs:
Landmines and unexploded ordnance affect some 3 million people in former conflict zones. DRC acceded to the Mine Ban Treaty in May 2002, however, as of 2003 landmines were still in use by various parties to the armed

---

[58] CAP Plan d'Action Humanitaire 2008 RDC, p.5,
http://ochadms.unog.ch/quickplace/cap/main.nsf/h_Index/2008_DRC_ActionPlan_FR/$FILE/2008_DRC_ActionPlan_FR_SCREEN.pdf?OpenElement
[59] OHCHR in DRC: http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Countries/AfricaRegion/Pages/ZRSummary0809.aspx
[60] UN Security Council Report of the Secretary-General on the Protection of Civilians in Armed Conflict , 28th October 2007: http://www.reliefweb.int/rw/RWFiles2007.nsf/FilesByRWDocUnidFilename/EGUA-78WR4Q-full_report.pdf/$File/full_report.pdf

conflict. In addition to Congolese government forces and opposition forces, troops from Burundi, Rwanda, Uganda and Zimbabwe are alleged to have used mines in DRC.[61] Mines have been planted in or around markets, airports, agricultural zones, hospitals, pathways, roads and houses, limiting access to civilian areas and inhibiting distribution of humanitarian assistance, while posing a threat notably to children. Insecurity and limited infrastructure has made comprehensive data collection on landmine injuries and deaths impossible and no national landmine impact survey has been conducted. In 2002, UN Mine Action Service established in Kinshasa the Mine Action Coordination Center (MACC), which began collecting data on mine/UXO casualties in DRC. In 2003, the MACC recorded 246 landmine casualties, followed by 52 casualties in 2004 and 26 casualties in 2005. The MACC database contains 1,770 mine/UXO victims from 1964 to 2005. At least 207 of these were children under age 15, including 143 boys and 64 girls. In June 2007, an explosion in Mbandaka at a Congolese military storage facility killed 3 people, injured 94, and displaced more than 200 families. Surrounding schools, government, and military facilities were seriously damaged and unexploded ordnance (UXO) were scattered throughout the densely populated town and along the Congo River.

c. Child protection concerns

CRC Committee concluding observations (2001): In the last concluding observations of the Committee on the Rights of the Child for DRC, the report highlighted challenges in implementing the CRC due to the negative impact on children of the armed conflict within the State party's territory and the role of numerous actors in the conflict outside of the control of the Government, the responsibilities of other States and other factors. In addition to this, it noted that the extremely poor economic and social conditions of the vast majority of the population severely limited the application of the CRC.

Children in Armed Conflict:
All parties to the conflict have recruited and used children as soldiers and in support roles; there have been well over 30,000 children involved. With the continued operation of armed groups, primarily in the east of the country, children continue to be recruited and used.[62] It is believed that between 1,700 and 2,100 children are still with armed groups and forces in the district of Ituri and in North and South Kivu provinces, and to a lesser degree in Equateur.[63] Over 5,000 children who have been released from armed groups require continued support in the process of social reintegration.

The International Criminal Court's (ICC) first pre-trial hearings against Thomas Lubanga, former militia leader from the DRC charged with war crimes for enlisting, recruiting and using children under fifteen in hostilities, has been considered a major milestone in international attempts to eradicate the practice of armed groups using children. If the charges are confirmed by the pre-trial chamber, it would be the first case of the ICC and the first case that focuses exclusively on child soldiers.[64]

Since 2002, MONUC Child Protection Section has been monitoring and reporting on child rights violations within the DRC.

SC Resolution 1612:
DRC has been designated one of the seven priority situations on the agenda of the Security Council in establishing a monitoring and reporting mechanism for Security Council Resolution 1612. The Country Task Force Monitoring and Reporting (CTFMR) is co-chaired by the Deputy SRSG and the UNICEF representative. Key members include: MONUC, UNICEF, ILO, UNHCR, Save the Children UK and CARE. The CICR and Belgian Red Cross have taken as interest in this initiative as observers.

---

[61] According to the International Campaign to Ban Landmines's *Landmine Monitor 2003,* see Watchlist: http://www.watchlist.org/reports/files/dr_congo.report.20060426.php?p=13

[62] UNICEF & Office of the SRSG CAAC, Monitoring and Reporting on Grave Child Rights Violations: Report on the Second Annual Global Workshop on Monitoring and Reporting, October 2007, see p.31 on DRC

[63] UNICEF HAR 2008 (draft) – HAR 2007: 8,000 children believed to be still with armed groups and forces, while the 19,000 children released from armed groups require social reintegration.

[64] 9th November 2006, http://www.un.org/children/conflict/pr/2006-11-09130.html

In October 2007, Ms. Coomaraswamy, Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict, voiced her grave concern over the escalation of forced child recruitment and sexual violence by Laurent Nkunda's armed forces (CNDP), the FDLR and allied militias in the North Kivu province of the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

Gender-based violence:
The DRC is known to be one of the countries with the worst incidence of sexual and gender-based violence with alarming rates of sexual violence prevailing in a climate of impunity in eastern Congo.. During the month of January 2007, some 2,100 reported cases were reported - with children being a third of the victims. According to the Human Rights Watch report, assailants who raped women and girls frequently beat, whipped, or otherwise physically abused them before, during, and after the crime. Some rapists attacked the young and very young, and may have wanted to avoid exposure to HIV/AIDS or believed that sex with a young child could eliminate the virus.[65]

II. Child protection in emergencies – coordination structures
Highlights

Model used:

National level: Focal point in protection cluster and Task-force

Field level: Working groups within the field protection clusters

Locus of decision taking on child protection issues:

National level: largely at the technical, agency level (notably UNICEF and Save the Children). The development of standards, policies and strategies are done by the Task Force.

Field level: more broadly distributed among the actors

Staff time dedicated to child protection coordination (UNICEF, NGO): For the participation in the coordination of broader protection activities: 5% or less of working time spent);

For the child protection coordination:10% of staff member's time

---

a. Pre-existing child protection coordination structures

Prior to the Cluster Approach, an inter-agency protection group existed under the inter-agency Provincial Committee.

Three structures dealing with child protection pre-existed the Protection Cluster and continue to exist in parallel to the Cluster. They deal with structural and specific issues, as opposed to the Child Protection Working Group within the Protection Cluster that focuses on emergency protection issues. The structures exist at the national and local levels and include the following:

i. *Child DDR Commission*:
Is decentralised at the pronvincial level and deals exclusively with DDR issues relating to children.

---

[65] Human Rights Watch publication: The War Within the War: Sexual Violence Against Women and Girls in Eastern Congo, 2002: http://www.hrw.org/reports/2002/drc/

Members of the Child DDR Commission include:
Chair: UNICEF, with GoDRC where available
Government: Yes (CONADER, FARDC)
UN: UNICEF, MONUC (Child Protection),
Other organizations: ICRC
INGOs: Save the Children UK, COOPI, Caritas et al
NNGOs: CAJED, Don Bosco, Pami, Upaderi, etc.

ii. *Commission de Protection de l'Enfance:*

Mainly in Goma ; works on issues such as children in conflict with the law, child sorcery, street children, etc.

Members of the Commission de Protection de l'Enfance (CPE) include:
Chair: Local authorities
Government: Yes at local level
UN: UNICEF, MONUC CP
Other organizations: ICRC
INGOs: Save the Children UK, Caritas et al
NNGOs: Children's Voice, CAJED, Don Bosco, Upaderi, et al.

iii. *Commission Provinciale de Lutte Contre les Violences Sexuelles:*

This decentralized body deals with GBV issues, not only for children but also for adults.

Members of the Commission provincial de lute contre les violences sexuelles (CPLCVS) include:
Chair: Local authorities
Government: Yes at local level
UN: UNICEF, MONUC HR, UNFPA, OCHA
Other organizations: ICRC
INGOs: COOPI, IRC, Merlin, Cordaid, GTZ et al
NNGOs: Most child protection NGOs due not participate in this forum

b. Current child protection coordination structures and the protection cluster

At the end of 2005, the Cluster Approach was adopted in the DRC as one of the four pilot countries with Liberia, Somalia, and Uganda. Clusters have been established in all conflict-affected Provinces and sectoral commissions strengthened in the rest of the country. Provincial clusters – in particular nutrition, wash, education and NFI – are generally "co-chaired" by UNICEF together with an NGO provincial focal point selected by all cluster members.[66] The following 10 clusters have been established in the DRC:

- Coordination and Support Services
- Economic Recovery and Infrastructure
- Education
- Emergency Telecommunications
- Food
- Health
- Nutrition
- WASH (Water, Sanitation and Hygiene)
- Protection/Human Rights/Rule of Law

---

[66] The provincial cluster focal point plays the role of convening and facilitating the day-to-day work of the cluster with UNICEF technical and financial support.

- Shelter & Non-Food Items

Training: The Humanitarian Reform Support Unit at OCHA organized a country-level workshop on the cluster approach in DRC. Some interviewees had not received training or information on Humanitarian Reform.

i. Protection Cluster:

At national level:
The national cluster was established in mid-January 2006, and is co-led by UNHCR with MONUC Civil Affairs.[67] Priorities have focused on emergency response particularly in North and South Kivu, and Katanga. Its three main parts of activities include: protection of civilians in particular in the prevention of violence; protection linked to return and reintegration; refugee status and determination, resettlement and capacity.[68] In 2007, two new priorities were added: attention to acute protracted humanitarian crises across all provinces, and improved humanitarian analysis and baseline data for all clusters collected through 300 missions in the three provinces.

Members in Kinshasa: The group meets every other week, with an emergency cell that meets when required. It includes the following:
Chair: UNHCR and MONUC Civil Affairs
Government: No
UN members: MONUC Human Rights, MONUCAS, MONUC Cimic, OCHA, OHCHR, UNHCR, UNICEF, UNFPA, UNIFEM, WFP
Organisations: Human Rights Watch, ICRC (as an observer), EUSEC,
INGOs: Benevolencija, IRC, NRC, Save the Children UK, Solidarites,
LNGOs: No
Donors: ECHO

TORs:

Sub-clusters or focal points: A focal point system was established from the beginning within the Protection Cluster, with UNICEF the focal point for Child Protection, and UNFPA for SGBV. There are no TORs for the focal points. These focal points established provincial-level working groups under the auspices of the Protection Cluster in North Kivu in October 2007 given the complexity and urgency of CP and SGBV protection concerns, CP working groups are also being initiated in South Kivu and in Ituri. TORs exist for both CP and SGBV working groups.

Deployments: Protection Officers (ProCap) have been deployed to support the national cluster and PPCs, including a Senior ProCap deployee to lead the PPC in Bunia.

Field level:
Due to the sheer size of the DRC and the complexity of the IDP phenomenon, the protection cluster has adopted a decentralized approach installing Provincial Protection Clusters (PPCs) in priority regions. With the acute protection environment in the Eastern provinces, PPCs have been established in Bunia (Ituri), Goma & Beni (North Kivu), Bukavu & Uvira (South Kivu), and Kalemie & Lubumbashi (Katanga). The PPCs are supported by the national protection cluster based in Kinshasa which provides guidance on the strategy and its implementation, and liaises with national authorities and the MONUC hierarchy for intervention if needed. In the provinces the PPCs have been led by designated cluster focal points that are supported by their Heads of Office. All UNHCR cluster leads either co-chair with or are supported closely by MONUC.

ii. Child Protection:

---

[68] UNHCR's Protection Strategy in the DRC in 2006/07

National level: Within the Protection Cluster, UNICEF is the focal point for child protection. UNICEF and MONUC Child Protection co-chair the 1612 Country Task Force on Monitoring and Reporting. UNICEF also represents the Child Protection Working Groups there.

Field level Child Protection Working Group (CPWG): The Working Groups were established in October 2007 as a UNICEF initiative within the framework of the Protection Cluster, including that of provincial level ones. There are CPWG at the field level in Goma (for the North Kivu province), Bukavu (for the province of South Kivu), and in Bunia (for the district of Ituri), all of which report to the provincial Protection Cluster. The focus is on emergency protection issues, with attention to IDP children - an area that was not previously highlighted by pre-existing structures. Meetings take place twice a month.

> **Members in the field (North Kivu)**:
> **Chair:** UNICEF CP and MONUC (Child Protection Section)
> **Government:** No
> **UN:** MONUC CP, UNHCR, UNICEF
> **Others:** No (ICRC receives minutes)
> I**NGOs**: AVSI, La Benevolencija, Caritas, NRC, Oxfam-Quebec, Save the Children UK, World Vision
> **LNGOs:** CAJED, Children's Voice, Don Bosco, PAMI

TORs: The CPWG TORs were drafted by UNICEF and MONUC CP section in consultation with members of the group in September 2007. The TORs include actions addressing the issues of Grave Child Rights Violations as well as programmatic response to child protection concerns.[69]

Coordination between structures

At the national level, links between the provincial Child Protection Working Groups and the Protection Cluster have been formalized in the TORs of the WG. The CPWG provides information to both the Protection Cluster, as well as reporting to the 1612 Country Task Force on Monitoring and Reporting (CTFMR) of Grave Child Rights Violations, based in Kinshasa. UNICEF is the focal point on child protection for the Cluster, and the CTFMR is co-chaired by UNICEF.

The Protection Cluster meetings also include a mandatory agenda item on child protection, during which the CPWG (UNICEF) provides a briefing to the Cluster.

At the field level, the CPWG meets a day before the Protection cluster meeting in order to share updated information. The CPWG lead is a member of the Protection Cluster, and thus the former reports to the provincial Protection Cluster. The cluster lead is also a member of both the CP and the GBV working groups. The Chair of the Commission de Protection de l'Enfance is a member of the CPWG.

c. Other parallel child protection coordination mechanisms

i. M&R and 1612 (CTFMR)

MONUC Child Protection Section has been carrying out monitoring and reporting activities on child rights violations since its establishment in 2002. Upon the adoption of the UNSC 1612 and the identification of the DRC as one of the situations on the agenda of the Security Council for the monitoring and reporting mechanism, a Task Force was established in Kinshasa. At the national level, the CTFMR is co-chaired by UNICEF and MONUC CP. Members also include the ILO, UNHCR, Save the Children UK and CARE. The participation of NGOs or civil society remains low, due to the MONUC-centric nature of the mechanism. UNICEF keeps the Cluster regularly informed of the Task

---

[69] See Annex

Force's work. The Task Force monitors, investigates, reports and analyses violations and defines protection responses, including advocacy and interventions.

At the field level the Child Protection Working Groups facilitate the sharing of information on grave violations against children within the framework of the 1612 Monitoring and Reporting Mechanism (MRM).

TORs: The 1612 CTFMR has developed TORs.

ii. Other

UNHCR/NRC Protection Monitoring system: Child Protection is integrated into this M&R system.[70]

d. Joint child protection activities and initiatives

i. Child protection specific

Thematic child protection assessments have been conducted by groups of agencies outside of the CPWG and cluster. This has included a needs assessment on IDP children during the peak of the emergency in September 2006, as well as UAM registration and geographic assessments in November 2007 by WVI. The results have been shared with the CPWG and used to inform the strategy of the Protection Cluster. Independent needs assessments on child protection were also conducted by Save the Children UK, WVI and AVSI on child friendly spaces, unaccompanied minors (UAM) etc.. The findings were shared with the CPWG, which informed the Protection Cluster.

ii. Joint broader protection/child protection activities

Joint activities (Needs Assessments): The Protection Cluster has led inter-agency assessment missions to areas of new displacement or areas at risk in the conflict (UNHCR interview). Child protection was integrated into this assessment.

Tools: Inter-agency guiding principles for unaccompanied separated children have been used.

Training: A broader protection training was organized by the Cluster for the armed forces. Sessions on child protection were included by Save the Children UK.

Specialised training was provided to managers and animators of the Child Friendly Spaces by War Child Holland as well as to staff of the child protection 'listening posts' by Save the Children UK.

A joint workshop was organized in September 2007 in Goma by MONUC CP and UNICEF on the Grave Violations of Child Rights.[71] Training on the SC Resolution 1612 was conducted in October 2007 (Goma, Beni, Bunia, Bukavu, Uvira). UNICEF has seconded one staff to MONUC CP at the Kinshasa level to carry out training and compile reports. Training was also provided to monitors of the UNHCR/NRC Protection Monitoring system.

Other initiatives: Depending on the assessments conducted by the protection monitoring system or other joint missions, ad hoc initiatives have been organized. This has included for example an advocacy strategy developed by UNICEF, MONUC CP, Save the Children, and UNHCR for negotiating the release of recruited children.

---

[70] UNICEF was consulted on the design of this and included questions on child protection.

[71] Compte Rendu de la Reunion du Groupe de Travail de Protection d'Enfant du 5 Octobre 2007 2007, UNICEF

III.   Funding for child protection coordination activities

Summary from the CAP Review (2007):

DRC	6 child protection projects
	100% of child protection funded
	28% of overall protection request funded
29%	**of sector funding for child protection**
1.2%	**of total CAP funding for child protection**
4%	**of total CAP funding for overall protection**

Note: *DRC benefited from a variety of funding mechanisms, which are not necessarily to be found in other contexts. Outside of the CAP, $26.2 million in humanitarian financial assistance was allocated to DRC.*

CAP:

2007

In **2007**, the DRC received **a total of $485.5 million** in humanitarian funding. The largest donors were the US at $119.9 million or 25% of the total sum; ECHO at $64 million or 13% of the total; the UK at $62.5 million or almost 14%, with CERF funding amounting to $52.5 million or 11% of the total.[72] Of the total sum, $459.2 million or almost 95% was covered through the **CAP**. 4% of the total CAP funding went to protection (corresponding to 28% of the overall protection request). 1,2 % of the total CAP funding went to child protection projects, corresponding to 100% of the child protection funding requests. In relation to protection funding, 29% went to child protection (6 child protection projects).

Child protection projects outside of the CAP included:
ICRC : $1.2 million (Belgium);
Association pour les Enfants Oubliés : $94,115 (France).
This amounted to a total of $1.3 million[73], representing just over 1% of the humanitarian funding received outside of the Appeal.

2006

In **2006,** the DRC received a total of **$447.6 million** in humanitarian assistance, with the UK the largest donor at $84.3 million or 19%; the US at almost $77 million or 17%; ECHO at $67.1 million or 15%. CERF funding followed closely amounting to $38 million or almost 9% of the total assistance received in 2006.[74] Of this total amount, $354.1

---

[72] See Financial Tracking Service, Tables A & B, 31st January 2008:
http://ocha.unog.ch/fts/reports/daily/ocha_R10_E15195___08013107.pdf
[73] Child Protection projects funded outside of the Appeal identified on the basis of the project titles: ICRC "Protection of separated children, child soldiers, and people deprived of their freedom" at $1.2m; Association pour les Enfants Oublies "Apporter une aide d'urgence en matiere de logements, vivre et biens matriels aux jeunes filles et enfants de milieu ruraux, $94,115. See FTS Table H,
http://ocha.unog.ch/fts/reports/daily/ocha_R4_A707___08013107.pdf
[74] See Financial Tracking Service, Table B:
http://www.reliefweb.int/rw/fts.nsf/doc105?OpenForm&rc=1&cc=cod&yr=2006

million or 79% was channeled through the CAP, while $93.5 million was allocated outside of the CAP framework. The $354.1 million through the CAP covered 51% of the total appeal ($696 million which was revised upwards from $644.9 million)[75].

Funding for organizations: In terms of appealing agencies: UNHCR received $54.5 million or 61% of its requirements; UNICEF received $60.6 million or 58% of its requirements; UNFPA $6 million or 21% of its requirements. In contrast, NGOs received much smaller sums, for example Save the Children UK received $2.1 million or 41% of its requirements; SC-UK $360,000 or 32%, Cordaid received $400,000 or 4% of its requirements.

Protection Cluster: requested $58.6 million, which was revised to $59.7 million, and received 43% of this amounting to **$25.6 million.** The Protection/Human Rights/Rule of Law sector required a revised amount of $44.1 million, and was covered at 46% or $20.2 million.

Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF):
In total, the DRC has received a total of **$90.5 million** in CERF funding since its launch in March 2006. Of this amount, the Protection cluster received seven allocations from the CERF amounting to $8.7 million or almost 10% of the total CERF funding to the DRC.[76] Child protection activities received a total of **$3.8 million** (2007) or **4% of the CERF** funding allocated between March 2006 and January 2008. This is based on 2007 funding, as none of the CERF allocations to the Protection sector in 2006 funded child protection (excluding Mine Action projects).

2007

In **2007**, the DRC received a total of $52.5 million primarily through the under-funded emergency window of the CERF.[77] This covered the sectors and clusters of Agriculture (FAO) Coordination and Support Services (UNICEF), Education (UNICEF), Food (WFP), Health (WHO, UNFPA, UNICEF), Multi-sector (UNHCR), Protection/Human Rights/Rule of Law (UNICEF), Shelter & NFIs (UNHCR, UNICEF), Water and Sanitation (UNICEF).

Protection activities: In 2007, the CERF allocated a total of $7.8 million or 15% of that year's CERF funding to the Protection/Human Rights/Rule of Law sector. This included five projects: four through UNICEF with a total of $3.7 million, one for UNHCR at $3.3 million, and one UNFPA project at $741,010.[78] Mine Action is outside this, while UNICEF received $353,100 for this sector.

Child Protection: Within the Protection activities funded at $7.8 million, **47% or $3.7 million** went to child protection through the UNICEF projects. This includes a CERF grant in October 2007 for UNICEF of just over $1.3 million to foster a safe and protective environment for children in North Kivu; $1.6 million, and $840,490 to reduce children's vulnerabilities, including family separation, exposure to sexual violence, child recruitment into armed groups, abduction, exploitation, neglect and abuse to foster a safe and protective environment for 50,000 IDP children in North Kivu.[79] Thus, an estimated **7% of the total CERF funding** in 2007 for DRC went towards child protection.[80]

2006

---

[75] The largest donors for the CAP were: the UK at $64.2 million or 18% of the total funding; ECHO at $57 million or 16% of the total funding; US at $51.3 million or 15%, while the CERF funding covered $38 million or almost 11%.

[76] This was through three UNICEF projects, three UNHCR projects, and one UNFPA project

[77] http://ochaonline.un.org/Default.aspx?tabid=1801, 6th December

[78] UNICEF $1.3m; UNICEF $1.6m; UNICEF $840,490; UNHCR $3.3m; UNFPA $742,000, see CERF website: http://ochaonline.un.org/Default.aspx?tabid=1801

[79] See CERF website: http://ochaonline.un.org/Default.aspx?tabid=1758

[80] Note: This calculation is based on adding up UNICEF projects within the Protection sector, however, does not include UNFPA's project on SGBV. This is due to the lack of more precise information on the nature of the protection projects funded through the CERF.

In **2006**, the DRC was the largest recipient of CERF grants in 2006 with a total of **$38 million** received under the under-funded grants window in 2006. Of this, two allocations were made to the Protection sector through two UNHCR projects funded at a total of $850,000 amounting to just over 2% of the total CERF funding that year – **none of this went towards Child Protection projects.**

In the context of DRC, **Mine Action** activities are separated from Protection. Two UNICEF projects for mine action were funded through the CERF: at $200,000 in 2006, and $353,100 in 2007 – amounting to a total of **$553,100 or less than 1%** of the total CERF funding.

<u>Consolidated Appeals:</u>

DRC Common Humanitarian Action Plan 2007 (HAP):
The HAP in 2007 appealed for $686.6 million, and received a total of **$459.2 million** covering **67%** of the requested amount. Much of the funding was channeled through the Pooled Fund – $49.3 million or 11% of the CAP - and the CERF under-funded window with $52.5 million or 12% of the total CAP funding. In terms of donors, the US provided the largest allocation at $104.2 million or 24% of the total funding of the CAP; ECHO provided $62.7 million or 14%; the UK funded the CAP with $52.6 million or 13%. The largest sector funded was that of Food at $132.9 million or 68% of the total appeal. The principal UN agencies involved in Protection received the following: UNHCR $51.9 million; UNICEF $50.5 million for various sectors including $5 million for child protection activities (DDR, prevention of family separation, prevention and response to GBV, and for orphans and other vulnerable children); UNFPA received $4 million. In contrast, the INGO Save the Children UK received $1.8 million.

Protection Cluster: The cluster requested $66.7 million through the Appeal, and was covered at 46% or $30.8 million. However, the sector of Protection/Human Rights/Rule of Law received **$15.9 million or 24% of its needs** marked at $66.7 million.[81] In addition to this, the Mine Action cluster did not request funding but was funded at $1.5 million, while the Mine Action sector received $10.5 million.

Child Protection: The Cluster included four specific child protection projects all through UNICEF amounting to **$4.1 million or 13% of the funding allocated to Protection and less than 1% of the total funding received through the CAP.** This does not include a UNICEF project on mine-risk education at $353,100.

Projects	Appealing agency	Original requirements USD	Revised requirements USD	Funding USD	% Covered
Strengthening CPIE	UNICEF	$0	$0	$1.6 million	0%
Protection of IDP children in North Kivu	UNICEF	$0	$0	$1.3 million	0%
DRC mine-risk education programme	UNICEF	$0	$0	$353,100	0%
Protection of women and children affected	UNICEF	$0	$0	$840,490	0%

---

[81] Note: There is a difference in funding received depending on whether Protection is grouped as a cluster or sector. On the Financial Tracking Service (FTS) website appeal projects are grouped by cluster (Table E), and by sector (Protection) (Table D). While the Protection Cluster received $30.8 million, note that the Protection/Human Rights/Rule of Law sector received $15.9 million. Figures used are based on the cluster categorization.

by armed conflict					
Total				**$4.1 million**	13% of total Protection Cluster funding

In addition to the above mentioned projects, there were several Human Rights related projects that could be classified as Child Protection.[82]

DRC Common Humanitarian Action Plan 2006 (HAP):

Child Protection: Various child protection projects were included within the Protection Cluster of the DRC Action Plan in 2006. Funding received for child protection amounted to an estimated $7.2 million representing 28% of the Protection Cluster funding received or 2% of the total Action Plan funding received in 2006.

Project title	Appealing agency	Revised request	Funding	% Covered
Reintegration of women and children, victims of GBV	UNFPA	$500,000	0	0%
Reintegration of vulnerable children (oroduct of rape, or AIDS-orphans)	UNFPA	$450,000	0	0%
Integral protection programme for children affected by armed conflict	SC-UK	$305,000	$295,000	97%
Integral protection programme for children affected by armed conflict	SC-UK	$440,000	$366,360	83%
Protection and reunification of seperated children in North Kivu et Ituri	SC-UK	$75,190	$199,030	265%
Demobilistaion and reintegration of child soldiers in Uvira and Fizi	CORDAID	$211,290	$0	0%
Integral protection programme for children affected by armed conflict	SC-UK	$410,000	$0	0%
Dissemination of the Convention on the Rights of the Child in South Maniema	ADDE	$20,000	$0	0%
Prevention and care for young women	UNFPA	$500,000	$0	0%

[82] Includes following projects : UNICEF ''Reduire le niveau de violence et les cas de violations des droits de l'Homme (Ituri) funded at $850,000 ; UNICEF ''Reduire le niveau de violence et les cas de violations des droits de l'Homme (Kasai Oriental)'' funded at $203,809; UNICEF ''Reduire le niveau de violence et les cas de violations des droits de l'Homme (Sud Kivu)'' funded at $750,000, see
http://ocha.unog.ch/fts/reports/daily/ocha_R3clu_A746___08013107.pdf

and children, victims of SGBV in Maniema				
Prevention and care for young women and children, victims of SGBV in Maniema	UNFPA	$850,000	$1,914,780	225%
Protection of children in urban settings	SC	$840,000	$0	0%
Fight against SGBV of young women and children in the Lower Congo	UNFPA	$405,000	$0	0%
Socio-family reinsertion of street-children in Kinshasa	CAREO	$197,220	$0	0%
Prevention, treatment and reduction of SGBV of women and children	UNICEF	$3,140,000	$1,010,000	32%
Reintegration and assistance to separated children	UNICEF	$5,812,800	$3,100,000	53%
Promotion of the rights of women and girls against SGBV and infected with HIV/AIDs	UNIFEM	$1,210,270	$300,000	25%
TOTAL		**$15.4 million**	**$7.2 million**	**47% of requested amount**

In addition to the above mentioned, the following projects could be included:
- Legal aid to girls and women who have been raped (CREDD, requested $23,000 but received 0% funding)
- Active research on the case files (dockets) concerning cases of SGBV against young women and children (ESDIHB, requested $201,960, but received 0%)

Mine Action required a revised request of $15.9 million and received $5.7 million or 36% of its requirements.

Other humanitarian funding

In addition to the CHAP, the DRC received **$22.6 million** in humanitarian funding. **Protection** related projects include four ICRC programmes to protect IDPs amounting to **$3.2 million**. In addition, **Child Protection** activities extracted from the Financial Tracking Services tables included UNICEF projects related to gender-based violence amounting to a total of **$989,020 or over 4% of the total funding outside of the CHAP**.[83]

Pooled funding:

Very few protection activities have been funded, although child protection has benefited from the pooled fund mechanism. Since the pooled funding is not broken down into specific activities ("awaiting allocation to specific agencies/sectors/projects"), the allocations to Protection and Child Protection activities through this mechanism are not clear.

---

[83] This includes the following UNICEF projects: Prevention and assistance to victims affected by sexual violence and HIV/AIDS at $331,125 (Spain); Prevention and assistance to women and children affected by HIV/AIDS and victims of sexual violence in North Kivu and Katanga provinces at $657,895 (Spain)

NGOs have raised their concern regarding access to pooled funds. A number of their traditional donors have contributed increasingly towards the pooled fund as opposed to individual agencies, and since pooled funds are channeled through UN agencies to NGOs, the perception is that this reduces the autonomy of NGOs. The Protection Cluster has noted this concern and has noted this as a matter to address in 2008. At the same time, some INGOs prefer that the funds pass through a UN agency first. Given the slowness in the release of pooled funds, UN agencies are better able to pre-finance INGOs to carry out the activities than the INGOs themselves (problem of liquidity).

2007

In **2007:** Around seven donors (Belgium, Canada, Ireland, Netherlands, Norway, Spain, UK) contributed to pooled funds at a total of almost **$107 million.** [84] Of this amount, **$49.8 million** or 47% of the pooled funds contributed to the **CAP/HAP projects**. Pooled funding made up **11% of the total CAP funding.**

2006

In **2006**, the DRC received $38m in pooled funds.

Rapid Response Mechanism (RRM)
Since its creation in 2004, the RRM has been co-managed by UNICEF and OCHA and is being implemented with NGOs to ensure rapid multi-sector assessment and response capacity for the initial period of an emergency. Interventions are primarily in the sectors under UNICEF lead, such as shelter and non food items (NFI), water and sanitation, and emergency education, however, a contingency fund exists to provide for responses in health, protection and HIV/AIDS sectors when required. It is being implemented with NGOs Solidarités (in Ituri and North Kivu), IRC (in North Kivu and South Kivu) and – starting in mid-2006, with CRS in Katanga.
- UNICEF's financial needs for the RRM in 2007 were at $20,000,000 (HAR figure)

Programme of expanded assistance to returns (PEAR):
Implemented in collaboration with all key UN agencies and partner NGOs, PEAR assists internally displaced families in eastern DRC to return to their homes, and provides multi-sectoral support for their reintegration and recovery (Watsan, Nutrition, Education, Child Protection, NFI/Emergency Shelter, Health, Community Participation and Mobilization, HIV/AIDs). It provides a bridge between emergency humanitarian assistance and longer term post-conflict recovery. UNHCR is undertaking the security and protection monitoring as Protection Cluster lead. UNICEF requested $20,000,000 for the PEAR in 2007 (HAR). It was not possible to ascertain whether these funds have been disbursed,

UNICEF Funding

2007

In **2007** (as of September 2007), $44.3 million or 40% of UNICEF's appeal for $110.8 million for DRC was funded.

2006

In **2006**, UNICEF's emergency programmes in DRC were 56% funded at $56 million of $105.4 million.

---

[84] $792,507 (Belgium, Pooled funding humanitarian programmes); $3.1million (Canada, awaiting allocation to specific agencies/sectors/projects); $4.6 million (Carry-over, balance of pooled fund 2006); $9.4 million (Ireland, awaiting allocation to specific agencies/sectors/projects); $10.5 million (Netherlands, to be allocated); $11.7 million (Netherlands, additional contribution); $3.3 million (Norway, to be allocated); $5 million (Spain, to be allocated); $58.6 million (UK, awaiting allocation).

IV.   Recommendations from the field

- Training on:
  - o   Coordination and specific information on humanitarian reform;
  - o   Protection cluster and role of focal points for child protection;
  - o   Capacity-building of partners in child protection
- Tools: checklists on child protection in various types of situations (eg. Camps etc); toolkit on displaced children; toolkit on advocacy (mainstreaming child protection)
- Guidance on:
  - o   Child protection to the Protection Cluster members;
  - o   Role of focal points within the cluster;
  - o   Who is doing what in Protection?
  - o   Clarity on the division of tasks between the cluster and CP agencies;
  - o   Best practices (eg. Setting up child-friendly spaces in various settings);
  - o   Guidelines on triggers for setting up a WG on CP;
  - o   Data collection methodology guidance at inter-agency level for consistency
  - o   Work strategies

V.   Sources

Institutions interviewed:
- UNICEF
- UNHCR
- Save the Children, UK

Open sources consulted:

- CERF**:**
http://ochaonline.un.org/CERFFigures/CERFFigures/CountriesreceivingCERFfunds/tabid/1799/Default.aspx
http://ochaonline.un.org/Default.aspx?tabid=1758

- Human Rights Watch
HRW publication: The War Within the War: Sexual Violence Against Women and Girls in Eastern Congo, 2002:
http://www.hrw.org/reports/2002/drc/

- International Crisis Group:
http://www.crisisgroup.org/home/index.cfm?id=2829&l=1#C1

- MONUC:
http://www.un.org/Depts/dpko/missions/monuc/index.html

- OCHA:
Financial Tracking Service:
http://ocha.unog.ch/fts/reports/daily/ocha_R10_E15386___07120407.pdf
Humanitarian Action Plan (HAP) 2007 DRC, Mid-Year Review

- OHCHR:
http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/ratification/11_b.htm
http://www.ohchr.org/EN/countries/AfricaRegion/Pages/ZRIndex.aspx
http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Countries/AfricaRegion/Pages/ZRSummary0809.aspx

Committee on the Rights of the Child: Democratic Republic of the Congo. 09/07/2001,
http://www.unhchr.ch/tbs/doc.nsf/(Symbol)/CRC.C.15.Add.153.En?Opendocument

- Office of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General on Children and Armed Conflict:
http://www.un.org/children/conflict/pr/2006-11-09130.html
http://www.un.org/children/conflict/pr/2007-10-19170.html
Monitoring and Reporting on Grave Child Rights Violations: Report on the Second Annual Global Workshop on Monitoring and Reporting, October 2007 (together with UNICEF)

- UNHCR:
UNHCR's Protection Strategy in the DRC in 2006/07

- UNICEF:
UNICEF's Cluster Leadership Implementation in the DRC, 27th April 2007 (internal paper)
UNICEF Humanitarian Action Report 2007
UNICEF Humanitarian Action Report 2008
UNICEF Intranet: Emergency Funding Update:
http://www.intranet.unicef.org/PFO/PFOInfoV3.nsf/Site%20Pages/Page0202
UNICEF Emergency Bulletin, 12th October 2007 (Internal use)

- UN Security Council:
Annual Report of the Secretary-General to the Security Council on Children and Armed Conflict:
http://www.reliefweb.int/rw/RWB.NSF/db900SID/EGUA-7BCSMX?OpenDocument
Report of the Secretary-General on the Protection of Civilians in Armed Conflict, 28th October 2007:
http://www.reliefweb.int/rw/RWFiles2007.nsf/FilesByRWDocUnidFilename/EGUA-78WR4Q-full_report.pdf/$File/full_report.pdf

ANNEX 6.3

LEBANON (2006)

I.   Background information

a.   Humanitarian context

The war that took place in Lebanon from the 12th of July to the 14th August 2006 resulted in the worst humanitarian crisis in the country since 1982 and had a devastating impact on the civilian population and particularly children: of the 1,191 persons killed and the 4,398 injured, an estimated 45% were children according to Save the Children.[85] Due to the military activities, nearly one million – a quarter of Lebanon's population – fled their homes in southern Lebanon, south Beirut and the Bekaa Valley during a period of 34 days. Around 70% of them were supported by host families and friends living in safer areas, while some took shelter in over 800 school buildings, an estimated 250,000 Lebanese fled mainly to Syria but also to Cyprus, Jordan and the Gulf area. Stocks of vital supplies such as food and medicine were severely stretched posing a strain on dwindling resources at host families, with the elderly and chronically ill particularly vulnerable.

The military operation of the Israeli Defence Forces (IDF) caused a high destruction level of property with at least 30,000 housing units damaged or destroyed, the vast majority of which were in the south in some cases whole towns and villages.[86] Key civilian infrastructure such as roads, power plants, bridges, seaports, and fuel depots were also damaged disrupting the delivery of vital social services as well as access to health services.[87] More than 40 schools were totally destroyed, while around 10% of all schools in the country needed repair. Public health challenges were also heightened by the damage and destruction to water systems in urban and rural areas in South Lebanon, the Beqa'a Valley and the southern suburbs of Beirut, which left at least 1.7 million people affected by either temporary of full stoppage of water supply to their households. The lack of essential drugs, fuel shortages in areas of public services, and skyrocketing of prices for basic goods hindered the maintenance of minimal health standards and further depleted the coping mechanisms of the population. Those particularly vulnerable were the Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs), people under siege, the elderly, those with disabilities, and families living below the poverty line whose coping mechanisms had been weakened by repeated displacement.

b.   Protection concerns

International humanitarian agencies have referred to Lebanon as a "protection" crisis due to the violations of International Humanitarian Law and International human rights law, threats to safety and security of civilians, and unimpeded access to populations.[88]

Within the broader civilian population there were particular groups such as women and children, notably widowers, orphan girls, women whose spouses were out of work, traumatized women, female-headed households, women abused/exposed to violence, those who lost their residences, pregnant women, injured women, adolescents and young girls, as well as the elderly, those with disabilities, the war wounded, host families, the chronically ill, mine affected, migrant workers and minorities. An additional vulnerable group included Palestinian refugees, with most Palestinian children in Lebanon living in extreme poverty. With the massive prevalence of UXOs, many civilians remained at risk creating a complex environment of protection needs.

---

[85] Lebanon Crisis Flash Appeal 2006
[86] See Lebanon Crisis 2006 CAP Revision, 28th August 2006, p.4
[87] Protection Strategy for Lebanon, 1 January 2007 – 31 December 2007
[88] UN Response to the Lebanon Crisis – An OCHA Lesson Learning Paper, 5th December 2006, po. 13-14:
http://www.reliefweb.int/rw/RWFiles2006.nsf/FilesByRWDocUnidFilename/YSAR-6XSQLQ-Full_Report.pdf/$File/Full_Report.pdf

Humanitarian access:
A major concern was the lack of humanitarian access to vulnerable populations, particularly to refugee camps in the south due to the physical insecurity and logistical challenges with the devastated transport infrastructure. The situation was compounded by the isolation through the air, sea and land blockade that prevented basic relief supplies from entering the country. This hindered the assessment of humanitarian needs and provision of assistance to vulnerable populations particularly IDPs, people under siege, the elderly, and families already living below the poverty line.

Unexploded Ordnances:
The greatest threat on the ground was that from UXO's. The end of the war saw as many as one million unexploded sub-munitions in the South of Lebanon which are still being cleared by de-mining experts. The high contamination of cluster bombs and unexploded munitions posed and continues to pose an acute threat in residential areas and farmlands. Between the end of the conflict and the end of November 2007, 281 mine, unexploded ordnances, and sub-munition casualties have occurred.[89] The contamination of agricultural land has also affected the livelihoods of people, especially agriculturists, seasonal and unskilled labourers diminishing their already weak economic capacity.

c. Child protection concerns

Children were disproportionately impacted by the conflict. An estimated one third of civilian fatalities are children, and a significant number of children were also injured (including those resulting in serious disability). Displacement and the increase in levels of poverty posed a greater risk of domestic and sexual violence as well as economic exploitation, especially of children and women, especially among the previously socio-economically marginalized sectors.

Lack of psychosocial care:
The psychological impact and distress deriving from the bombing and displacement has been particularly acute and has posed a risk of inducing serious trauma among children. Early psychosocial initiatives are essential for children who have been affected by war.

UXO and cluster bombs:
Due to the intense Israeli aerial, artillery and naval bombardment, the most immediate danger and a key concern has been the risk from widespread UXO and cluster bombs around towns and fields awaiting the returnees and posing a risk especially to children who are particularly vulnerable due to their curiosity and attraction to the colorful ordnances. According to UNIFIL and the National Demining Office (NDO), approximately 2,600 pieces of ordnance were fired every day into Lebanon during the recent conflict. Bombs, missiles, rockets, mortars, cluster bomblets and other sub-munitions litter travel routes and housing have been nestled in the debris. This has had a continuing impact on child mental and physical health, disruption to schooling and the right to adequate housing.

Children in Armed Conflict:
There was no recorded use of under-18 year olds by Hizbollah in 2006 conflict. However, there are reports of military training provided to children associated with Hizbollah through the Al-Mahdi brigades, a social group comprised of under-15. Another Shia group Amal with an armed wing, which reportedly participated to some extent in the 2006 conflict, is also said to train children militarily, although there are no reports of children being used by the group in combat roles. With over 18 armed factions exist in the Palestinian refugee camps in Lebanon, there are

---

[89] Cumulative casualties, from 14th August 2006 – 27th November 2007, see LAF LMAC (Lebanon Mine Action Center)
http://www.mineaction.org/downloads/1/2007%20UN%20Inter%20Agency%20Mine%20Action%20Strategy%20for%20South%20Lebanon1.pdf

reports of the use of children by Palestinian armed factions and groups in the Palestinian refugee camps. However, there are no reports of the use of Palestinian children during the 2006 war.[90]

Security Council Resolution 1612 (26 July 2005):
During the conflict, the UN Special Representative for Children and Armed Conflict Ms. Radhika Coomaraswamy highlighted that the killing and maiming, denial of humanitarian access for children, as well as attacks on schools and hospitals constituted grave violations of children's rights under the Security Council resolution 1612 (2005). According to reports from her office monitors along with UNICEF and other UN partners, by the 1st of August, an estimated 177 children had been killed in Lebanon, while according to UNICEF, one third of the approximately 3,000 injured while 45% of the 800,000 Lebanon's internally displaced people were believed to have been children. In April 2007, following her visit to Lebanon, Ms. Radhika Coomaraswamy welcomed the commitment made to her by the Prime Minister Mr Siniora on behalf of the Government of Lebanon and by Parliamentary Deputy Mohamed Raad on behalf of Hizbollah to ratify the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the recruitment and use of children in armed conflict. During her discussions she also raised the issue of cluster bombs and unexploded ordinance and asked Lebanon to take a leading role in the development of and advocacy for an International Protocol on Cluster Munitions.

II.   Child protection in emergencies – coordination structures

Highlights

Model used: Sub-cluster (led by UNICEF)

Locus of decision taking on child protection issues: At the national level within the sub-cluster

Staff time dedicated to child protection coordination: Child protection actors (UNICEF) spent between 10% and up to 50% of the his/her time

a.   Pre-existing child protection coordination structures

There were no pre-existing coordination structures for protection. However, separate Child Protection meetings were taking place up until 2006. The Higher Council for Childhood within the Ministry of Social Affairs and the CRC National Action Plans guided action on child protection.

b.   Current child protection coordination structures and the protection cluster

Ten days after the sudden on-set of the emergency, the Cluster Approach was adopted. While the Cluster Approach was disbanded in January 2007, a protection group with a focus on child protection was maintained. The following clusters were established during the emergency:

- Early Recovery (UNDP)
- *Education (UNICEF)*

---

[90] See report by Coalition To Stop the Use of Child Soldiers, Lebanon: The vulnerability of children to involvement in armed conflict, October 2007, http://www.reliefweb.int/rw/RWFiles2007.nsf/FilesByRWDocUnidFilename/EDIS-77NPNB-full_report.pdf/$File/full_report.pdf

- *Emergency Telecommunications (WFP)*
- *Food & Nutrition (WFP)?*
- Health (WHO)
- Logistics (WFP)
- **Protection Cluster (UNHCR)**
- Shelter, Site Management & NFIs (UNHCR)
- Water & Sanitation (UNICEF)

Training: Some informal guidance on humanitarian reform, protection cluster and child protection was received from Headquarters level (UN agencies). No workshop on humanitarian reform was organized.

i. **Protection Cluster**[91]:

National level: Due to the security restrictions, the Cluster was only organized at the national level during the emergency. The Protection Cluster working group (PCWG) was established under the chairmanship of UNHCR with the Ministry of Social Affairs as co-chair of the weekly cluster meetings in Beirut. In Syria, UNHCR coordinated its protection activities for Lebanese refugees and asylum-seekers very closely with the Government, NGOs and other actors.

The activities of the Protection Cluster incorporated: UXO, mine risk awareness and clearance; child-friendly spaces; ensuring equitable secondary distribution of items; support to Palestinian nationals and to refugees. Meetings took place frequently.

Members of the Cluster in Beirut included:
Chair: UNHCR, with the Ministry of Social Affairs (later stage)
Government: Ministry of Social Affairs
UN agencies: OCHA, OHCHR, UNDP, UNICEF, UNMACC, UNMAS, UNRWA
Other: ICRC, IOM,
INGOs: Refugees International, Terre des Hommes
LNGOs: None

---

[91] According to the OCHA evaluation of the Lebanon crisis (UN Response to the Lebanon Crisis – An OCHA Lesson Learning Paper, 5th December 2006; http://www.reliefweb.int/rw/RWFiles2006.nsf/FilesByRWDocUnidFilename/YSAR-6XSQLQ-Full_Report.pdf/$File/Full_Report.pdf), there are mixed reviews about the success of the cluster approach in Lebanon. Each cluster worked quite differently in Lebanon, some well, some not. Simple misunderstandings and communication problems seem to have impacted on the success of the clusters with inter-agency competition also seen as a hindrance to success. One of the main concerns included protection and what this covered. The Humanitarian Coordinator report to the Emergency Relief Coordinator recommended that the protection clusters mandate be reviewed to address the lack of an agreed definition of protection in the context of Lebanon (eg. documenting human rights violations, and non-IDP/refugee civilian protection). During the initial phase, the focus of the Protection Cluster was on top-down service delivery of emergency humanitarian supplies, later turning to cover mine clearance, UXO awareness, support to existing health care systems and engineering work. Gaps in addressing vulnerable groups including the war wounded, elderly, host families, chronically ill, mine affected, migrant workers and minorities were noted. Another main concern of UN and NGO informants was the role of clusters and sub-clusters in terms of appropriateness and added-value - particularly when intra-cluster and cross cluster coordination remained weak across many sectors. Sub-clusters under protection were *not* perceived as necessary by some key informants.

Field level: In the post-emergency phase following the cease-fire and the opening up of humanitarian access to the South, a Protection Working Group was set up both in Tyre and in Sur from the 17th of August in accordance with the Humanitarian Coordination Hubs established in Tyre and Saida. UNHCR assumed leadership in Tyre, while the protection cluster in Beirut continued to act as the coordination centre.

Members of the Protection Working Group in Tyre and Sur included:
Chair: UNHCR
Government: No
UN: HIC, OCHA, UNHCR, UNICEF, UNRWA, WFP, WHO
Other: IOM, MACC SL
INGOs: Care International, Intersos, Islamic Relief, Response International, Save the Children, Terre des Hommes
LNGOs: CCR (Civil Campaign for Relief), Hariri Foundation, Samidoun, Secours Populaire Libanais

Deployments: A ProCap member was deployed to Tyre during the post-emergency phase.

TORs:

ii. Child Protection:

Child Protection coordination meetings started prior to the setting up of the Protection Cluster, as there was an immediate need for coordination.

Sub-cluster model: The Protection Cluster adopted a sub-cluster model, with UNICEF leading the Child Protection sub-cluster. Cross-cutting issues such as psychosocial aspects of child protection were kept within the CP sub-cluster, as the Health Cluster led by WHO (with limited capacity) remained focused on mental health. At the governmental level, initiatives in this area did not divide psychosocial from the mental health side. In terms of GBV, UNFPA led this sub-group within the Protection Cluster - although it was limited in capacity with one staff member.

National level Child Protection sub-cluster: In Beirut, the Protection Cluster established a sub-cluster model on child protection led by UNICEF which looked into: mine risk education for children, advocacy and victim assistance, child-friendly spaces; identification of unaccompanied and separated children, and family tracing.

Members of this sub-cluster included a variety of actors marked below. It must be noted that before the outbreak of the war, only Save the Children was present out of the INGOs. A challenge in bringing together local NGOs was the difficulty in knowing who out of the plethora of organizations should be involved. Parallel meetings were being organized by the Government of Lebanon on a daily basis attracting a large number of participants; hence the sub-cluster needed a representative of NGO partners who could relay the information to others.

Members of the child-protection sub-cluster in Beirut:
Chair: UNICEF
Government: Director of Higher Council for Childhood (Ministry of Social Affairs)
UN: OCHA, UNDP, UNFPA (limited capacity), UNHCR, UNICEF, UNODC, WHO (limited capacity)
Other: ICRC, IOM, Lebanese Red Cross
INGOs: ANERA, CARE, Catholic Relief Services (CRS), Enfants du Monde Droit de l'Homme (EMDH), IMC, InterSos, IRC, Mines Advisory Group (MAG), Medicins Sans Frontieres (MSF-CH), Right to Play (RTP), Save the Children Alliance, Terre des Hommes (TDH), World Vision,
LNGOs: Arab Resource Collective members (Regional NGO), Samidoun (Spears Relief Centre Psychosocial Support Project)
Donors: USAID Disaster Assistance Response Team (DART), Swiss Humanitarian Adi (SHA), Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SCD)

Field level: In Tyre, a Child Protection Working Group was set up which functioned within the Protection Cluster.

Its **members** included a smaller scope in comparison to the body in Beirut:
Chair: UNICEF

> **Government:** No, sometimes representative of Mayor.
> **UN:** UNHCR, UNICEF
> **INGOs:** CRS, IRC, Terre des Hommes (TDH), People in Need (PIN), SC Alliance

TORs: No TORs for the Child Protection sub-cluster or focal points.

Decision-making: All child protection decisions were made at the national level, as the field level focused on operational aspects. Principal decisions in technical issues, standards development, and advocacy were all made within the Child Protection sub-cluster. Specific working groups were set up to look into issues like psychosocial care. Guidelines and inter-agency agreements from the Headquarters level facilitated joint work on advocacy In terms of broader protection issues, like the development of a Protection Cluster strategy, this was determined within the Protection Cluster, but with less involvement from the CP sub-cluster.

iii. Coordination between structures

Horizontal connectivity: At the national level, the Child Protection sub-cluster fed information to the Protection Cluster through attendance in the meetings and via emails. At the field level, information was shared on a weekly basis from the CP WG to the Protection Cluster in Tyre.

Vertical connectivity: Information from the field to the national level in the post-emergency phase was channeled in an unstructured manner through the individual agencies from which the information was then shared with the Protection Cluster in Beirut. Information was more easily passed on from the Beirut level to members based in Tyre.

Staff time dedicated to coordination: For broader protection activities, around 25-30% of staff member time (UNICEF) was spent on this at the initial stages. It was also described as a "burden" for small teams taking most of their time due to the fact that the Protection Cluster meetings were large in size and lengthy.

In terms of child protection coordination, child protection actors (UNICEF) spent between 10% and up to 50% of the his/her time for the preparation, attendance, and follow-up actions, depending on the staff member's role and responsibilities. However, this time spent was seen as constructive (by UNICEF staff). Meetings were held once or twice a week during the emergency, however, this decreased to every two to four weeks in the post-emergency phase.

c. Other parallel child protection coordination mechanisms

No monitoring and reporting system on either broader protection issues or child protection concerns was established.

d. Joint child protection activities and initiatives

i. Child protection specific

A child protection **needs assessment** was developed by the Child Protection sub-cluster and was conducted in the post-emergency phase in January 2007. However, this was not completed. The assessment looked into threats to life, separated children, physical safety (UXOs), physical violence, gender-based violence, child labour, health, education, psychosocial concerns, and existing resources.

The CP sub-cluster organized **trainings** on child protection issues that ran jointly with sub-cluster members in September 2006. A few other trainings were also held by CP actors, including one in relation to psychosocial care**,** as well as one on child protection indicators for the purpose of monitoring and evaluation.

Tools: In the post-emergency phase, the Child Protection Rapid Assessment tool was adapted and developed by the CP sub-cluster in September 2006.

Other initiatives: Main output were several publications, including the Maqsoud booklet psychosocial aspects of child protection in emergencies (guidelines for social workers), posters and flyers on mental health for parents, CPIE publication for the emergency in the North in 2007, plus other drafts

ii. Joint broader protection/child protection activities

Needs Assessment: Attempts to conduct a Rapid Assessment were not successful due to the security challenges. A common UN inter-cluster assessment tool was developed by OCHA, with a protection cluster section including a limited component on child protection. The focus of the CP part was on standard issues (separated children, sexual violence), and UNICEF's standard form (detailed CP assessment) was left out in support of an inter-agency one.

Training: No broader trainings on protection were held, although trainings were organized on Land Mine issues

III. Funding for child protection coordination activities

While there were constraints to the operational response to the Lebanon crisis, such as security issues, lack of experienced staffing, agency bureaucracies, agency competition and the short-term nature of the emergency, funding was easily met. The Flash Appeal was fully funded within six weeks of being issued at $119 million.[92] In addition to the appeal response, an additional $406.6 million was allocated to the emergency response. The total sum of all commitments, contributions and pledges for the 2006 crisis in Lebanon which includes regional support for Lebanese refugees amounted to **$524.5 million**. The largest donors were the US at $108.7 million or 21% of total funding; Saudi Arabia at $63.5 million or 12% of all funding; and ECHO at $54.6 million or 10% of all humanitarian funding received.[93]

<u>Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF)</u>:
Lebanon received a total of **$5 million** – or 1% of its total humanitarian funding - through the Rapid Response window of the CERF that contributed to the Flash Appeal needs. Agencies that received CERF funding included: UNICEF$1 million for water and sanitation; WFP $3 million for coordination and support Services; WHO $1 million for the health sector. The CERF grant presented 1% of the total humanitarian assistance provided.[94] **No Child Protection or broader Protection activities including mine action** were supported through the CERF.[95]

<u>Flash Appeal & Revised Flash Appeal:</u>

---

[92] UN Response to the Lebanon Crisis – An OCHA Lesson Learning Paper, 5th December 2006, pp.5-6,
see:http://www.reliefweb.int/rw/RWFiles2006.nsf/FilesByRWDocUnidFilename/YSAR-6XSQLQ-Full_Report.pdf/$File/Full_Report.pdf
[93] http://ocha.unog.ch/fts/reports/daily/ocha_R10_E15146___07120607.pdf
[94] http://ocha.unog.ch/fts/reports/daily/ocha_R5_A725___07120607.pdf
[95] http://ochaonline.un.org/Default.aspx?tabid=1800

Launched on the 24th July 2006, the 90-day Flash Appeal for Lebanon sought $155.3 million to meet the needs of 800,000 war-affected people in Lebanon and Syria until the 24th October. The CERF funding of $5 million contributed to the Flash Appeal. Following the cessation of hostilities on 14th August with the Security Council Resolution 1701 (2006), and the return of more than 90% of Lebanon's displaced, the situation changed from humanitarian to early recovery.

Agencies appealing: UNHCR, as the Cluster lead, required a total of $18.9 million – revised to $12.7 million – to cover both protection and multi-sectoral activities in shelter, site management and non-food items, and was fully funded with $18.7 million. UNICEF requested $25.2 million – revised to $14.7 million - and was fully funded receiving $23.5 million. UNFPA however, requested $6.2 million, revised to $1.3 million, and was not funded at all. The NGO Save the Children UK did not receive any funding either through the Flash Appeal.

A **revised Flash Appeal** with Government leadership was launched by Jan Egeland at the Stockholm conference on the 31st August. The revision incorporated a downwards reassessment to **$96.5 million**, of which $87.9 million had already been funded leaving $8.6 million unfunded. The Flash Appeal was **funded at $119 million** which covered 123% of the revised requirements. Main donors were the US at $17.8 million or 15% of the required amount; EC at $13.8 million or 12%, and ECHO at $11.4 million or 10% of the total Flash funding.

The Protection Cluster was the only one to increase its requirements in the revised Flash Appeal, from $15.8 million[96] to $25.8 million. This included mine action response, as the **Mine Action sector**, which was separately categorized in the first appeal, was included within the protection sector in the revised appeal.[97] The Protection/Human Rights/Rule of Law Cluster required the largest amount of funding with 13 projects, and received the **largest portion of funding in comparison to other Clusters, amounting to $30.6 million covered at 118%**.

Child Protection projects within the Protection Cluster component of the Flash and Revised Flash Appeals included a total of six projects focusing on Child Protection in Lebanon and in Syria. This amounted to a total request for $5.1 million to cover three UNICEF projects and two through Save the Children UK. However, this figure was decreased to **$1.7 million** in the revised appeal remaining with the remaining three UNICEF projects. The funding received covered the three projects by 100%, however, none of the funding went to the NGO Save the Children projects, which were removed from the revised appeal. **In relation to the Protection Cluster funds, funding for Child Protection represented less than 6% of funding allocated to the Cluster:**

Project	Appealing agency	Original requirements USD	Revised requirements	Funding USD	% Covered
Psycho-social Support[98]	UNICEF	$1.5 million	$1.2 million	$1.2 million	100%
Protection from Violence and Abuse (public awareness)	UNICEF	$700,000	$200,000	$200,000	100%
Provision of Humanitarian Mine Action Response in Lebanon	UNICEF	0	$300,000	$300,000	100%
Advocacy (Children's	SC-UK	$40,000	$0 (removed from Flash Appeal)	$0	0%

---

[96] The FTS website indicates the original requirement of Protection Cluster to be at $15.8 million while the Revised Flash Appeal document mentions this to be $16.6 million.

[97] The Mine Action sector originally requested $1.2 million through UNDP but did not receive any funding.

[98] UNICEF project: Facilitation of the psycho-social recovery of affected children and their families; establish community based CFS; promoting active youth involvement

Rights)					
Child Protection	SC– UK	$2.5 million	$0 (removed from revised Flash Appeal)	0	0% funded
Child Protection in Syria	UNICEF	$350,000	$0 (Removed from revised Flash Appeal)	0	0%
TOTAL	**4 UNICEF projects; 2 SC-UK projects**	**$5.1 million**	**$1.7 million**	**$1.7 million**	**100%**

Child Protection funding outside of the Appeal:[99] In addition to the Flash Appeal projects, five NGO child protection projects were funded outside the Appeal at a total of $2.7 million.[100]

Project	Agency	Donor	Funding
Safe Spaces for Palestinian Refugee Children Affected by the Crisis in Northern Lebanon	SCD-RB	ECHO	$135,140
Children from Nabatieh who experienced the crisis of July-August 2006 receive psychosocial support within their education and improved social facilities	MPDL	ECHO	$748,500
Psychosocial support for children affected by war in Southern Lebanon $	TdH (Switzerland)	ECHO	$819,670
Aide psychologique aux enfants victimes de la guerre au Liban	EM/DH	ECHO	$872,035
Accompagnement medico-psychologique des populations traumatisees par les bombardements	Association pour la protection de l'enfant de la guerre		$128,210
TOTAL			**$2.7 million**

ICRC Appeal for Lebanon:
The ICRC launched a preliminary appeal for Lebanon on the 18th July for CHF 10m – around $6.5m to cover medical, economic, security and water and habitat – in addition to the initial ICRC budget for Lebanon (CHF 1.7 million) presented in the ICRC Emergency Appeal 2005. It was funded at $763,360, but did not cover child protection activities.

UNICEF funding requests:
UNICEF initially requested $7.3 million to respond to the crisis in Lebanon in its Immediate Needs document, from the 18th July to the 18th November 2006. Of this, $600,000 (8.2%) was requested for Protection/Psychosocial activities for the prevention of separation of children; protection of children from violence, exploitation and abuse; sensitization of caregivers on identifying trauma in children and providing psychosocial support; recreational and

---

[99] It must also be noted that a sizeable amount of funds were marked as "awaiting allocation to specific project/sector": over 52 projects through UNICEF are marked as awaiting allocation, amounting to
[100] This does not include mine action activities.

educational support. However, UNICEF replaced its initial call with a revised figure of $25.2 million included in the Flash Appeal.

UNICEF's Humanitarian Action Report 2007: requested $5.7 million for Lebanon, of which 40% was funded with the $193,242 CERF grant.[101] **Child Protection** activities required $2.5 million (44%) and received $177,008 (July 2007) for child-friendly and recreational spaces, psychosocial assistance for children affected by distress, rehabilitation of schools and community centers, civic participation and dialogue, as well as mine-risk education/unexploded ordnance awareness and education activities. Contributions under the 2006 Flash Appeal came late during the year leading to a significant carry over of funds in 2007.

UNICEF Humanitarian Action Report 2008: is requesting $5.9 million for 2008 of which $600,000 (10%) is for Child Protection activities, and $150,000 (2.5%) targeted separately for Mine Action.

IV.   Recommendations from the field

- Conceptual clarity: Need for clear definition of both protection and child protection
- Clear TORs: on Protection and accountability for all members involved
- Tools:
  - o Practical tools in Arabic (eg. 1-2 page summary on cluster system/ existing Guidelines)
  - o Inter-agency Rapid Assessment
  - o Standards (eg. CCCs)
- Capacity-building:
  - o Cluster Approach
  - o Coordination and cluster /sub-cluster leadership skills (part of preparedness)
- Rapid deployment from HQ (example of WASH Cluster/ deployment of Youssef)
- Inter-agency agreements on key issues, importance of role of HQ
- Ensuring local NGOs are aware of coordination structures and are participating
- Participation of donors in Cluster was not productive for NGOs

V.   Sources

Institutions interviewed:
- UNICEF
- OCHA
- UNHCR
- National NGO

Open sources consulted:

- CERF:
http://ochaonline.un.org/Default.aspx?tabid=1800

- Coalition to Stop the Use of Child Soldiers:

---

[101] Emergency Appeal funding status figure from December 2007

Lebanon: The vulnerability of children to involvement in armed conflict, October 2007,
http://www.reliefweb.int/rw/RWFiles2007.nsf/FilesByRWDocUnidFilename/EDIS-77NPNB-full_report.pdf/$File/full_report.pdf

- Mine Action:
UN Inter-agency Mine Action Strategy for South Lebanon 2007:
http://www.mineaction.org/downloads/1/2007%20UN%20Inter%20Agency%20Mine%20Action%20Strategy%20for%20South%20Lebanon1.pdf

- OCHA
Lebanon Crisis Flash Appeal, July 2006:
http://ochadms.unog.ch/quickplace/cap/main.nsf/h_Index/Flash_2006_LebanonCrisis/$FILE/Flash_2006_LebanonCrisis_SCREEN.pdf?OpenElement
Lebanon Crisis Revised Flash Appeal, August 2006:
http://ochadms.unog.ch/quickplace/cap/main.nsf/h_Index/Revision_2006_Flash_LebanonCrisis/$FILE/Revision_2006_Flash_LebanonCrisis_SCREEN.pdf?OpenElement
http://www.reliefweb.int/rw/rwb.nsf/db900SID/LSGZ-6T7JH4?OpenDocument
Lebanon Protection Cluster Strategy Paper, 24th August 2006:
http://www.humanitarianreform.org/Default.aspx?tabid=242
Protection Strategy for Lebanon 1 January 2007 – 31 December 2007 (draft 22nd November 2006)
Protection Working Group meeting minutes, Tyre, 11th September 2006
UN Response to the Lebanon Crisis - An OCHA Lesson Learning Paper, 5th December 2006:
http://www.reliefweb.int/rw/RWFiles2006.nsf/FilesByRWDocUnidFilename/YSAR-6XSQLQ-Full_Report.pdf/$File/Full_Report.pdf

- Office of the Special Representative to the Secretary General on Children and Armed Conflict:
Website: http://www.un.org/children/conflict/english/middleeastapril2007.html

- OHCHR:
http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/ratification/11_b.htm

- UNHCR
Real-Time Evaluation of UNHCR's Response to the Emergency in Lebanon and Syria, July – September 2006 (October 2006)
UNHCR recommendations "The Lebanon Situation"
www.unhcr.org/publ/PUBL/4666d244e.pdf

- UNICEF
UNICEF Humanitarian Action Report 2007
UNICEF Humanitarian Action Report Mid-Year Review, 31st July 2007
UNICEF Humanitarian Action Report 2008 (draft)
UNICEF Immediate Needs Document Lebanon (18 July – 18 November 2006)

ANNEX **6.4**

LIBERIA

I.   Background information

a. Humanitarian context

While Liberia has been transitioning from emergency towards political stability, reconstruction and development, progress is still fragile. Despite the State's efforts to revitalize public institutions, develop and implement a poverty reduction strategy, its capacities and resources remain limited following the 14 years of civil war. The war costs the lives of 270,000 persons, and displaced both internally and in the neighboring countries, close to a third of the country's population of three million, affected up to 80% of the rural population at some stage. Thus, humanitarian assistance is needed for the priority of return and reintegration of refugees and Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) in Bomi, Lofa and Nimba counties. The largely neglected counties in Liberia's south-east also face needs. Given the extent of destruction from the civil strife, far too many Liberians remain in a state of high vulnerability; three-quarters (76.2%) of the estimated 3.2 million people are living on less than a dollar a day (Liberia Human Development Report 2006) aggravated by the high level of unemployment (80%). The majority of Liberian children and women do not have access to basic rights for services including healthcare, safe drinking water, appropriate sanitation, shelter, education and protection. Liberia remains one of the most-food insecure countries in the region, where external shocks are likely to affect food security. A Government survey conducted with the UN and NGOs found that up to 90% of the population is vulnerable to food insecurity, and of these, 50% are highly vulnerable while 39% of the children are stunted.[102] Less than 15% of the population has access to basic health service, with many key facilities operated by medical NGOs that have been scaling down their activities in 2007, creating a transitional gap between emergency assistance and recovery and development efforts. Only 32% of the entire population has access to potable water; only 24% of rural households have access to sanitary facilities.[103] Preventable or easily treated diseases remain the main killers of Liberia's children and women. Liberia has the fifth highest under-five mortality rate and one of the highest maternal mortality ratios in the world. Less than 15% of children will reach their first birthday and one out of four mothers dies due to childbirth. Malaria and diarrhea are the two leading causes of child morbidity accounting for up to 50% and 22% respectively of total child morbidity. The HIV prevalence in 15-49 year olds is at 5.2%. The education sector has been severely affected with a limited amount of qualified staff and lack of facilities, leading to less than 50% of primary school age children estimated to be in school.

b. Protection concerns

Insecurity
High levels of vulnerability and insecurity persist due to the chaos and insecurity of natural disasters, and concern over regional instability. The lack of economic opportunities and sustainable livelihoods for the population, particularly youth, remains a concern for peace and stability in the country. Some 39,168 ex-combatants were yet to be reintegrated at the beginning of 2007. Until rule of law institutions become fully functional, protection issues also remain a serious humanitarian concern. The security situation and political stability continues to rely on the United Nations Mission in Liberia Force (UNMIL) established in September 2003.

Gender-based violence

---

[102] Comprehensive Food and Nutrition Survey, Government of Liberia et al, August 2006, in CHAP Liberia 2007, p. 5
[103] IPRSP, GoL, 2006

UNMIL's fourth public report on the human rights situation in Liberia highlighted violations by law enforcement and judicial personnel, the situation in rubber plantations and issues related to the protection of child rights, as well as high rates of sexual and gender-based violence, particularly involving child victims, and the effect of harmful traditional practices on the enjoyment of human rights.[104] While the Protection Cluster's GBV Task Force finalized a National Plan of Action in 2006 to address GBV, more work is needed. Reports of GBV and abuse off minors continue to be received from all parts of the country. A Government survey conducted in 2005 and 2006 interviewing 1600 women indicated that 92% of the women had experienced some form of sexual violence, including rape.[105] The levels of poverty among women and children and the absence of social safety networks render them extremely vulnerable to sexual exploitation and abuse involving both community members and humanitarian and peacekeeping personnel.

c. Child protection concerns

Separated children
The forced displacement of families and the separation of children from their caregivers put them at grave risk of violence, abuse, abduction and exploitation. With 86% of the population displaced at least once during the conflict years, many children live in settings deprived of basic care and parental guidance.

Gender-based violence
Despite the end of the conflict, sexual and gender-based violence is a disturbingly common feature, with the majority of reported rape cases being perpetrated against children aged 10-14 years – increasing the risk of HIV transmission. Despite amendments in the Penal Law, there appears to have been little impact on the prevalence of rape in Liberia, including of minors. MSF-Spain has reported that 85% of rape survivors receiving treatment in an MSF clinic were under the age of 18 and 55% were under 15.[106] There has also been little change in the situation facing children including the use of harmful traditional practices (early marriage, arranged marriage, female genital mutilation etc), trafficking, child prostitution, as well as child abuse and exploitation.[107]

Children and Armed Conflict:
Following the end of the conflict, sustainable social and economic reintegration of children formerly associated with fighting forces is critical, and assistance is needed to normalize the environment for the well-being of children. Between 2004 and 2005, the United Nations Mission in Liberia (UNMIL) - which has a multidimensional operation including a component on child protection and disarmament, demobilization and reintegration - was relatively successful, resulting in 10,963 children demobilized of which 77% were boys and 23% girls. As of October 2006, 32,876 beneficiaries had completed their reintegration and rehabilitation programmes, and another 26,956 were enrolled in projects at the time. A residual caseload of 39,168 ex-combatants was scheduled to take part in rehabilitation and reintegration programmes in 2007. UNICEF, UNMIL and other key partners are continuing to conduct follow-up monitoring of former child combatants through family and community-based interaction.

On 13 April 2006, President Johnson-Sirleaf signed executive order No. 4, which extended the mandate of the National Commission on Disarmament, Demobilization, Rehabilitation and Reintegration for another year. President Johnson-Sirleaf took a landmark step when she formally requested Nigeria to surrender former President Charles Taylor to The Hague to face trial against war crimes, crimes against humanity and other serious violations of international humanitarian law, including the use of child soldiers, abduction and forced labour.

As of July 2006, there is no known group that uses or recruits child soldiers or former child soldiers. Although there are allegations of such activities in connection with the volatile political situation in neighbouring Côte d'Ivoire and

---

[104] Quarterly Report, Human Rights and Protection Section, UNMIL, October 2006.
[105] Common Humanitarian Action Plan Liberia 2007, p.13
[106] UNHCR RTE on Liberia (2007): http://www.internal-displacement.org/8025708F004CE90B/(httpDocuments)/F540F16CD4583DD4C125732200535BE2/$file/Real+Time+evaluation+UNHCR+full+report+July+24.pdf, p.17
[107] Consolidated Appeal Process for Liberia2 006, United Nations, 2005.

Guinea, these have not been confirmed. The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), however, has continued to facilitate the repatriation of foreign former child combatants. The situation in neighboring countries needs particular attention and is subject to ongoing monitoring by UNMIL, in close cooperation with the United Nations Office for West Africa (UNOWA), the United Nations Operation in Côte d'Ivoire (ONUCI) and other actors. UNMIL and ONUCI carry out coordinated border patrols to deter any attempts to recruit Liberians, while UNICEF and other child protection agencies have responded by putting in place a mechanism for prevention of re-recruitment through increasing reintegration programmes along the borders.

II.   Child protection in emergencies – coordination structures

Highlights

Model used: Sub-cluster

National level: co-chaired by UNICEF and the government of Liberia (GoL);

County level, lead CP agencies (mainly NGOs) chaired the county level CP structure (task forces)

Locus of decision taking on child protection issues: Within child protection structures; bigger advocacy issues are referred for action to the protection cluster.

Staff time dedicated to child protection coordination: 25% at national level[108] (UNICEF); 25% at county level (NGO)

---

    a. Pre-existing child protection coordination structures :
        i. DDR coordination (2004) (lead INGO CP in each county) - has been subsumed into broader protection network;
        ii. TF coordinated by Ministry of Gender on institutionalisation; links into PC network

    b. Current child protection coordination structures and the protection cluster:

In terms of humanitarian coordination, Liberia was one of the first four "roll-out" pilot countries of the Humanitarian Reform Process with the introduction of the Clusters in January 2006 and the establishment of an Inter-Agency Standing Country Team in February 2006 to oversee the implementation of the cluster approach. As the United Nations in Liberia has been an integrated mission since November 1997, with the presence also of a UN Peace-Building Support Office in Liberia (UNOL), there has been no UN OCHA to support the Cluster Approach process in Liberia (see evaluation below). In 2007, cluster coordination has been transitioning to Government-led sectors. For the most part, Cluster Leads were agreed upon as outlined by the IASC Principals.

- Camp Management (UNHCR)
- Early Recovery (UNDP)
- Education (UNICEF)
- Emergency Shelter and Non-Food Items (UNHCR)

---

[108] In start-up time was 30%

- Emergency Telecoms (WFP, UNICEF with UNMIL)
- Health (WHO with support from UNICEF)
- Food security (WFP/FAO)
- Logistics (WFP)
- Nutrition (UNICEF)
- **Protection (UNHCR, see below for Focal Points per theme)**
- Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (UNICEF)

i.   The Protection Cluster:

The IASC, with the agreement of UNMIL Human Rights, endorsed UNHCR to assume leadership for the wider protection role in Liberia. UNHCR thus became chair of the pre-existing national Protection Core Group (PCG), which consists of UN agencies, NGOs, and Government representatives. In addition to the Protection Core Group (PCG), there are two sub-clusters: a GBV Task Force, and a **Child Protection Network**, both led by the Ministry of Gender. The PCG adopted new terms of reference around priority policy areas with the following leadership tasks

The National Protection Cluster/Core Group members include:
UN: UNHCR, UNICEF, UNDP, HCS, UN Habitat, UNFPA, UNIFEM, UNMIL Human Rights, WFP
Government: yes, Liberian National Police
INGOs: ARC[109], CCF, DRC, FNID, HRPF, FOHRD, HRPF; IRC, JPC, JRS, NRC, SC-UK,
Others: ICRC (observer)
NNGOs: LRRRC Monitoring and Steering Group, HRCL, UDA,
Donors: ECHO

At county level, five new PCGs were established, increasing the total number of county level PCGs to eleven.:

Protection Core Group priority policy areas
- Rule of law (UNDP/UNMIL RRR)
- **Child protection (UNICEF)**
- Human rights monitoring (UNMIL Human Rights)
- Gender-based violence (UNHCR/UNICEF/UNFPA)
- Land, Housing property rights (UNHCR/UNMIL Civil Affairs)
- Return/Resettlement of IDPs (UNHCR)

Regular meetings at the national and county level (10 counties) have been held, including for sub-Clusters.

The Protection framework focused on return monitoring, child protection, GBV, Sexual Exploitation and Abuse, advocacy, and legal reform. The Protection objectives were stated in the CHAP 2007: increase the capacity of the legal justice system to protect women and children; develop and support a comprehensive health care response to GBV; build the capacity of national and community-based institutions and civil society in protection issues; and provide support towards the reintegration of children and youth. In addition to this, a joint protection monitoring network was established – with the main cases reviewed being rape, violations of child rights, and property disputes. The presence of government officials in PCG meetings is said to have enhanced their effectiveness although has presented a challenge in reaching a consensus on issues of confidentiality and rights-based interventions. According to the Mid-Year Review of CHAP Liberia 2007, significant progress had been achieved in pursuit of these objectives, and the **Child Protection Network (CPN)** witnessed major achievements.

---

[109] Action of the Rights of the Children (ARC), Christian Children's Fund (CCF), Danish Refugee Council (DRC), European Commission Humanitarian Office (ECHO), Foundation for International Human Dignity (FIND), Foundation for International Democracy (FOHRD), Human Rights Project Fund (HRPF), IRC, Catholic Justice and Peace Commission (JPC), Jesuit Refugee Service (JRS), Liberian National Police (LNP), LRRRC, Monitoring and Steering Group (MSG), NRC, National Human Rights Centre of Liberia (HRCL), SC-UK, United Democratic Alliance (UDA), UNDP, UNFPA, UNHCR, UNICEF, UNMIL Human Rights and Police, and WFP. The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) has an observer status.

ii. Evaluation of the Cluster Approach:

The global Cluster Approach Self-Assessment undertaken by the IASC found some positive outcomes, such as the forging of stronger partnerships and the mobilization of funds.[110] The CHAP 2007 cites that while the introduction of the Cluster Approach faced teething problems due to the lack of guidance from IASC and OCHA, it provided further impetus for closer coordination and improved the focus and response of some clusters. In general, a number of characteristics differentiate Liberia from other Cluster Approach pilot countries, as Liberia is a country in transition from relief to recovery, while there are still pockets of significant humanitarian needs. The IASC Self-Assessment found that it had been unclear how to best implement the cluster approach in a mainly "transitional" context. The humanitarian coordination function has been subsumed into the United National Mission in Liberia (UNMIL), and awareness of how to bring about the Cluster Approach, and the implications and benefits offered were initially low. This was due to the perceived inadequate level of preparedness and proactive promotion of the guidelines on the part of the IASC and UNOCHA. Initially, there was an information gap between the global Cluster Leads, UNOCHA, and the IASC and the country level. This meant that organizations acquired information through other channels. While there has been great improvement, there is a continued need to focus on active communication – with the OCHA-Humanitarian Reform Support Unit playing a central role in ensuring communications are maintained. OCHA's HRSU organized a workshop on the cluster approach in Liberia. In terms of the **Protection Cluster**, according to both the UNHCR's Real-Time Evaluation of its IDP Operation in Liberia (July 2007) and the IASC Self-Assessment of the Cluster Approach (2005), there has been clear leadership within the Protection Cluster. However, the former evaluation states that the relationship between the PCG and the sub-clusters is not clearly defined and there are communication gaps.[111]

iii. Child protection coordination structures

The Child Protection functions as a priority area in the overall protection cluster. At national level, co-chaired by UNICEF and the government of Liberia (GoL) and has the following membership:

UN: UNICEF, UNHCR, UNDP, UNMIL

Government: Yes

Other: ICRC as an observer

INGOs: SC-UK, IRC, WVI, CCF, Samaritan Purse, Search, Find,

NNGOs: CAP, Don Bosco, WANEP

At county level, the child protection groups are lead by CP agencies (mainly NGOs) chaired the county level CP structure (task forces).

---

[110] UNICF HAR 2008, p.2

[111] UNHCR's Real-Time Evaluation does not look into Child Protection issues within the Protection Cluster findings: http://www.internal-displacement.org/8025708F004CE90B/(httpDocuments)/F540F16CD4583DD4C125732200535BE2/$file/Real+Time+evaluation+UNHCR+full+report+July+24.pdf, pp.16-19

ToRs: Yes

    c. Other parallel child protection coordination mechanisms
        i. M&R and 1612: NONE

    d. Joint child protection activities and initiatives
        i. **Child protection specific**: NONE
        ii. **Joint broader protection/child protection activities:** advocacy efforts via the broader protection cluster on institutionalisation and orphanages
        iii. **Tools:** Guidelines, Referral forms, Stand-by emergency response teams

III.   Funding for child protection coordination activities

Summary from the CAP Review (2007):

Liberia	4 child protection projects
	10% of child protection request funded
	2 out of 4 projects received 0 funding
	40% of overall protection request funded
12%	**of sector funding for child protection**
2%	**of total CAP funding for child protection**
16%	**of total CAP funding for overall protection**

Central Emergency Fund:
As part of the Humanitarian Reform process, there was an allocation of the CERF funding to Liberia. The Cluster Approach served as an efficient mechanism to determine priorities and implementing capacity for the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA)-administered CERF funding allocated to Liberia in August. In 2006, Liberia was allocated **$4 million** from the CERF as one of the "chronic under-funded" emergencies. Funding was allocated to the clusters of Health ($2 million), WatSan ($1 million), and Food Security/Agriculture ($1 million) - **not to the Protection Cluster**.

Common Humanitarian Action Plan (CHAP) 2007:
While the Liberia appeal has not been repeated in for 2008, the CHAP launched in February 2007 included actions to minimize the gap between humanitarian action and development, as prioritized by the clusters of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) Country Team. The Liberia CHAP is complemented by the West Africa 2007 CAP launched in November 2006.[112] Humanitarian support required for Liberia in 2007 was estimated by the clusters at **$116.8 million** revised to **$109.4 million** – to address humanitarian needs identified in the interim Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (iPRSP).[113] The CHAP 2007 was funded at $67.4 million (62%).[114] The strategic humanitarian priorities of the CHAP remained broadly the same as in 2006, namely: the provision of basic social services to vulnerable populations; revitalization of returnee communities for security and productive livelihoods; strengthening the capacity of civil society and local authorities.

The **Protection/Human Rights/Rule of Law** sector appealed for **$20.6 million (17.6%) – revised to $26.8 million (24.5%)** through the CHAP to cover 8 projects. Six out of the eight projects covered child protection activities: amounting to $12.7 million (61.7% of total sector funding):

- GBV and the Legal Sector (Christian Children's Fund) - $394,000
- Meeting the health needs of GBV survivors (Christian Children's Fund) - $440,000
- Safeguarding the Future Effectively (Protection of girls and women against Sexual Exploitation and Abuse) (Christian Children's Fund) - $500,000
- Children without Primary Caregivers and Juvenile Justice (UNICEF) – $592,000
- Reintegration of demobilized children and other war affected children (UNICEF) - $8 million
- Protection of children from sexual violence, exploitation and abuse (UNICEF) - $2.8 million

---

[112] http://www.reliefweb.int/rw/rwb.nsf/db900SID/EGUA-6YCRYR?OpenDocument

[113] In some clusters, the cluster lead agency is shown as the appealing agency for all projects in that cluster or sector. These may represent consolidated projects where the cluster lead agency is seeking funds on behalf of a number of partners, as agreed locally.

[114] 16th December 2007, see http://ocha.unog.ch/fts/reports/daily/ocha_R3sum_A757___07121607.pdf

In total, the Protection/Human Rights Cluster received **10.8 million (40%)** of the revised request for $26.8 million. While the Protection Cluster request was among the three highest funding requests in the CHAP, it received the second largest proportion of funding through the CHAP, but received relatively low funding in terms of the percentage vis-à-vis the request made, only fairing better than the Health and the Water and Sanitation sectors.

UNHCR requested $39.6 million (33.9%) through the CHAP, while UNICEF appealed for a total of $20.7 million (17.7%).

Consolidated Appeals Process 2006:
In 2006, the initial requirements were at $121 million revised to $145.2 million to meet urgent humanitarian needs. However, only 50% of the revised funding requirements were met amounting to $72.6 million through the CAP. Protection and Human Rights requested a revised amount of $13.4 million (9.2% of the total amount), and received $4.7 million (35%). Only Shelter and Non-Food Items as well as the Health sector received a lower percentage of funding in relation to their requests. The lack of overall funding qualified Liberia for funding through the CERF under-funded mechanism which amounted to $4 million. This allocation is included in the total CAP allocation figure.

The OCHA FTS recorded a further 436.2 million provided for Liberia outside the CAP. In sum, the total allocations for humanitarian assistance for Liberia amounted to $108.9 million. Funding was also provided through the funds contributed in the West Africa Regional CAP, so it is difficult to get a comprehensive picture of the sectoral allocations of the funding outside the Liberia 2006 CAP, as much of the funding is allocated in blocks to organizations rather than enumerated for specific purposes.

UNICEF Humanitarian Action Report 2007:
UNICEF's financial needs for Liberia in 2007 was at $20.8 million – outside of the Consolidated Appeals Framework - with $4 million requested for child protection activities[115] for the reintegration of demobilized children formerly associated with fighting forces; training of teachers and of students on sexual exploitation and abuse; supporting transit centers for juveniles as an alternative to detention with adults; providing legal protection training on juvenile justice reform; revitalizing the juvenile court; training Liberian National Police officers.

UNICEF Humanitarian Action Report 2008:
Requests a total of $18.2 million (outside the Consolidated Appeals Framework) including $4.1 million (19.2%) for Child Protection activities for reintegration opportunities to war-affected children; the training of teachers and health staff on response to sexual exploitation and abuse; support the prevention, identification, documentation, tracing, care and reunification of separated children; support transit centers for juveniles as alternative to detention with adults, and train police officers serving in the Women and Children's Protection Unit.

IV.   Recommendations from the field

Guidance from the global and child protection actors:

-   Need to ensure that broader protection actors understand the specifics of child protection and necessary expertise
-   Resources to support coordination by NGOs if they are the lead agencies
-   Capacity building and technical support
-   Logistics and material support for lead agencies

-   How other clusters deal with issues of cultural challenges around child protection (FGM, child labour, internal child trafficking)

---

[115] It was not possible to ascertain how much of the requested amount was actually funded.

- How other clusters deal with juvenile justice issues
- How other clusters have dealt with the issues of national policies regarding institutional care-giving (adoption, orphanage, etc)
- How others have been able to mainstream child protection issues into other cluster working groups

V.   Sources

Agencies and organisations interviewed:

- UNICEF
- IRC

Open sources consulted:

- Humanitarian Information Centre:
http://www.humanitarianinfo.org/liberia/

- IASC:
Inter-Agency Support Mission to Liberia, 20 – 25th November 2005:
http://www.reliefweb.int/idp/docs/reports/2005/Liberia%20mission%20report%2020-25%20november%202005.pdf

- OCHA:
http://ochaonline.un.org/humanitarianappeal/webpage.asp?Page=1546
OCHA Financial Tracking System:
http://ocha.unog.ch/fts/reports/daily/ocha_R3sum_A757___07121607.pdf
Humanitarian Reform Support Unit:
http://www.humanitarianreform.org/Default.aspx?tabid=310
IASC Interim Self-Assessment of Implementation of the Cluster Approach in the Field, 15-17 November 2006

- Office of the Special Representative of the Secretary General for Children and Armed Conflict:
http://www.un.org/children/conflict/english/liberia.html

- Relief Web:
http://www.reliefweb.int/rw/RWB.NSF/db900SID/EGUA-79VSMS?OpenDocument&rc=1&cc=lbr
http://www.reliefweb.int/rw/rwb.nsf/db900SID/EGUA-6YCRYR?OpenDocument

- UNHCR:
Real-Time Evaluation of UNHCR's IDP operation in Liberia, July 2007:
http://www.internal-displacement.org/8025708F004CE90B/(httpDocuments)/F540F16CD4583DD4C125732200535BE2/$file/Real+Time+evaluation+UNHCR+full+report+July+24.pdf
UNICEF Humanitarian Action Report 2007
UNICEF Humanitarian Action Report 2008 – Summary (draft)

- UNMIL Liberia:
http://www.un.org/Depts/dpko/missions/unmil/background.html

ANNEX **6.5**

MOZAMBIQUE

I.   Background information

a. Humanitarian context

Despite improvements in reducing poverty levels, Mozambique remains one of the poorest countries in the world, ranking number 168 out of 177 countries on the 2005 Human Development Index (HDI). It has a predominantly rural population with 75% depending on small-scale agriculture. Approximately 38% of the population live with less than $1 a day; life expectancy is at 42 years of age; 57% do not have access to a safe water supply. HIV/AIDS prevalence in over 15 year olds is 16% with 58% of all those living with HIV/AIDS being women. The infant mortality rate is high –158 per 100,000 live births.[116] Most of the 1,250 units of health care network are in a less than reasonable state of preservation, with 30% of them without running water; malaria is the first cause of death in the country particularly affecting women and children. The country's chronic state of vulnerability and humanitarian crisis results from three principal factors: 1) the weak infrastructure for basic services decimated after more than a decade of civil war; 2) the impact of HIV/AIDS on national capacities and development; 3) the susceptibility of Mozambique to natural disasters, including seasonal floods, cyclones and prolonged droughts, as localized flooding is common during the southern African rainy season from October to March.

Mozambique is prone to a wide range of natural disasters, which regularly cause major damage to the local communities as well as setbacks to economic growth. Over the past 45 years, Mozambique has had 53 natural disasters – an average of 1.17 disasters per year. The country's main hazards are floods, cyclones and droughts, while many analysts consider droughts to be Mozambique's most serious potential hazard.[117] During the first months of 2007, Mozambique experienced two simultaneous natural disasters, starting on the 4th of February with the Zambezi River Basin Flood Emergency, which affected an estimated 285,000 people, including 163,000 who sought shelter in emergency accommodation and resettlement centers, while some 56,000 who farmed on the river basin, lost their crops.[118] More than half of the flood affected population was estimated to be children. Access to education was severely disrupted for these children as a result of the floods, as many schools were damaged and/or made inaccessible. A high number of orphaned and vulnerable children were registered.[119]

Later the same month, Cyclone Favio hit on the 22nd February affecting a further 150,000 people across the southern province of Inhambane. While dealing with both the flood and cyclone affected areas, Mozambique was further troubled by a sea surge killing ten and affecting 400-500 people and an explosion in an ammunition depot killing approximately 100 people in March 2007. These events had stretched thin not only the Government's capacity, but also that of the international humanitarian community.

Due to the poor availability of clean water and sanitation facilities, populations in districts vulnerable to flooding and cyclones face the constant threat of cholera outbreaks. During the emergencies, a very small percentage of accommodation centers had sanitation facilities, or functioning wells, and many of these centers had no means of providing water. Poor access to clean water has a direct affect women and girls directly as they are responsible for collecting most of the domestic water at the household level – leaving less time for school attendance and childcare.

---

[116] ActionAid report: *The Cluster Approach in Mozambique: Is it improving emergency response? An NGO perspective*, p.7
[117] ActionAid report: *The Cluster Approach in Mozambique: Is it improving emergency response? An NGO perspective*, p.7
[118] IASC briefing on the Humanitarian Situation after the Floods in Mozambique, by Ms. Paola Emerson (OCHA), Humanitarian Affairs Officer, Geographical Coordination and Monitoring Section, 28th March 2007
[119] UNICEF Humanitarian Action Mozambique donor update, 23rd February 2007

In Mozambique, diarrhoea resulting from water-borne diseases is still a major child killer, with a prevalence of 14% among under-five children.

Child deaths are a source of major concern: of an estimated 715,000 children born every year, about 89,000 will die before reaching age one and an additional 39,000 will die before reaching age five. Malnutrition remains the major underlying cause of almost 50% of child deaths in the country. General malnutrition rates in the population are quite high, while the 2002/3 Demographic and Health Survey indicated that 41% of Mozambican children are stunted and 24% underweight. Malaria is another major cause of child deaths in Mozambique. At the same time access to basic health care and infrastructures had been disrupted in affected areas due to the cyclone.

With the high HIV prevalence in the affected regions and the further risk of HIV infection due to consequences of the disaster, as well as infection associated with gender-based violence and sexual exploitation, children face a risk of being orphaned by HIV/AIDS. In 2006, the number of children orphaned by HIV/AIDS was estimated at 380,000, while the number is expected to increase to 630,000 by the year 2010.[120]

b. Protection concerns

Protection is a key concern in emergency responses to natural disasters, notably in relation to the protective and psycho-social environment of accommodation centres for displaced populations to protect children, women and men from violence, abuse, exploitation, neglect and discrimination. Urgent action is required to address additional risk of HIV infection associated with gender-based violence and sexual exploitation, as well as specific HIV related discrimination

c. Child protection concerns

HIV/AIDS:
With the world's highest HIV prevalence rate, women and children, and notably orphaned and vulnerable children (OVC) are severely affected; the rate of OVC and grandmother- and child-headed households is increasing. In 2006, the number of children orphaned by HIV/AIDS was estimated at 380,000 and this figure is expected to increase to 630,000 by the year 2010. Orphaned children are becoming more and more vulnerable as extended families are unable to meet their basic needs, particularly in areas with the worst humanitarian conditions.[121]

Children and Armed Conflict:

During the civil war in Mozambique, thousands of children were used as soldiers between FRELIMO and the Mozambique National Resistance (RENAMO).[122] During the negotiations on the Optional Protocol of the CRC, Mozambique supported a "straight-18" ban on military recruitment during. Mozambican law allows conscription from the age of 18 but this age limit may be lowered during times of war. There are concerns that former child soldiers, now of draft age, may be liable for compulsory military service again.[123]

---

[120] UNICEF Humanitarian Action Report 2008
[121] UNICEF Humanitarian Action Report 2008
[122] See Interact report: *Children in Armed Conflict Review and Evaluation Workshop*, 22 June 2004, Pretoria, South Africa: http://www.issafrica.org/pubs/CReports/2004/interactjun.pdf

[123] See Human Rights Watch article, November 2001: http://hrw.org/doc/?t=africa&c=mozamb

II. Child protection in emergencies – coordination structures

Highlights

<div style="border:1px solid black;padding:10px;">

Model used: Child protection agency led protection cluster; no field structures; no separate child protection structures since the child protection agencies were running the overall protection cluster

Locus of decision taking on child protection issues: Outside of protection cluster; old structures stayed in place – emphasis remained on individual agencies, with occasional ad hoc joint decision-making (cash transfers for emergency response)

Staff time dedicated to child protection coordination:

During emergency: 2 staff at ¾ of their time from UNICEF plus involvement of Deputy Head of Office, 2 staff at 20% of their time and 1 full-time deployee for 1 month from Save the Children

Between emergencies: 1 day per month

</div>

a. Pre-existing child protection coordination structures

Prior to the protection cluster, there were working groups on thematic issues (orphans, vulnerable children, GBV and legal reform) in which the Government of Mozambique also participates.

b. Current child protection coordination structures and the protection cluster

i. Humanitarian Reform and Cluster Approach:

With a strong disaster management system in place - the National Disaster Management Institute of Mozambique (INGC, Instituto Nacional para Genencia das Calamidades) - the Government of Mozambique led the emergency response. In support of this effort, the UN County Team, during their retreat on 8th of February, agreed on the formation of a Humanitarian Country Team (HCT), to initiate the Cluster Approach and submit a Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) application.[124] With the rapid onset of the emergency, OCHA's Humanitarian Reform Support Unit did not organize a workshop on the Cluster Approach in Mozambique, but arrived in Maputo to support the setting up of the Cluster Approach. Ten clusters were set up on the 12th February to reflect the sector working groups in the National Emergency Operations Centre (CENOE – Centro Nacional Operativo de Emergencia) - an

---

[124] See Inter-Agency Real-Time Evaluation of the Response to the February 2007 Floods and Cyclones in Mozambique. According to the ActionAid report on the Cluster Approach in Mozambique, NGO participation in this decision was minimal, as there was no IASC, or Humanitarian Partnership Country Team (HCT), and the Disaster Management Team did not have any NGO participation. Although an HCT was established on 13th February, it did not include any NGO members. An IASC was formed for the duration of the emergency, but the Resident Coordinator subsequently disbanded it. See ActionAid report: *The Cluster Approach in Mozambique: Is it improving emergency response? An NGO perspective*, p.12

offshoot of the INGC. It should be noted that the cluster approach was adopted for the Zambezi valley floods, but not used for the response to Cyclone Favio where the INGC managed field level coordination. The clusters have continued as a coordination mechanism beyond the emergency phase, and undertook contingency planning for future rapid response.

- Early Recovery: UNDP
- Education Cluster: jointly led by UNICEF/ Save the Children Alliance;
- Food Security: jointly led by WFP/FAO
- Health: WHO;
- Logistics: WFP;
- Nutrition: led by UNICEF;
- **Protection Cluster:** jointly led by **UNICEF/Save the Children Alliance**;
- Shelter[125]: jointly led by IFRC[126]/Mozambican Red Cross
- Telecommunication: WFP;
- Water, Sanitation and Hygiene: UNICEF

ii. Protection Cluster:

Save the Children Alliance and UNICEF were nominated co-leaders of the Protection Cluster. The Cluster worked closely with the Ministry of Women and Social Affairs and the Ministry of Interior notably on family reunification issues. Key activities of the Protection Cluster included: prevention of sexual exploitation and abuse through the training of national police and national actors; assessing children separated from their families and reunification of affected children with their families; training on psycho-social support for children; training on mine risk education. Save the Children Alliance, UNICEF and UNFPA are have been conducting training in the area of SGBV and child protection to enhance readiness on the part of government and cluster partners for future natural disaster response.

Members:
- **Co-leads**: Save the Children Alliance and UNICEF
- **UN agencies**: UNFPA, UNESCO, WFP, UNAIDS
- **Government:** Yes
- **NGOs**: Action Aid, Africare, ASADEC, ASVIMO, Concern, Food for the Hungry International, Halo Trust, Handicap International, Helpage International, International Relief, Rede Came, Rede da Criança, Samaritans Purse, Terre des Hommes, World Vision
- **Other**: Mozambican Red Cross

Real-Time Evaluation (RTE): An independent, inter-agency IA-RTE of the Flood and Cyclone emergency responses in Mozambique was commissioned by the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) to assess the effectiveness of the response in relation to the implementation of the Cluster Approach, as well as planning and preparedness. The IA-RTE was conducted from the 2nd to 23rd April, covering the period February to April 2007. The evaluation focused on the performance of the cluster approach in terms of improving coordination, partnerships, leadership, information management, monitoring and quality control, cross-cutting themes (HIV/AIDS, Early Recovery and Gender), funding, and leadership, but did **not look into the Protection Cluster and Child Protection matters**.

iii. Child protection coordination structure

No distinction between the child protection coordination structure and the protection cluster.

---

[125] Camp coordination, led by IOM, was a separate sub-cluster but was later merged with the Shelter Cluster on 21st March 2007
[126] UNHabitat took the lead from IFRC on 13th March 2007

c. **Other parallel child protection coordination mechanisms**
   i. **M&R and 1612:** None
   ii. **Other:** Inter-agency reporting procedure set up in camps so that the women and children could report abuses
d. **Joint child protection activities and initiatives**
   i. **Child protection specific:** ToT for CPIE roll-out; UNFPA/SC/UNICEF GBV training;

   ii. **Joint broader protection/child protection activities:** Multi-sectoral assessment including protection in collaboration with the IASC; establishment of protection focal points in other clusters; translation of tracing forms into Portuguese

III.   Funding for child protection coordination activities [127]

<u>Summary of Flash Appeals Review (2007)</u>:

<u>Mozambique Floods</u>	0 child protection projects out of 4 protection projects total
	68% of overall protection request funded
3%	**of flash appeal for overall protection**

a.   General observations

<u>**2007**</u>:

The total funding received for the flood response in Mozambique in February 2007 amounted to a total of almost $46.9 million. Of the total amount, $26.6 million or almost 57% came through the Flash Appeal, with the remaining amount from outside of the Appeal. The largest portions of funding were through: the CERF at $12.2 million or 26%; ECHO at $9.7 million or 21%; US $7.2 million or 15%.[128]

During the initial phase of the flood response, UN agencies and other humanitarian partners used emergency funds, emergency stockpiles, and reprogrammed existing resources to meet the emergency needs before a joint request to the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) was submitted a week after the peak of the flooding. The **CERF** allocated $12.2 million to Mozambique, of which **$464,030** went to the **Protection Cluster** through UNICEF – presumably for child protection activities. This was followed by a Flash Appeal on 12th March which attracted $26.6 million covering almost 69% of the required $38.7 million.

Outside of the Appeals, Mozambique received $2.5 million in 2007, with Japan providing 43% or $1.1 million; Germany and Italy following with $405,405 and $283,688 respectively. **None** of the miscellaneous **funding outside of the appeals went towards child protection**.

While funding for the Protection Cluster and for **Child Protection** activities appear to have been comparatively low in relation to the overall amount, the Cluster and Child Protection activities were well-funded in relation to the requested amount.

<u>**2006**</u>:

Mozambique received a total of $17.8 million in humanitarian assistance in the year 2006, primarily to respond to drought, epidemics and diseases, and food security. The largest donors were: the US at $12.9 million or 73% of the total funding; ECHO at $2.2 million or 12%; and Germany at $1 million or almost 6% of the total.[129] Out of this, only one project was related to child protection through the Swiss NGO Terre des Hommes (TdH), which received

---

[127] Note: a) All funding figures have been extracted from the Financial Tracking Service (FTS) through ReliefWeb.org and approach the funding figures from an inter-agency perspective. Thus, the figures used in the calculations are based on information provided to the FTS by agencies and donors, however, cannot include any possible, additional funding.
b) With regard to UNICEF funding for child protection, the figures have been identified from the various Tables on the FTS. However, this study does not disaggregate what percentage of the funding received covers the separate, individual agency appeals, ie. UNICEF's Humanitarian Action Report funding requests are mentioned, while the actual funding received per UNICEF appeal are not mentioned.
[128] January 9rd 2008, FTS: http://ocha.unog.ch/fts/reports/daily/ocha_R21_Y2007___08010307.pdf
[129] See FTS website, Mozambique 2006, Table B:
http://ocha.unog.ch/fts/reports/daily/ocha_R24_E15044___08021307.pdf

$110,168 for community-based assistance for orphaned and vulnerable children, consequences of HIV/AIDS.[130] Thus, this figure represents less than 1% of the total funding for Mozambique in 2006.

b. **<u>Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF):</u>**[131]

<u>2007</u>:

In order to scale-up immediate emergency response activities, the Humanitarian Country Team decided to request a grant of $13 million and submitted this application on the 20th February 2007. The HCT received a total of $12.2 million.[132] This included funding for the sectors: Agriculture (FAO), Coordination and support services (WFP, UNDP), Education (UNICEF), Food (WFP), Health (UNICEF, UNFPA, WHO), **Protection/Human Rights/Rule of Law (UNICEF),** Shelter and NFIs (IOM), Water and Sanitation (UNICEF).[133] In sum, the CERF allocation of **$464,030** for the **Protection Cluster** through UNICEF presumably went towards **Child Protection** activities and was just under **4% of the total CERF funding** to Mozambique in 2007.

<u>2006</u>:

Mozambique did not receive CERF funding in 2006.

c. **<u>Mozambique Floods and Cyclone Flash Appeal 2007:</u>**

On the 12th March 2007**,** the Humanitarian Country Team appealed for a further $24 million through the Flash Appeal in addition to the $10.8 million committed at the time through the CERF and the $2.8 million through other commitments or contributions. Thus, the amount totaled a requirement of $37.6 million revised to $38.7 million. The Flash Appeal was covered at **$26.6 million** or 69% of revised appeal – however, it must be noted that a large part of the Flash Appeal funding, $11.2 million or 42%, was composed of CERF funds. This was followed by US funding at $5 million or 19% and ECHO funding at $2.7 million or 10%[134]

The **Protection Cluster** requested a comparatively low sum of $869,231 through the Flash Appeal, amounting to a total of $1.3 million with the revised appeal to cover four projects (two UNICEF projects, UNFPA, World Vision). All Protection Cluster projects were related to Child Protection, and only two UNICEF projects (out of four projects within the Cluster) were funded. In sum, **funding for the Protection Cluster went entirely for child protection activities, which were funded at a total sum of $907,018. This represented 68% of the requested amount, or just over 3% of the overall funding for the Mozambique Appeal in 2007**.

Table of Child Protection Projects within the Protection Cluster for the Flash Appeal:

Project	Appealing Agency	Original requirements	Revised requirements	Funding USD	% Covered
Ensuring a Protective	World Vision	$50,000	$50,000	0	0%

---

[130] See FTS website, Mozambique 2006, Table A: http://ocha.unog.ch/fts/reports/daily/ocha_R10_E15044___08021307.pdf

[131] ActionAid report notes that the fact that UN agencies can access CERF funding and NGOs and international NGOs cannot directly access it places an immediate strain on the concept of partnership. It also points to the Real Time Evaluation that reported how local NGOs were constrained by a lack of funding… and felt that they had been left out of the international response". One international NGO noted that many local NGOs had not even heard of the CERF prior to the emergency and would have been helped by a very short summary document in Portuguese.See ActionAid report: *The Cluster Approach in Mozambique: Is it improving emergency response? An NGO perspective*, p.16

[132] December 5TH 2007

[133] See CERF website: http://ochaonline.un.org/Default.aspx?tabid=1718

[134] See IA-RTE report, and FTS website

Environment in flood affected areas [135]					
Ensuring a protective environment in cyclone affected areas [136]	UNFPA	$38,800	$38,800	0	0%
Ensuring a protective environment in flood and cyclone affected areas [137]	UNICEF	$780,431	$780,431	$442,990	57%
Protection support for the flood response [138]	UNICEF	$464,027	$464,027	$464,027	100% (fully funded by CERF)
TOTAL	**2 UNICEF projects, 1 UNFPA, 1 World Vision**	**$1.3 million**	**$1.3 million**	**$907,017**	**70% of requested amount**

As co-leads of the Protection Cluster, it is interesting to note that while UNICEF's projects comprised half of the Protection Cluster ones, Save the Children Alliance did not have any projects listed in Protection, but had projects in the Education and Food sectors instead. From the whole appeal, UNICEF was well-funded at $6.3 million or 89% - while Save the Children's total requirement for $987,670 was not funded at all through the Flash Appeal (0%).[139]

d. Other Humanitarian Funding outside of the Appeal:

Other humanitarian funding outside of the appeal and in response to the floods in 2007 amounted to a total sum of $20.3 million.[140] **None of this funding went towards protection or child protection activities.**

i. IFRC Appeal:

---

[135] Psychosocial support & protection from GBV to women and children, child friendly spaces in five accommodation centres

[136] UNFPA project on training accommodation centre staff and health workers on the protection of women & children from GBV & to provide rape treatment kits

[137] UNICEF project: training health workers and humanitarian workers on protection and prevention of GBV; to provide basic household and recreational kits to affected populations from floods and cyclone; to provide psycho-social support to children and women in flood and cyclone affected areas

[138] UNICEF project: protecting children & women from violence and abuse; provide household items; enhancing the psycho-social environment; training humanitarian workers in protection & a principled approach to humanitarian action; carrying out Mine Assessment & ensuing Mine-risk Awareness activities.

[139] UNICEF requested just over $7.1 million and was funded at almost 89% or $6.3 million; UNFPA received 62% or $578,072 of its requested $931,872; however, the co-lead for the Protection Cluster, Save the Children, did not receive any funding for its appeal of $987,670January 9th 2008, see FTS: http://ocha.unog.ch/fts/reports/daily/ocha_R1_A760___07120607.pdf

[140] FTS funding: http://ocha.unog.ch/fts/reports/daily/ocha_R4_A760___08021307.pdf

The IFRC issued an appeal on the 16th February for $5.97 million for the flood response, and a revised appeal on 14th March for $16.9 million. This appeal was poorly supported at $2.2 million (April 14th figure).

ii. __UNICEF funding__:

Under the Mozambique Flash Appeal: UNICEF requested $7.13 million – incorporating the initial HAR 2007 amount of $5.2 million – and received $5.9 million to address both emergencies. This included the CERF funds of $2.7 million received for the Education, Health, Protection, and Wash Clusters. In total, UNICEF's requests through the Flash Appeal were funded at $26.6 million (88.50%).[141]

UNICEF's Humanitarian Action Report (HAR) 2007: initially requested $5.2 million of which the Country received $5.9 million – incorporating funds received against the HAR and the Flash Appeal as mentioned above.[142] The request for **Child Protection** activities was at $181,900 and was well-funded at $907,017 (including HAR & Flash Appeal funding). The revised figures for the Mid-Year Review of the HAR requested an additional $5.7 million for preparedness and response for the rainy season of which $400,000 was requested for Child Protection activities (and a separate $100,000 for programme communication for HIV/AIDS). In total, $10.9 million was requested in 2007 through the HAR.

IV. Recommendations from the field

Requests to global and child protection actors:

➢ Concrete case studies from other clusters, which are more useful than generic ToRs and indicators.
➢ The PC had enough technical competence, but can only ask for what it is aware of so would be good to have updates on new developments and tools, shared experiences, etc.
➢ Technical standards more relevant to non conflict, natural disaster situations
➢ Shared standardized needs assessments tool, would be particularly helpful for govt counterparts who are used to dealing with water or logistics with concrete, measurable targets
➢ Where HIV/AIDS is an issue would be good to have more guidance on protection needs associated with HIV, i.e. discrimination, prevention

V. Sources

Agencies and organisations interviewed:
• UNICEF
• Save the Children

Open sources consulted:

• ActionAid:
ActionAid report: *The Cluster Approach in Mozambique 2007: Is it improving emergency response? An NGO perspective,* November 2007

• CERF

---

[141] http://ocha.unog.ch/fts/reports/daily/ocha_R1_A760___07121207.pdf
[142] HAR Mid-Year Review 2007 (July), p.43

http://ochaonline.un.org/Default.aspx?tabid=1801

- Financial Tracking Service (FTS):
http://www.reliefweb.int/rw/fts.nsf/doc105?OpenForm&rc=1&cc=moz

- Interact:
Interact report: *Children in Armed Conflict Review and Evaluation Workshop*, 22 June 2004, Pretoria, South Africa:
http://www.issafrica.org/pubs/CReports/2004/interactjun.pdf

- International Federation for the Red Cross:
Operations Update for Mozambique, February 23rd 2007: http://www.ifrc.org/docs/appeals/07/MDRMZ002EA01.pdf
-Revised Appeal for Mozambique, 14th March 2007
http://www.reliefweb.int/rw/RWFiles2007.nsf/FilesByRWDocUnidFilename/YSAR-6ZAMYZ-Full_Report.pdf/$File/Full_Report.pdf

- OCHA :
Flash Appeal Mozambique, 12th March 2007
http://ochaonline.un.org/humanitarianappeal/webpage.asp?MenuID=10353&Page=1558

Humanitarian Appeal: http://ochaonline3.un.org/cap2005/webpage.asp?Page=1558

OCHA Mozambique Floods SitRep, 25 February 2007
OCHA SitRep Mozambique Floods, No. 7, 22 February 2007
OCHA MOZAMBIQUE: Floods, OCHA SitRep No. 6, 21 February 2007

- OHCHR:
http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/ratification/11_b.htm

- UNICEF:
UNICEF Humanitarian Action Update, Mozambique, 15th November 2007
UNICEF HAR 2007 report
UNICEF HAR 2007 Mid-Year Review
UNICEF HAR report 2008 (draft)

UNICEF SitRep, Mozambique, 24 February 2007
UNICEF Mozambique donor update 23 February 2007
UNICEF Situation Report MOZAMBIQUE 22 February 2007
UNICEF SitRep MOZAMBIQUE, 20 February 2007

ANNEX **6.6**

PHILIPPINES

I.   Background information

a. Humanitarian context

The Philippines lies along the Pacific typhoon belt and the western rim of the Pacific Ring of Fire, a belt of active volcanoes and major earthquake faults. The country is one of the most disaster-prone countries in the world: much of it is mountainous and vulnerable to earthquakes and eruptions from around 20 active volcanoes; the country faces about 20 typhoons annually on average, with five of them expected to cause major damages to life and property. Typhoons remain the largest killers in the Philippines, followed by earthquakes, volcanoes and floods. In the 20th century, deaths due to typhoons in the country have amounted to 28,812 and $5,653 million in damages (World Bank and National Disaster Coordination Council, 2004). Since 2000, nearly three million people have been affected by various disasters annually. Based on statistics provided by the National Disaster Coordination Council (NDCC), the frequency and severity of natural disasters have been increasing, as has the scale of impact in terms of loss of life and property damage. Recently, at the end of July 2007, the Bulusan Volcano in the Province of Sorsogon in the Bicol Region exploded affecting six municipalities and a total of 20,747 students. Vulnerability to natural hazards is closely linked to poverty thus largely affecting rural areas.

In 2006, three extreme weather disturbances (typhoons) hit the Philippines within 10 weeks between the 25th September and 1st December 2006, with another lower order typhoon on 9th December. These events triggered landslides, flash floods, mudslides, widespread flooding and together with the associated high winds, caused destruction and damage to homes, community buildings, communications, infrastructure, roads, bridges, agricultural crops and fishing farms affecting more than seven million people.[143] A total of 62 of the country's 79 provinces were affected by the typhoons' impact, and the estimated total losses from these typhoons amounted to $1,175 million.[144] The most destructive one was Typhoon Reming (also called Durian), which struck the Philippines on 30th November in 2006, severely affecting 469,500 persons in some 62 provinces, creating intense damage and destruction in one of the poorest regions of the country. Most of the severely affected areas were coastal and farming municipalities and towns located around the periphery of Mt. Mayon Volcano. Typhoon Reming was, by all accounts, one of the most destructive typhoons to strike the Philippines in recent memory.

The effects of typhoons Xangsane (25th September 2006), Cimaron (27th October), Chebi (12th November), Durian (28th November), Utor (10th December) are still affecting hundreds of thousands in the Philippines. The first typhoon Xangsane hit in September, followed by typhoon Cimaron on the 27th October. On the 12th November, another typhoon named Chebi battered the same areas as those hit by typhoon Xangsane and Cimaron. Thousands more families were seriously affected and many injured. Typhoon Reming/ Durian, which hit on the 30th November, was the most destructive, severely affecting the provinces of Albay, Catanduanes, and Camarines Sur in southeastern Luzon Island, with significant damage also recorded in Mindoro Oriental, Marinduque, Batangas, Laguna, Mindoro Occidental and Romblon provinces. Over a thousand lives are estimated to have been lost, and over 180,000 houses have been totally destroyed by Reming alone. On the 10th December, yet another typhoon Utor hit the country, the fifth in 2006. These events produced wide-scale destruction and devastation affecting the lives of over 500,000 persons in 62 of the country's 79 provinces in the north eastern provinces. Albay, which was the worst affected

---

[143] 2006 Philippines Typhoon Appeal, p.10
[144] http://www.internal-displacement.org/idmc/website/countries.nsf/(httpEnvelopes)/69EDB90EE38DFA6EC1257291004D6733?OpenDocument

province, hosted 3,097 families displaced in 23 evacuation centers and 2 transitional sites in Legaspi City, Daraga, Guinobatan and Camalig.[145]

The typhoons that hit the Philippines in 2006 caused the deaths of 1,158 people, the displacement of more than 300,000 people, and approximately $450 million in infrastructure damage and agricultural losses. A total of 309,518 of houses were totally damaged, over 3,000 families were living in evacuation centers, and an additional 42,000 families were living in shanties or improvised shelters. The typhoons inflicted severe damage to health centres in a number of provinces. In some of the provinces affected, there was already a low coverage of polio 3. Many communities were cut off access to safe water, and the poor water and sanitation conditions posed a risk to the health of communities. The extensive devastation of Typhoon Reming damaged as least 50% of water facilities and public infrastructures in the affected areas. The provinces of Albay, Camarines Sur and Sorsogon incurred massive livelihood distresses with severe damage of major livelihood systems with displaced people generally heavily affected. Around 3,067 families were dwelling in evacuation and transit centers and a large number of IDPs living in host communities waiting to be able to return. Land acquisitions for identified permanent resettlement sites were pursued by the government.[146]

Children were largely affected. In terms of the nutritional status of children under five years of age, this came under tremendous stress in the aftermath of the typhoons in the Bicol region due to pre-existing high levels of chronic malnutrition of 30% and poor infant and young child feeding practices. Day care centers, pre-schools and basic educational infrastructure sustained varying degrees of damages, for example 236 day care centers were totally damaged and 359 were partially damaged in Albay, affecting 21,548 children; and educational supplies, teaching and learning materials and school furniture were either washed out or destroyed. Over 5,600 schools were damaged disrupting the education of over 800,000 children merely in the Southern Luzon area of the Philippines. A number of children were also orphaned. Most affected children and their families experienced psychological distress.

The Philippines has also faced a 35-year confrontation between the Government and Muslim separatists on the southern island of Mindanao, and a second conflict with communist insurgents across the country that has caused 160,000 deaths and displaced up to two million people since 2000. Armed clashes intensified in 2007 as the Armed Forces of the Philippines (AFP) stepped up its military campaign against non-State armed groups, particularly in Mindanao.

b. Protection concerns

Gender-based violence:
Women, children, young people and the elderly comprise the majority of the displaced population by the recent typhoons. Women's and young girls' roles/workloads were abruptly changed and their rights threatened by violence and lack of security, facing a risk of gender-based and sexual violence.

Armed conflict and displacement:
In 2006, an estimated 100,000 people were displaced from their homes in the Philippines during 2006 as a result of armed conflict and human right abuses mainly in the southernmost island of Mindanao where. In Mindanao due to the Moro campaign for self-rule and other sources of bloodshed, including a long Maoist insurgency, violence linked to militant Islamist groups with pan-Asian aspirations, ethnic vendettas, clan wars and banditry, more than 120,000 people have remained uprooted.[147] Tens of thousands of people in Mindanao remain unable to return or are living in situations akin to displacement due to previous conflicts.[148] Much of the violence is fuelled by deep poverty rooted in

---

[145] OCHA Situation Report 5th February 2007

[146] OCHA Situation Report no. 13, Philippines Typhoon, 2nd March 2007

[147] This is considered to be a conservative estimate. See AlertNet article *Philippines-Minadanao conflict*: http://www.alertnet.org/db/crisisprofiles/PH_SEP.htm

[148] Due to the fluidity of the displacement situation, with frequent clashes and short-term displacement movements, there are no accurate figures available on the total number of internally displaced persons (IDPs). In July 2006, WFP estimated the number of vulnerable IDPs at 120,000. See IDMC: http://www.internal-displacement.org/8025708F004CE90B/(httpCountries)/FB34FE99F089E9C6802570A7004BF2DF?OpenDocument

under-development and the destruction caused by years of fighting that has further impoverished an already disadvantaged population. More than 35% of the population in Mindanao lives in poverty, and the displaced are particularly vulnerable to food insecurity, health risks and unemployment.

c. Child protection concerns

Children and armed conflict:
While there have been no indications of armed forces officially recruiting children, there is increasing concern about the use of child soldiers. Children continue to be targeted for recruitment, allegedly by the: New People's Army (NPA), which is the armed wing of the Communist Party of the Philippines (CPP); Abu Sayyaf Group; and the Mindanao rebel group Moro Islamic Liberation Front (MILF). According to a UNICEF study conducted in 2005-2006, there is an official NPA policy that prohibits recruitment of children under 18, although it allows use of children 15 years and above for non-combat tasks. An earlier report in 2004 by the Coalition to Stop the Use of Child Soldiers notes however that a quarter of new recruits for NPA in Mindanao are thought to be children, representing some 3% of regular troop strength with their tasks ranging from regular combat to post-battle scavenging.[149].In 2002, 10 – 15% of members of the MILF were estimated to be below 18 years of age, and 15 – 30% of Abu Sayyaf members were estimated to be children.[150] The number of children recruited to fight for the Abu Sayyaf Group is reported to have greatly diminished after the joint Philippine-United States military exercises in Basilan.

Progress has been made in the Philippines with the agreement between the Government of the Philippines and the National Democratic Front in February 2004 to establish the Joint Monitoring Committee to monitor the implementation of the 1998 Comprehensive Agreement on Respect for Human Rights and International Humanitarian Law. The Inter-Agency Committee for Children Involved in Armed Conflict (IAC-CIAC) was created through executive order no. 56 in 2001 and mandated to initiate projects for the prevention of recruitment and for the rescue, rehabilitation and reintegration of children involved in armed conflict. There has also been concern regarding cases of children being detained for alleged association with armed groups in violation of international standards.[151]

---

[149] See *Global Report 2004* by Coalition to Stop the Use of Child Soldiers, http://www.child-soldiers.org/regions/country?id=169, see also See AlertNet *Philippines-Mindanao conflict:* http://www.alertnet.org/db/crisisprofiles/PH_SEP.htm?v=in_detail

[150] See *Global Report 2004* by Coalition to Stop the Use of Child Soldiers, http://www.child-soldiers.org/regions/country?id=169

[151] See p.3 of Report of the Secretary General to the Security Council on Children and Armed Conflict, December 2007, A/62/609-S/2007/757 http://daccessdds.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N07/656/04/PDF/N0765604.pdf?OpenElement

II.   Child protection in emergencies – coordination structures
Highlights

Model used: Child protection agency led protection cluster

Locus of decision taking on child protection issues:

National level: outside of the Protection Cluster (within Council for the Welfare of Children);

Provincial and village level: inside (within Provincial Disaster Coordination Council and local councils), and Council for Protection of Children (LCPC)

Staff time dedicated to child protection coordination: During the emergencies very time-consuming,

---

a.   Pre-existing child protection coordination structures:

Prior to the existence of the Protection Cluster, a Child Protection In Emergencies coordination group existed under the Government Council for the Welfare of Children (CWC), an umbrella body responsible for coordination and policy setting for all children's issues. Only one of its sub-committees, the "sub-committee on children affected by armed conflict and displacement" deals with child protection in emergencies

b.   Current child protection coordination structures and the protection cluster

In the period October 2005 to October 2007, the cluster approach was implemented in eight sudden onset emergencies, including in the Philippines. On the 27th December 2006, eleven Clusters were formed - while nine were meeting in January - in the spirit of humanitarian reform. Some of the clusters are co-chaired with the government while some, especially in the field, are led by NGOs. It was also noted that NGOs were not properly consulted on the adoption of the Cluster Approach.[152] The following eleven Clusters were designated:

- Agriculture & Livelihoods (FAO)
- Camp Coordination and IDP Management (IOM)
- Early Recovery (UNDP)
- Education (UNICEF)
- Emergency Shelter (IFRC convenor; UN Habitat Focal Point for long-term housing & resettlement issues)
- Food (WFP)
- Health (WHO)
- Logistics (WFP/IOM)
- Nutrition (UNICEF)
- Protection (UNICEF for children and co-led later with Government of Philippines)
- Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (UNICEF & Oxfam)

Training: At the end of January, OCHA organized a regional workshop on the Humanitarian Reform inviting colleagues from the Philippines working within the Cluster system.

---

[152]http://www.humanitarianreform.org/humanitarianreform/Portals/1/cluster%20approach%20page/training/CSLT%20oct07/Day2/Philippines%20Tip%20sheet.ppt

i. Protection Cluster

The Protection cluster was formed as the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD) agreed to assume the role as the co-lead government agency with UNICEF. Due to the existing capacity, <u>at the beginning</u>, there was a tendency to see protection issues through the lens of child protection, although the protection cluster did cover other protection concerns and reported on broader protection issues through its weekly updates. Several briefings on the mandate of protection cluster were conducted for cluster members, and in Sept 2007, the cluster agreed on a preparedness and contingency plan that covered all protection issues, including child protection

---

Members: Regular participants include:
Co-chairs: UNICEF and Department Social Welfare and Development (DSWD)
Government: Council for Welfare for Children (CWC)
UN: UNICEF
Other organisations: IOM
INGOs : Hope Worlwide, PHILRADS, TRANSDEV, Kapuso Foundation, PLAN-Phil, ADRA, Save the Children Alliance
LNGOs: Citizens Disaster Response Team (CDRC), several faith-based organizations

---

National level:
The Protection Cluster is co-led by the Government of Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD) and UNICEF.[153]

Field level:
No protection cluster apart from one in the region the most devastated by the typhoons and volcanic eruptions in 2006.[154]

Local authorities lead the coordination on protection at the provincial, municipal and village level.

ii. Child protection coordination structures

With a child protection agency leading the protection cluster, co-led with the Government of Philippines (GoP) through the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD), there has been a focus on child protection issues. The overall coordination on child protection is carried out through a decentralised at the national, regional, provincial and village levels.

National level:

The pre-existing child protection group was expanded at the national level to include other agencies involved in broader protection issues, and this group has its own plans and activities independent of the Protection Cluster which are shared with and reported to the protection cluster through the CWC that is representing the children's sector in the protection cluster.

Regional level:

The Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD) presence is only down to the regional level with only nominal influence over local social welfare offices. Regional Secretariats are headed by DSWD regional offices.

---

[153] IOM offered to co-lead but didn't take on an active role.
[154] The roll-out of the cluster approach down to the local levels has been a challenge.

Field level (provincial, municipal and barangay (village) levels):

Different aspects of CP have been addressed by different agencies. Main responsibility for child protection rests with the Gov (DSWD) and local government units (LGUs) or local councils for the protection of children (LCPCs), which are led by the local chief executives, governors, mayors and barangay chairmen.

Reporting lines: Reporting on CP goes through the DSWD system. However, due to decentralized nature of the set-up, reporting from the local levels is uneven. UNICEF does not have a formal reporting line between the field and the national level on CP issues, and relies on the reporting system of the government and NGOs.

c. Other parallel child protection coordination mechanisms
i. M&R and 1612:

The Philippine country-level task force for monitoring and reporting was convened in March 2007, comprising UN system agencies, child rights and local human rights organisations. In July, the Government confirmed its concurrence with the implementation of SC Resolution 1612.[155]

ii. Other:

Other monitoring mechanisms through national and local NGOs (but limited capacity)

d. Joint child protection activities and initiatives[156]
i. Child protection specific:

None; manual developed for NDCC on disaggregated data for CPIE (not used by government)

ii. Joint broader protection/child protection activities:
NONE except for training

---

[155] Secretary General's Report on Children and Armed Conflict, 21st December 2007, p.28
http://daccessdds.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N07/656/04/PDF/N0765604.pdf?OpenElement
[156] Other inter-agency assessment conducted but not for disasters; ie Child Welfare Committee Assessment in Southern Philippines covered all child rights issues and violations

III.   Funding for child protection coordination activities

Emergency Funding Mechanisms

Overview:
After Reming (Durian) typhoon struck on 30th November in 2007, the Government of the Philippines (GoP) declared a State of National Calamity on 3rd December and announced its readiness to accept offers of international assistance. The UN System in the Philippines met with the National Disaster Coordinating Council, and the UN Resident Coordinator (RC) alerted bilateral and multilateral donors. Australia quickly channelled emergency assistance through the United Nations, and others responded directly or through the Red Cross movement and international NGOs. An Appeal was issued on the 15th of December 2006 to respond to the typhoons that hit the Philippines between September and December, requesting a total of $48.7 million. However, a mere $4.7 million in humanitarian funding through and outside of the Appeal was allocated to the Philippines in 2007. The largest donors included: ECHO at $954,300 or almost 21% of the total funding; the Netherlands at $926,000 or 20%; and Italy at $737,460 at 16% of the total sum.[157] Only $50,000 through the CERF was allocated for child protection in 2007.**[158]**

CERF
A total of $3.5 million in CERF funding has been allocated since 2006 to UN agencies responding to emergencies in the Philippines of which around $50,000 was used to fund specific child protection activities.
In **2007:** New CERF allocation took place in July 2007 to address core humanitarian needs of those unable to return to their destroyed homes due to the effects of the typhoons at the end of 2006. The CERF allocated $938,215 through its rapid response window to UN agencies responding to core humanitarian needs of those unable to return to their destroyed homes due to the typhoons at the end of 2006. This funding targeted the needs in the following sectors: the health sector through WHO at $47,080 and UNFPA at $82,370; food through WFP for $287,955; shelter, camp management, and non-food items through the IOM for $520,810.[159] This included $350,000 for "child protection;" however, this sum was lumped together with the budget for "Family Packs" which constituted a major need and budget item. As the CERF contribution had to be spent within 3 months, few child protection activities could be completed within such a short period. Out of the amount received, around $50,000 could be spent on child protection, and the rest was utilized for family packs.

None of the CERF allocations were for child protection.

In **2006:** The Central Emergency Response Fund provided a total of almost $2.6 million for the typhoon relief in the hardest-hit areas, in advance of the UN Consolidated Appeal, which ultimately received only 11% of requested funding. The CERF enabled the IOM, UNFPA, UNICEF, and WHO to provide immediate humanitarian assistance to disaster-affected communities. The sectors covered included: agriculture through FAO at $100,000; emergency shelter and non-food items through UNICEF at $350,000, WFP at $497,550, IOM at $250,000; multi-sector through UNDP at $350,000 and UNFPA at $243,255; health through WHO at $357,500; water and sanitation through UNICEF at $450,000. UNICEF received $800,000 through the CERF for its response in shelter and non-food items, as well as the water and sanitation cluster.
Note: The CERF website does not indicate any funding for Protection related activities, however the Typhoon Appeal notes that $350,000 in CERF funding was allocated to Protection. In total, one project was funded for child protection amounting to $50,000.[160]

---

[157] Financial Tracking Service, (FTS) see Philippines 2007, Table B:
http://ocha.unog.ch/fts/reports/daily/ocha_R24_E15288___08021413.pdf
[158] Not clear from the OCHA managed FTS, which relies on information provided by donors and organisations on funding figures, what areas the UNICEF projects covered, as they are not specified and are mentioned as "Emergency activities" or "Humanitarian Support", see FTS Philippines Table A: http://ocha.unog.ch/fts/reports/daily/ocha_R10_E15288___08021413.pdf
[159] See CERF website: http://ochaonline.un.org/Default.aspx?tabid=1766
[160] The 2006 Philippines Typhoon Appeal notes that $350,000 or almost 14% of CERF funding was provided to the Protection Cluster, however, this is not noted on the CERF website. See: 2006 Philippines Typhoon Appeal, p.5, and CERF website; http://ochaonline.un.org/cerf/CERF2006/CERF2006country/CountriesreceivingCERFfunds2006/tabid/1800/Default.aspx

Consolidated Appeals Process:
The UN launched the Philippines Typhoon Appeal on the 15th of December 2006 to respond to the cumulative effects of the Typhoons, requesting $46 million to cover the unmet needs totaling $48.7 million.However, low amounts of funding was received – only $4.7 million or 11% of the total appeal.[161] Out of total amount requested, UNICEF appealed for less than 27% of the entire appeal requesting $12.9 million to support five projects of which one was protection related. The organisation received two CERF allocations totalling $800,000 to support projects in shelter and non-food items, as well as water and sanitation. In total, UNICEF received $3.9 million, or 30% of its request.[162]

The Protection Cluster requested a total of $950,000 or less than 2% of the total Appeal. The only project included within the cluster was one through UNICEF for a project to protect children from abuse, violence and discrimination, and facilitate their psychosocial recovery. This was to be in partnership with CWC, Christian Children's Fund, Regional Psychosocial Network-Child Rights Resource Centre, Cultural Centre of the Philippines, DSWD, faith-based organisations, and local government units. The total sum required was $950,000, although a CERF allocation for $350,000 is noted to have been made,[163] thus leaving a need for $600,000 – one of the lowest requirements in the whole Appeal amounting to just over 1% of the total appeal. **No funding was provided for child protection activities**.

Project Title	Appealing agency	Requested amount	CERF coverage	Funding received	% Covered
Promoting a protective environment and psychosocial help for children, their families and communities	UNICEF	$950,000	$350,000	$0	0%

IFCR: In response to the typhoon in September, the IFRC allocated CHF100,000 ($80,000) through their Disaster Relief Emergency Funds (DREF). In October, the IFRC launched a preliminary emergency appeal for CHF 5.7 million ($4.6 million) to assist 126,000 beneficiaries for three months. However, donor response to the preliminary appeal remained very low.[164] In November, the IFRC allocated an additional CHF 100,000 (USD 80,000) from its DREF and in December, it launched a revised international appeal on behalf of the Philippines National Red Cross (PNRC) seeking CHF 10.5 million ($8.6 million) to cover December 2006 till September 2007. None of this was for child protection.

UNICEF: UNICEF appealed for US$310,000 in December 2006 for the typhoon response and was able to generate a very rapid response with assistance from various National Committees and AusAID through its own flash appeal, which was launched within 48 hours of the disaster. UNICEF Philippines received a total of $50,000 through the CERF mechanism to fund child protection.

---

[161] OCHA's Financial Tracking System: http://ocha.unog.ch/fts/reports/daily/ocha_R10_E15288___07121707.pdf
[162] UNICEF Emergency Appeal Funding Status, 30th November 2007
[163] See the Typhoon Appeal for the Philippines 2007
[164] This reflects inadequate attention by national and international news media, partly a result of major disruptions in the electricity grid and telephone systems following the disaster, and the absence of an explicit request for international assistance by the Philippine authorities.

IV. Recommendations from the field

Recommendations to Global Cluster and child protection actors

➢ Build capacity of protection cluster for broader protection response

➢ Tools & guidelines that would help CP actors identify & address cross-cutting CP issues in other clusters

➢ Standard performance indicators and M&E system

Identified needs:

➢ Performance indicators and M & E system

➢ Child-focused documentation system during emergencies

➢ Effective strategies in ensuring CP / broader protection issues are addressed by other clusters

➢ Roll out of national protection cluster to sub-national level

➢ Training and capacity building on broader protection issues for the Government and NGO partners

➢ Strengthen community-based approach to disaster management eg. Barangay Council for the Protection of Children (BCPC) or People's Organizations (PO's)

➢ Systemize child protection mechanisms at the community-level

V. Sources

Agencies and organisations interviewed:

- UNICEF
- OCHA

- National NGO

Open sources consulted:

- **AlertNet:**
Philippines-Minadanao conflict: http://www.alertnet.org/db/crisisprofiles/PH_SEP.htm

- **CERF :**
http://ochaonline3.un.org/Default.aspx?tabid=1801
http://ochaonline.un.org/Default.aspx?tabid=1766

- **Coalition to Stop the Use of Child Soldiers:**
Global Report 2004, http://www.child-soldiers.org/regions/country?id=169,

CPIE Coordination Structures within the Cluster Approach

- **Humanitarian Reform:**
http://www.humanitarianreform.org/humanitarianreform/Portals/1/cluster%20approach%20page/training/CSLT%20oct07/Day2/Philippines%20Tip%20sheet.ppt
http://www.humanitarianreform.org/humanitarianreform/Portals/1/cluster%20approach%20page/Global%20Capacity%20Building/Global%20Cluster%20leads%20and%20Cluster%20field%20implementation.doc

- **IDMC**:
http://www.internal-displacement.org/8025708F004CE90B/(httpCountries)/FB34FE99F089E9C6802570A7004BF2DF?OpenDocument

- **International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies**:
Philippines National Red Cross, Philippines Typhoon Operation:
http://www.wpro.who.int/NR/rdonlyres/A5C8B45F-18D1-42FB-9ACA-5268C78AA218/0/ifrc_pnrc_philippine_typhoon_operations_2006.pdf

- **OCHA:**
ReliefWeb Financial Tracking System:
http://ocha.unog.ch/fts/reports/daily/ocha_R10_E15288___07121707.pdf
Philippines Typhoon Appeal 2006:
http://ochadms.unog.ch/quickplace/cap/main.nsf/h_Index/2006_Philippines_Typhoon/$FILE/2006_Philippines_Typhoon.doc?OpenElement
http://ochaonline.un.org/cap2005/webpage.asp?Page=1518
OCHA Situation Report no. 13, Philippines Typhoon, 2nd March 2007
OCHA Situation Report no. 10: 5 Feb 2007
OCHA Situation Report, 22nd January 2007

- **Office of the Special Representative of the Secretary General for Children and Armed Conflict**:
http://www.un.org/children/conflict/english/philippines.html

- **OHCHR:**
http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/ratification/11_b.htm

- **ReliefWeb:**
http://www.reliefweb.int/rw/rwb.nsf/db900SID/LSGZ-6WPDWP?OpenDocument
http://www.reliefweb.int/rw/rwb.nsf/db900SID/LTIO-6WLPEC?OpenDocument

Office of the WHO Representative in the Philippines:
Health Cluster and UN Humanitarian Reform:
http://www.wpro.who.int/internet/files/eha/tookit_health_cluster/Health%20Cluster%20and%20UN%20Humanitarian%20Reform%20Presentation.pdf

- **UNICEF**:
UNICEF Emergency Appeal Funding Status, 30th November 2007
UNICEF Situation Report, 19th October 2007
UNICEF Emergency Situation Report, 31st July 2007:
http://www.intranet.unicef.org/GENEVA/Panorama.nsf/Main%20Form/FB420FD24EE6D2BCC125732B0045F0A9?OpenDocument
UNICEF Situation Report, 23rd January 2007
http://www.intranet.unicef.org/GENEVA/OnlineMagazine.nsf/e0e51f1725a34b21c1256a010047e8a8/1fc49d9f5079fd7bc125726e0050bae2?OpenDocument

- **UN Security Council:**
Report of the Secretary General to the Security Council on Children and Armed Conflict, December 2007, A/62/609-S/2007/757 http://daccessdds.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N07/656/04/PDF/N0765604.pdf?OpenElement

99

ANNEX **6.7**

SOMALIA

I. **Background information**

a. **Humanitarian context**

A series of events in the first half of 2007 led to a drastic deterioration in the humanitarian situation in Somalia. The escalating violence, combined with extensive flooding at the end of 2006 and start of 2007, poor *Gu* rainfall (March – April), and outbreak of diseases have resulted in displacement and an alarming rise in malnutrition rates. Over 1.5 million out of a population of 7.9 million are in a state of humanitarian emergency or acute food and livelihood crisis exceeding the emergency threshold of 15% in districts of South/Central Somalia – an increase of 50% from one million people at the start of 2007.[165] The lack of an effective central government since 1991 has resulted in destruction of infrastructure, disintegration of basic health and social services, widespread human rights abuses, heightened by the on-going violence, poverty and volatility.

The country has some of the worst indicators in the world: approximately 43% of Somalis live below the extreme poverty line; life expectancy is 48 years; over 50,000 children are estimated to be malnourished and at risk of death; gross school enrolment for boys is at 34% and for girls at 22%; one in 12 Somali children dies before the age of one (86 per 1,000 live births), while one in every seven children does not survive to his or her fifth birthday.[166] Due to complications related to pregnancy or childbirth, 1,013 Somali women die for every 100,000 live births.[167] Preventable or easily treated diseases remain the main killers of Somali children and women , as only an estimated 20% of the population having access to basic health services, 29% have access to a safe water source and 37% have access to sanitary facilities.[168] Malaria, respiratory infections, and diarrhoeal diseases remain responsible for at least half under-five mortality killing thousands each year. Acute respiratory illness is common, especially among children, due to the near universal use of solid fuels for cooking and the lack of adequate household ventilation.

Following the defeat of the Islamic Courts Union (ICU) in January 2007, insecurity has escalated notably in the capital Mogadishu with regular attacks by insurgents on the Transitional Federal Government (TFG) and Ethiopian forces. The fighting has been the worst since the civil war of the early 1990s; hundreds of civilians have been killed and thousands more have been injured, human rights abuses have been committed by all sides. This has led to massive displacement: from February to August 2007, the Population Movement Tracking (PMT) witnessed and reported that 450,000 were displaced from Mogadishu.[169] The displacement has had considerable impact on the areas to which the IDPs have fled[170]. Living conditions for many of these IDPs are deplorable, with widespread destitution and hunger, as well as exposure to abuse and violence. Combined with the estimated 400,000 IDPs existing prior to 2007, the total number of IDPs in Somalia is now estimated at 850,000.

---

[165] According to the FAO/Food Security Analysis Unit post-*Gu* Assessment, see Humanitarian Appeal 2008, Consolidated Appeals Process, pp. 32 - 33

[166] Consolidated Appeals Process Somalia 2008, p. 16

[167] Consolidated Appeals Process Revision Somalia 2007, p.5

[168] Figure from UNICEF Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey (MICS) 2006

[169] From February to April 2007, approximately 450,000 persons were displaced from Mogadishu because of the fighting, which included indiscriminate attacks on civilian areas. From May to end June IDP returns totalling to 230,000 persons.

[170] It is estimated that as of August 2007, 127,000 new IDPs from Mogadishu are in Galgaduud; 170,000 are in Lower Shabelle; 42,000 in Hiran; 45,000 in Mudug; 49,000 in Middle Shebelle; and 23,000 in Bay, although other regions are hosting large new and old IDP populations.

As of 1st November 2007 in Somalia, there has been an estimated 450,000 long-term internally displaced persons (IDPs) with a total of 850,000 IDPs comprising 10.8% of the population[171] - the majority being women, children under 14 years of age, and the elderly.[172] Over half of the IDPs have been generated mostly out of Mogadishu as a result of fighting since early 2007. In the zones of Puntland and Somaliland, which have previously been relatively stable, violence erupted in October over the disputed regions of Sool and Sanaag, displacing well over 20,000 people. The effects of displacement are most acute in terms of numbers and poor living conditions and increasingly nutritional status in Lower Shabelle. Insecurity in South/Central and other factors have the potential to further destabilise either or both of the northern zones.

The humanitarian situation has also deteriorated due to the combined effects of the below normal rainfall during the spring *Gu* rains which resulted in reduced crop production and a worsening food security situation in South/Central. "Deyr" (short season) rains and bad harvests has caused an alarming rise in acute malnutrition especially in the Lower and Middle Shabelles region where large numbers of conflict-related IDPs have fled to. While chronic levels of malnutrition have existed in Somalia for some years, there has been a rise in acute malnutrition rates recently. Undernourishment in the total population is at 36% (UICEF 2006); in South/Central Somalia an estimated 83,000 children are suffering from acute malnutrition while 14,000 are severely malnourished.[173] High levels of stunting (above 20%) affecting children's growth and mental development are being reported. Following the widespread floods in late 2006 and early 2007, Somalia suffered an outbreak of cholera/acute watery diarrhea (AWD) that led to the deaths of 1,200 persons.

There are currently an estimated 40,000 Somalis living with HIV, over half of whom are women or girls 15 years and older.[174] Levels of HIV infection are worrying especially in the North West, where recent data showed approximately 1.7% of pregnant mothers 15-24 years to be HIV positive. The knowledge among women of HIV/AIDS and HIV transmission is low.[175] Those who are HIV positive face high levels of stigma within their communities. Sexual violence is also a major human rights violation that woman and children, mainly girls face in a climate of impunity.

The educational system in Somalia ceased to exist in the chaos following 1991, and a generation of Somali children have lost the opportunity for formal education. Somalia's gross enrolment ratio has been the lowest in the world: only one in three children or 28% attends primary school. Disparities exist between the three geographical zones, as well as in terms of gender, with only 35% of primary school children being girls, and only five girls for every ten boys attend secondary school.[176] In 2007, some 40,000 school children were displaced from Mogadishu.

Following the adoption of the Security Council Resolution 1744, troops of the African Union Mission in Somalia (AMISOM) arrived in the country in March 2007 and have since come under attack. The mission's mandate was extended in August 2007, and again in late February 2008 for a further six months, whilst Security Council discussions continue on the possibility of a United Nations peace-keeping mission to Somalia. The AU mission, whose mandate is to protection the Transitional Federal Institutions, has also taken on activities of providing clean water and health services to IDPs and defusing large quantities of explosive remnants of war (ERW) from both the recent conflict and the years of violence preceding it.

   b. **Protection concerns**

Insecurity and Human Rights Abuses:

---

[171] CAP Somalia 2008: http://ochaonline.un.org/cap2005/webpage.asp?MenuID=10484&Page=1630, and
UNICEF Somalia Emergency Situation Report, October 24th - November 6th 2007
[172] Humanitarian Appeal 2008, p.v
[173] UNICEF Humanitarian Action Report 2008.
[174] CAP 2008 Somalia, p.20
[175]UNICEF Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey (MICS) 2006
[176] UNICEF Humanitarian Action Donor Update, May 2007

The context of insecurity and violence in Southern and Central Somalia has been marked by grave children's rights violations. The build-up of the TFG-ICU conflict has deteriorated the already tense situation with protection of civilians a one of the major concerns and challenges in Somalia. There have been widespread breaches of international humanitarian law and human rights abuses with reports of arbitrary arrests, detentions, expulsions, and alleged cases of beatings, torture and murder, as well as house-to-house searches, and massive displacement. Vulnerable groups – in particular IDPs, minorities, women and children in Central and Southern Somalia are the worst affected by the armed conflict and suffer from discrimination, violence, harassment, arbitrary arrest, detention and lack of due process, lack of education and livelihood opportunities, forced evictions, and the absence of redress mechanisms. The cycle of violence including indiscriminate shelling and use of firearms in residential neighborhoods has resulted in hundreds of civilians killed and thousands injured. Not least affected have been UNHCR persons of concern, the Ethiopian Oromos, at the hands of Ethiopian troops. Freedom of movement within the city has been severely curtailed due to the violence and re-emergence of checkpoints, while movement within and between regions is difficult and dangerous. In addition, an increase in the number of people smuggled from the northern coastline of Bossaso has been noted.[177]

Humanitarian access:
Access to IDPs and other vulnerable groups in need of assistance has been hampered by conflict, lack of security guarantees, ongoing military air operations, and clan tension. Such obstacles include obstructions in the form of checkpoints/roadblocks, ambushes of aid convoys, heavy and arbitrary taxation of humanitarian cargo, harassment and arrests of humanitarian workers as well as extortion, piracy, roadblocks, and also roadside bombs. Both United Nations agencies and international NGOs report that national staffs are being increasingly targeted. In this extreme operational environment, agencies have few protection staff on the ground - with the UN permanent presence limited to Nairobi, Somaliland and Puntland, and NGOs having limited presence and capacity in the field. Minority clans suffer discrimination, often being denied access to assistance, even when that assistance is targeting them. The Government of Kenya's closure of its border with Somalia on security grounds from early January 2007 has also hindered humanitarian access and delivery of assistance.

Gender-based violence:
GBV takes several forms in Somalia, and includes domestic violence, forced and early marriages and harmful traditional practices like female genital mutilation/ cutting (FGM/FGC). Vulnerable groups, especially within minority communities and the displaced, face increased risks of violence and exploitation with frequent occurrences of abduction, sexual violence and rape. More than a third of cases reported against children under the age of sixteen.[178] In Galkayo, for instance, 43% of IDP women do not have safe access to latrines due to the potential for rape. In 2006, the Protection Monitoring Network monitored 639 women who had reported rape; after six months, 10% of these women had committed suicide and another 20% were missing.[179] Survivors of sexual violence are often ostracized by their communities, and have to battle with the physical injuries, trauma and stigma of such violence while this type of violence persists almost unchallenged. Women and children are sometimes forced to offer sex in exchange for food, shelter and protection (surprised to hear this). Harmful traditional practices are widespread: of women and girls aged 15-49, 98% have been circumcised, with 78% having experienced the extreme form of FGM.

c. Child protection concerns

Child protection violations include violence against children, child labor, child recruitment, children being killed/ maimed by landmines/UXO, sexual violence, as well as harmful traditional practices such as early marriage and Female Genital Mutilation.

---

[177] Consolidated Appeals Process Somalia 2007 Revision, p.22, see:
http://ochadms.unog.ch/quickplace/cap/main.nsf/h_Index/Revision_2007_Somalia/$FILE/Revision_2007_Somalia_VOL1_SCREEN.pdf?OpenElement
[178] Consolidated Appeals Process Somalia 2007 Revision, p.22 & 28, see:
http://ochadms.unog.ch/quickplace/cap/main.nsf/h_Index/Revision_2007_Somalia/$FILE/Revision_2007_Somalia_VOL1_SCREEN.pdf?OpenElement
[179] CAP Somalia Revision 2007, p.7

Insecurity and lack of access:

The context of insecurity and violence in Southern and Central Somalia which has undermined traditional coping mechanisms is marked by grave children's rights violations. Violence between the TFG and Ethiopian Forces on the one hand, and insurgent groups on the other, has resulted in high civilian casualties in Mogadishu. The precise number of child casualties has been difficult to verify due to insecurity and lack of access. However, estimates are that in Mogadishu alone, there have been over 1,200 deaths, of which 35% have been children. Both the Union of the Islamic Courts (ICU) and the Transitional Federal Government (TFG) have been responsible for the killing and maiming of children in 2007.[180] The past two years has seen a marked shift in the context of grave violations against children from intermittent, isolated inter-clan conflict to more systematic conflict of a political nature, resulting in more prominent effects on children becoming direct victims of indiscriminate shooting and mortar attacks. Due to a lack of government control and institutionalized rule-of-law, child protection violations most often remain in impunity.

In July and August 2007, there was a reported wave of raids on schools by TFG forces in Mogadishu; teachers and students have been abducted. Several hospitals have also been raided or attacked.[181]

Explosive remnants of war (ERW):

Children have been maimed and killed by concentrations of unexploded ordnances (UXO) in areas of South/Central Somalia; mine and unexploded ordnance incident related deaths and injuries among children have increased in 2007. During the first six months of 2007, 33 children and 186 adults died in ERW or landmine incidents. Between January and June 2007, there were more than 28 landmine accidents, killing eight children and wounding ten; and 33 accidents involving bombs or unexploded ordnances killing 25 children and wounding 46. A serious incident of unexploded ordnance exploded in Mogadishu in July 2007 and killed five children.[182]

Children in Armed Conflict:

Child recruitment continues, and there have been reports of children being used by all parties to the conflict in 2007. Both the Union of the Islamic Courts (ICU) and the Transitional Federal Government (TFG) recruited and used children during intense fighting for control of Mogadishu at the end of 2006. The UIC publicly declared its intention to recruit from schools and undertook an intensive recruitment campaign of boys and girls. TFG as well as some clan militias have been widely reported to be using children to carry arms. However, since June 2007, the TFG administration in Jowhar has began to release children from its ranks and reintegration activities are being planned.[183]

Gender-based violence:

Various forms of Sexual and Gender-based violence continue constituting a grave violation of children's rights. Although there is currently no systematic monitoring of cases of SGBV in place in South-Central Somalia there is anecdotal evidence which confirms that adolescent girls, young women and sometimes boys among the displaced have been abducted, harassed and raped.[184] Between January and June 2007, the heightened violence has rendered women and girls, particularly among the IDPs, more vulnerable to sexual violence. There have been several cases of girls raped while fleeing Mogadishu; in four of there cases, verified reports identified the perpetrators as men dressed

---

[180] Report of the Secretary-General to the Security Council, Children and Armed Conflict, A/62/609-S/2007/757, 21st December 2007, pp.21, 41 – 42:
http://daccessdds.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N07/656/04/PDF/N0765604.pdf?OpenElement
[181] Report of the Secretary-General to the Security Council, Children and Armed Conflict, A/62/609-S/2007/757, 21st December 2007, p.21,
http://daccessdds.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N07/656/04/PDF/N0765604.pdf?OpenElement
[182] Report of the Secretary-General to the Security Council, Children and Armed Conflict, A/62/609-S/2007/757, 21st December 2007, p.21, http://daccessdds.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N07/656/04/PDF/N0765604.pdf?OpenElement
[183] Report of the Secretary-General to the Security Council, Children and Armed Conflict, A/62/609-S/2007/757, 21st December 2007, p.21,
http://daccessdds.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N07/656/04/PDF/N0765604.pdf?OpenElement
[184] CAP 2008 Somalia, p. 38

in the uniforms of the TFG militia.[185] More than a third of reports of rape in IDP camps are against children under 16 years of age.[186] Human trafficking of Somalis and Ethiopians has also been identified in Hargeisa in Somaliland; young girls are trafficked for sexual exploitation and domestic labour. There is little in the way of victim support (counselling, medical treatment or obstetric care) or appropriate law enforcement mechanisms for women and children who have been raped, and justice responses to violations are sometimes harmful to survivors, such as girls having to marry their rapists.

Child labor:
Almost half of Somali children (49%) are engaged in child labour. Poverty forces IDP girls into exploitative work relationships.

II.   Child protection in emergencies – coordination structures

Highlights

Model used:
At national level (Nairobi): Focal point (UNICEF), though no formal child protection coordination structure
At field level (within Somalia): Child protection networks (mainly national actors), working groups such as GBV working group
Locus of decision taking on child protection issues: Outside of protection cluster, pending a more formal, regular agenda item on child protection within the protection cluster; within child protection networks at field level; agency grounded decision-making; informal link to protection cluster (unclear reporting lines)
Staff time dedicated to child protection coordination (UNICEF, NGO)
Nairobi: 20-25% staff time (UNICEF)
Field: little time spent in protection cluster activities; most time in CP Network activities (NGO)

a.   Pre-existing child protection coordination structures

The child protection networks existed prior to the introduction of the protection cluster for Somalia. The networks composed mainly of national actors were set up to respond to and advocate against child protection concerns in areas where access for internationals has traditionally been difficult. The networks cooperate closely with UNICEF in Nairobi, and at field level.

b.   Current child protection coordination structures and the protection cluster

---

[185] Report of the Secretary-General to the Security Council, Children and Armed Conflict, A/62/609-S/2007/757, 21st December 2007, p.21,
http://daccessdds.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N07/656/04/PDF/N0765604.pdf?OpenElement
[186] Consolidated Appeals Process Somalia 2007 Revision, p.28, see:
http://ochadms.unog.ch/quickplace/cap/main.nsf/h_Index/Revision_2007_Somalia/$FILE/Revision_2007_Somalia_VOL1_SCREEN.pdf?OpenElement

In line with global humanitarian reform initiatives, Somalia was one of the four pilot countries along with the DRC, Liberia and Uganda to pilot a national IASC and adopt the Cluster Approach.[187] The process of realigning sector management into clusters began with the establishment of the IASC Country Team in January 2006 and the onset of the drought. Initially eight clusters were established at the start of 2007 (Access and Education, Agriculture and Livelihood, Food, Health and Nutrition, Protection, Water and Sanitation)**,** while additional clusters have since been activated. A workshop on the Cluster Approach was organized by OCHA's Humanitarian Reform Support unit (HRSU) in early 2006.

- Access and Security – OCHA (Access), UN Department of Safety and Security (UNDSS) (Security)
- Early Recovery - UNDP
- Education - UNICEF
- Food security and Livelihoods – WFP (Food) & FAO (Livelihoods)
- Health – WHO
- HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS)
- Logistics/Support – WFP
- Nutrition - UNICEF
- Protection/Human Rights/Rule of Law – UNHCR & OCHA
- Shelter for IDPs - UNHCR
- Water and Sanitation UNICEF

Inter-cluster coordination meetings have been held once or twice a month in 2007. UN agencies and INGOs have increased partnerships with local NGOs, especially in the Jubas and the Shabelles resulting in an increased number of Somali NGOs active in clusters at all levels. Along with the Somali Red Crescent Society (SRCS), these NGOs have assumed lead responsibility for local coordination. Local emergency committees have also been formed.[188] In terms of overall coordination, structures have been modified: the Somalia Aid Coordination Body (SACB) has been replaced by the Coordination of International Support to Somalis (CISS). The Coordination Monitoring Committee has becomes the highest-level mechanism for coordination between the TFG and the international community.

One UN: Additionally, the UNCT has developed a plan to strengthen its coordination function and its ability to provide coordination support services to government and international partners. The plan includes moving towards "One UN" through the adoption of single results-based country programme (the UN Transition Plan for 2008-2009). The UNCT will establish an integrated structure to support the RC and HC functions. The UNCT is also strengthening links between the HC/RC functions and the SSS/CISS to streamline services and maximize use of resources.[189]

i.   Protection Cluster:

As a result of taking on the Protection Cluster Lead role, UNHCR has increased its field presence and operations in Somalia: in particular in Puntland and in south and central Somalia, where UNHCR had limited presence before. It now has a network of over 30 national partners, monitoring protection issues and tracking IDP movements.

---

[187] According to the Cluster Approach Evaluation in November 2007, merging clusters with pre-existing structures has been particularly contentious and progress slow in Somalia, see Cluster Approach Evaluation, November 2007, p. 21
[188] Consolidated Appeals Process Somalia 2008, p. 9
[189] Consolidated Appeals Process Somalia Revision 2007, p.21
http://ochadms.unog.ch/quickplace/cap/main.nsf/h_Index/Revision_2007_Somalia/$FILE/Revision_2007_Somalia_VOL1_SCREEN.pdf?OpenElement

Partners of the protection cluster in Nairobi[190] include:
Lead: UNHCR & OCHA (as of 2006)
Government: No
UN: OCHA, UNAIDS, UNDP, UNESCO, UNFPA, UN-HABITAT, UNHCR, UNICEF, UNIFEM
Other: International Organization for Migration (IOM),
INGOs: DRC, Handicap International, Islamic Relief, Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC), Oxfam-NOVIB,
LNGOs: Somali Human Rights NGOs and networks (though very few at Nairobi level)

There are five sub-groups – although no separate formal child protection group - within the Protection Cluster Working Group (PCWG): mixed migration (IOM and HCR); DDR, Mine Action (UNDP); the Protection Monitoring network taskforce (including 1612), and SGBV (OCHA)

Puntland: an IDP Working Group, chaired by UNDP and supported by OCHA, has been established in Garowe. In addition, a special taskforce chaired by Habitat has been established in Bosasso, however, the group has little focus on protection. There are several child protection networks functioning in Puntland, and GBV working groups are currently being established in Garowe and Galkayo.

Somaliland: an IDP working group, chaired by OCHA, was established followed by the setting up of the Protection Working Group. This has been mapping local protection capacity, and is one of the few mechanisms trying to assess and respond to GBV. Additionally, there are several child protection networks functioning in Somaliland. There is also an active GBV working group in Hargeisa.

There are new protection cluster in Mogadishu and Baidoa in central South Somalia, and a GBV working group in Baidoa.

ii. Child Protection

UNICEF is the focal point within the protection cluster in Nairobi for child protection issues. There are few to no other child protection actors in Nairobi. The child protection networks in Puntland, Somaliland and Central South Somalia are composed mainly of national actors, both NGOs and local governance structures. The local child protection actors also participate in the local protection clusters.

c. Other parallel child protection coordination mechanisms
i. M&R and 1612:

Somalia is one of the seven priority situations on the agenda of the Security Council in terms of the first phase of implementation of a monitoring and reporting mechanism within the framework of the Security Council Resolution 1612.

The Steering Committee for the Country Team on Monitoring and Reporting (CTMR) has been in operation for over two years and is based outside the country in Nairobi owing to the precarious and unpredictable security situation in Somalia.

The **Steering Committee members** include: UNICEF, UNHCR, UNOCHA, OXFAM Novib and the Norwegian Refugee Council.
Other UN agencies and NGOs sporadically participate in this Committee.

---

[190] Inter-Agency Internal Displacement Division, OCHA, Mission to Somalia, May 2006, p.3
http://www.reliefweb.int/idp/docs/reports/2006/IDD%20Somalia%20Mission%20Report%2022-30%20May%202006.pdf

UNICEF, Oxfam Novib and UNHCR have trained local NGOs in the country to monitor protection violations. The partners are looking at a broad range of violations, and a broad range of target populatins, including IDPs, children, women and minorities. Amongst these, the Somali NGOs engaged in child protection monitoring provide information and this is supplemented by additional reporting from other sources such as observer groups and Somali and international media. There has also been periodic reporting to the Steering Committee on Monitoring and Reporting, the Secretary General, the Special Representative of the Secretary General for Children and Armed Conflict and the Security Council in conformity with SC Resolution 1612.

ii. Other

d. Joint child protection activities and initiatives

i. Child protection specific:

None, there are several agency initiatives (such as mapping of civil society) that are fed into the child protection and overall protection coordination systems.

ii. Joint broader protection/child protection activities:

GBV SOP; efforts to put in place the M&R

III. Funding for child protection coordination activities

Summary of the CAP Review (2007):

Somalia	1 child protection project
	100% of CP request funded
	17% of overall protection request funded
10%	**of sector funding for child protection**
0.1%	**of total CAP funding for child protection**
1.2%	**of total CAP funding for overall protection**

Chronic under-funding for years has severely restricted humanitarian operations and a lack of long-term funding has resulted in limited capacity to establish long-term programs or to begin programs in new areas.

In 2007, Somalia received a total of almost $358.4 million in humanitarian assistance[191], of which 87% came through the consolidated appeal.[192] The largest donors were the US at $116.4 million or 33% of the overall funding; carry-over donors not specified for $35.1 million or 10%; Norway at $30.4 million or almost 9% of the total funding. CERF funding amounted to $15.7 million or over 4% of the total funding.[193] Based on those projects listed publicly on the Financial Tracking Service, which does not for example include pool funds, **Child Protection** was funded in 2007 only through the CAP, and amounted to a total of **$2.5 million.** This represented 74% of the revised requests, or less than 1% of the CAP funding[194]**,** in comparison to 1.2% of the total CAP funding which went to overall protection. However, within the protection funding, 10% went to child protection.

In 2006, Somalia was supported with almost $252 million in humanitarian funding.[195] The largest donors were: the US at almost $85 million or 34% of the total funding; UK at $25.1 million or 10%; ECHO at $24.2 million or just below 10%. CERF allocations amounted to $6 million or 2% of the total humanitarian assistance that year. Of the total funding received, $186.6 million, or about 74% came through the CAP, and $65.3 million outside of the Appeal.

In terms of **child protection**, none of the CERF allocations nor the Flood response or Kenya Appeal contributed to child protection. It was through the CAP 2006 that Somalia received funding for one CP project that amounted to $64,980. This represented over 2% of the total funding received for the Protection/Human Rights/Rule of Law sector, and 0.03% of the total CAP funding and 0.02% of the total humanitarian funding in 2006**.[196]**

a. Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF):

Between March 2006 and January 2008, Somalia received a total of $32.3 million – of which none was allocated to the Protection Cluster, and therefore, child protection activities were not funded at all through the CERF.

---

[191] Financial Tracking System, Table A, February 2008: http://ocha.unog.ch/fts/reports/daily/ocha_R10_E15183___08021516.pdf
[192] Consolidated Appeals Process: Humanitarian Appeal 2008, p. 19
29 FTS website, Table B, February 2008: http://ocha.unog.ch/fts/reports/daily/ocha_R24_E15183___08021516.pdf
[194] Note: This is an estimate, based on calculations of those projects subjectively identified as child protection ones. It does not include any funding of potential projects that are not listed on the Financial Tracking Service (FTS) website, such as pooled funding.
[195] FTS website, Table A: http://ocha.unog.ch/fts/reports/daily/ocha_R10_E14973___08021516.pdf
[196] Note: These calculations are based on the figures available through the FTS website.

In 2007, CERF allocations through the Rapid Response and Under-funded Emergency mechanisms amounted to $15.7 million or 4.9% of the total humanitarian assistance to Somalia that year.**[197]** This amount covered 5.7% of the total funding received through the Consolidated Appeals Process for Somalia in 2007. CERF funding was allocated to the sectors of Coordination and support services (WFP), Food (UNICEF, WFP), Health (WHO), Multi-sector (UNDP), Shelter and NFIs (UNHCR, UNICEF), Security (UNDP), and Water and sanitation (UNICEF). None of this was allocated to child protection.

In 2006, Somalia received a total of $16.6 million from the CERF rapid response grants window. This included funding for the following sectors: agriculture (FAO), coordination and support services (WFP), food (WFP), health (WHO), multi-sector (UNDP, UNICEF, WFP), food (WFP), shelter and non-food items (UNICEF), [198] None of this went towards child protection activities.

b. Consolidated Appeals Process (CAP):

In 2007: While funding for the Somalia CAP has increased significantly over the past few years, the percentage of funding for the CAP has remained at around 66%, a figure largely in line with CAP funding in other countries.[199] The original CAP for 2007 sought $237.1 million to support 128 projects in eight sectors of the dual pillars of both humanitarian assistance and early recovery. The revised CAP launched in April 2007 appealed for $262.4 million for 146 projects, including 26 new ones and 11 eliminated. However, since the revision of the CAP, some sectors made additional adjustments upwards, thus amounting to a total request for **$383.2 million.** This was met at 81% or **$311.8 million**.[200] The food sector was very well-funded, at $150.3 million or 123%, followed by the multi-sector and coordination and support services. Protection/Human Rights/Rule of Law was poorly funded at $3.6 million or 17% of its required sum.[201] The largest donors were the US at $113.1 million or 36% of total funding of CAP; carry-over funding (not specified) for $35.1 million or 11%; and Norway for $25.4 million or 8% of the total funding for the CAP.CERF funding amounted to $15.7 million or 5% of the total funds received throught the CAP.[202]

In terms of individual agency requests, UNHCR, the Protection Cluster Lead appealed for a total of $11.2 million to cover three projects, with one protection related project for $1.7 million or 15% of HCR's total requests, this was revised up to almost $18 million, and UNHCR received 100% of the funding. UNICEF requested $24.3 million to cover over twenty projects, including eight protection/human rights/rule of law sector ones for a total of almost $2.5 million or 10% of its total requests, and revised its requests up to $38 million. UNICEF received a total of 92% or $35.1 million. UNFPA appealed for $3.3 million to cover eight projects of which three were protection related amounting to $1.1 million or 33% of its requests. UNFPA revised its request down to $3.1 million, and was funded at 57% or $1.8 million. NGO projects within the CAP comprised 37% of all projects in 2007, and increased to 41% of the total amount of projects submitted in the CAP in 2008.[203] In the revised appeal in 2007, Save the Children – Denmark appealed for $365,110, and was fully funded, while its sister branch from the UK required $1.8 million and was also funded at 100%. NRC on the other hand requested $6.3 million and received 13% of this or $822,368.[204]

---

[197] This includes over $10.4 million for the flood response (December 2006) and approximately $11 million for the IDP response (March-July 2007). Somalia also received $1 million for security which had not been funded under the CAP. A CERF package of $3.6 million focusing on immediate response to the IDP crisis in Mogadishu-Afgoye was approved in October 2007. The most highly funded sectors under the CERF in 2007 were Logistics (32%), Food Security (19%) and Shelter/NFIs (11%).

[198] Sectoral allocation of CERF 2006: health and nutrition 50%, water and sanitation 30%, and livelihood support 20%. UNICEF received a total of $1.1 million to support activities in the sectors of water and sanitation as well as health and nutrition. See: http://ochaonline.un.org/Default.aspx?tabid=1735

[199] Consolidated Appeals Process Somalia 2007, p. 10

[200] FTS: http://ocha.unog.ch/fts/reports/daily/ocha_R21_Y2007___08010307.pdf, the most funded sectors have been Mine Action and Food (100% each), Multi-Sector (96%), and Coordination and Support Services (95%).

[201] See FTS website, Table D: http://ocha.unog.ch/fts/reports/daily/ocha_R3sum_A734___08021516.pdf

[202] See FTS, Table G: http://ocha.unog.ch/fts/reports/daily/ocha_R5_A734___08021516.pdf

[203] Consolidated Appeals Process: Humanitarian Appeal 2008, p.9

[204] See FTS website, Table C, February 2008: http://ocha.unog.ch/fts/reports/daily/ocha_R1_A734___08021516.pdf

The Protection/Human Rights/Rule of Law sector appealed for $20.1 million or 8.5% of the total appeal; this request was revised to $21.6 million. **However, this was the lowest-funded sector in the CAP 2007, receiving a mere $3.6 million or 17% of its appeal.** Out of the 19 projects with over 30 components, only five were funded: four UNICEF projects - protection of women from SGBV funded at 50% or $224,040; access to HIV prevention funded at 100% or $363,800; community-based protection and psychosocial support at 100% or $2.1 million - and one NGO project for Save Children – Denmark funded at 100% or $365,112.

Child Protection projects identified from the Protection/Human Rights/Rule of Law sector projects amounted to a total request for $1.5 million, which was revised upwards to $3.4 million. This included: five UNICEF projects at a total of $2.9 million, one UNFPA project for $390,000, and one Save the Children – Denmark project at $535,500.[205] The projects were covered at **$2.5 million or 74% of the revised requests,** and make up the bulk of the Protection Cluster funding received**.**

Project	Appealing agency	Original requirements USD	Revised requirements USD	Funding USD	% Covered
Rule of Law and Security – Access to Justice and Human Rights in Northeast and Central South Somalia. [206]	UNICEF	$115,000	$115,000	$0	0%
Rule of Law and Security – Law Enforcement Central South.[207]	UNICEF	$115,000	$115,000	$0	0%
EOD Clearance of Mogadishu and National EOD Response in South Central Somalia.[208]	UNICEF	$75,000	$75,000	$0	0%
Preventing the spread of HIV/AIDS among Somali adolescent and youth in IDP camps in South/Central Somalia	UNFPA	$390,000	$390,000	$0	0%
Addressing	UNICEF	$225,000	$225,000	$0	0%

---

[205] Note: This identification of projects is based on reading the project proposals, and are subjective, as it is not always clear which projects are specifically child protection related ones.

[206] Joint programme with UNDP, UNICEF, and NRC. Includes UNDP-UNICEF program initiated in 2006 to ensure the protection and access to justice and security for vulnerable children and youth: UNDP requested $1.8 million; UNICEF $115,000 & NRC $248,000. .

[207] UNICEF and UNDP planned to continue their collaboration to strengthen child rights and child protection, in particular for children in conflict and in contact with the law. Total of $2.6 million requested.

[208] Appealing agencies for the entire project included UNDP for $5 million and UNICEF for $75,000. In addition to clearance of ERW, this included the development of appropriate Mine Risk Education (MRE) materials for community mobilisation and for use in schools and school clubs.

Sexual and Gender Based Violence (SGBV) in South/Central Somalia, including in IDPs settings (women & girls)[209]					
Community-based protection and psychosocial support for IDP, returnees and urban poor populations.[210]	UNICEF	$600,000	$2.1 million	$2.1 million	100%
ABE for children affected by armed conflict	Save Children – Denmark	$0	$365,112	$365,112	100%
TOTAL	7 projects: 5 UNICEF ones, 1 UNFPA project, 1 Save the Children project	$1.5 million	$3.4 million	$2.5 million	74% of revised request

In addition to these, several projects included elements of Child Protection:

- IOM: "Protecting the Human Rights of Migrants"[211] - required $481,800 but did not receive any funding.
- UNICEF: "Protection of women from sexual violence, abuse, exploitation and HIV infection in central and southern zone" requested $444,100, and was 50% funded with $224,000.
- UNICEF: Protection Monitoring & Operational Data Management for Response – appealed for $535,500 and was fully funded.[212]

The Mine Action sector separately requested $3.1 million and was fully funded covering all three projects.[213]

<u>**CAP 2006:**</u>
The CAP for Somalia in 2006 required $174.1 million, and this was revised substantially upwards to $323.8 million. It was funded at 58% or $186.6 million in total. The largest donors included: the US at $77.8 million or 42% of the

[209] Joint project with UNIFEM requesting $650,000, UNICEF appealing for $225,000, and UNFPA for $460,000 amounting to a total of $1.3 million in order to assist 80,000 women and girls in IDP settings.
[210] Inter-agency project with NRC, UNICEF, WVI, UNHCR requesting a total of $729,000. UNICEF component included protection awareness, particularly on child protection, as well as IDP rights and SGBV issues.
[211] To improve the treatment of migrants in NE Somalia/Puntland, especially women and children, with respect to exploitation, abuse, and other rights violations, including human trafficking, see Consolidated Appeals Somalia 2007 Projects, p.31
http://ochadms.unog.ch/quickplace/cap/main.nsf/h_Index/CAP_2007_Somalia/$FILE/CAP_2007_Somalia_VOL2.doc?OpenElement
[212] Note: the joint project includes NRC who appealed for $60,000; UNICEF for $535,500; WVI for $75,000. Activities include capacity building in protection monitoring and population movement; expansion of monitoring activities; strengthening links between protection monitoring and response and advocacy. This includes an aspect of follow-up on the UN SC Resolution 1612.
[213] Mine Action sector included the following projects: Humanitarian support to demining actions through DDG funded at almost $2 million; Mine Action by HT funded at $920,988; and Mine Risk Education by HI/France at $250,667.

total amount; the UK at $19.5 or 11%; carry-over (donors not specified) for $15.8 million or almost 9%; while the CERF amounted to $6 million or 3% of the total funding through the CAP 2006.[214]

Some of the appealing agencies that covered protection requested and received varying amounts of financial support: UNDP requested $25.6 million and received $2.5 million or less than 10% of its appeal; UNHCR revised its appeal downwards from $11.9 million to $11.5 million, and received $9.4 million or 82% of its requested amount; UNICEF revised its appeal for $18.8 million to $27.4 million, and was almost fully-funded at 96% or $26.2 million; UNFPA requested $1.9 million, but was not funded at all; UNIFEM requested $780,000 but was not covered at all. NGOs like CARE Somalia received $48.1 million or more than its request for $42.4 million revised substantially upwards from $11.8 million – while CARE did not receive any funding for its request for merely $344,750. NRC was not funded at all for its appeal for almost $4 million.[215] Out of the sectors appealing through the CAP, food was by large the best funded sector at $131.2 million or 74% of the total appeal, as was "sector not specified" at $17 million, and multi-sector at $12.2 million. Protection/Human Rights/Rule of Law requested $16.1 million, revised to $17.5 million, and received a mere 15% of the total appeal or $2.7 million.[216]

Protection/Human Rights/Rule of Law sector: Within the 13 projects of the Protection sector including 24 components, the appeal for $16.1 million was revised upwards to $17.5 million. This included an identified amount of four UNICEF projects on child protection, some within a larger inter-agency project, totaling the requested amount of $1 million, revised to $1.6 million. However, only one project was funded at $64,980, and only covering 14% of the requested amount. **This total sum represents around 3% of the amount requested for child protection related activities, and over 2% of the total funding received for the Protection/Human Rights/Rule of Law sector.**

Project Title	Appealing Agency	Original request	Revised request	Funding	% Covered
Protection, monitoring, capacity building and advocacy initiative	UNICEF	$450,000	$508,000	$0	0%
Rule of Law and Security – Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration	UNICEF	$387,000	$387,000	$0	0%
Rule of Law and Security – Judiciary and Human Rights	UNICEF	$192,000	$192,000	$0	0%
Community-based protection and psychosocial support for IDPs, returnees, and urban poor populations	UNICEF	$450,000	$450,000	$64,980	14%
Protection violations monitoring, psychosocial care	UNICEF	$0	$609,600	$0	0%

[214] FTS website Somalia 2006, Table G http://ocha.unog.ch/fts/reports/daily/ocha_R5_A696___08021516.pdf
[215] FTS website, Somalia 2006, Table C http://ocha.unog.ch/fts/reports/daily/ocha_R1_A696___08021516.pdf
[216] FTS website, Somalia 2006 funding, Table D
http://ocha.unog.ch/fts/reports/daily/ocha_R3sum_A696___08021516.pdf

and support, and reunification of separated and/or unaccompanied minors				
TOTAL	**4 UNICEF projects**	**$1.5 million**	**$2.1 million**	**$64,980**	**3%**

Additional projects within the Protection sector mentioned below included aspects of child protection. However, none of these projects were funded at all.[217]

c. Other humanitarian funding

2007:

Somalia received **$46.5 million** in humanitarian funding outside of the Appeal. Out of this, **none of the projects are clearly identifiable as child protection projects**.[218]

Humanitarian Response Fund (HRF): As a pooled fund of unearmarked donor contributions within the CAP, managed and administered by OCHA with an advisory board comprised of NGOs and UN agencies – the Humanitarian Response Fund (HRF) requested $8 million in the 2007 CAP. As of 15 November 2007, the HRF was funded at $11.6 million (inclusive of carry over from 2006), with an additional $3 million allocated from the CERF. Of this total, as of 1 November, $9.4 million has been allocated to 60 projects, the bulk of these in the Livelihoods and WASH sectors in South/Central. Of those proposals funded, 58% were proposed directly by local NGOs or jointly with INGOs/United Nations agencies. Changes during 2007 in administrative procedures have enabled local NGOs (LNGOs) to more easily access the HRF.

UNICEF Humanitarian Action Report 2007: The Somalia CAP 2007 included an initial appeal for $24.3 million for UNICEF interventions, increased by $2.5 million in the Revised 2007 CAP for Somalia amounting to $26.8 million. Also, both through the Somalia CAP Flash Appeal and a UNICEF Horn of Africa Flood Immediate Needs issued in December 2006, UNICEF requested a total of $8.5 million for urgent flood needs across sectors. Of this amount, $2 million was funded through the CERF in December 2006 for non-food items, and removed from the 2007 appeal figures. UNICEF's total appeal for the emergency response in 2007 was $33.3 million and received 96%, or $32.1 million of $33.3 million, as of early November.[219] Of the requested amount, the requirement for Communication, Protection and Participation (CPP) was at $2.9 million or 8.7% - and was well-funded at $4.7 million in November 2007. One of the five urgent projects highlighted in the Donor Update in May 2007 was on Child Protection and HIV/AIDS awareness and prevention for $900,000.[220] Other CP activities included addressing: separated children and follow-up; child protection monitoring; psychosocial care and support services; establishing child-friendly spaces; training on psychosocial care; disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration; HIV awareness and prevention.

2006:

---

[217] 1) Joint projects by UNICEF, UNIFEM, NRC, UNDP: "Protection Monitoring, Capacity Building, and Advocacy Initiative" for $1 million (UNICEF: $450,000 revised to $508,000; UNIFEM: $180,000; NRC $300,000; UNDP $70,000) – not funded (0%). 2) IOM: "Anti-Trafficking in Persons in Puntland: A Capacity-Building and Awareness-Raising Initiative" for $243,600 – 0% funded.

[218] A few Protection related projects are included but do not specify a child-focus: ICRC received funding for protection and crisis health care from Finland for a total of $1.8 million.
See FTS website, Table H: http://ocha.unog.ch/fts/reports/daily/ocha_R4_A734___08021516.pdf

[219] UNICEF Somalia Emergency Situation Report 24th October – 6th November 2007

[220] UNICEF Humanitarian Action Donor Update, May 2007

Somalia was allocated $65.3 million outside of the CAP. None of this funding went specifically towards child protection activities.[221]

Somalia Floods Response 2006: In November 2006, Somalia was hit by the worst flooding in recent history: the floods displaced entire communities, submerged villages, destroyed granaries, cut off feeder roads, blocked or damaged irrigation and flood relief infrastructures and inundated thousands of hectares of farmland in the South/Central area covering Gedo, Juba Valley, Hiran and Shabelle Valley Regions. A Flood Response Plan was launched on the 5th of December 2006, to addresses immediate life-saving interventions for up to 350,000 flood-affected persons in acute need of assistance, and amounting to $28.6 million, of which $10.4 million had already been funded through the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) mechanism, leaving an unfunded balance of nearly $18.2 million to cover actions during three months. A total of **$23.9 million** was allocated: $10.2 million outside of the Flood Appeal; $13.7 million through the Appeal – none of the funding through the Appeal or outside was in support of child protection activities.[222]

In terms of the total humanitarian funding in response to the floods, the CERF was the largest provider with $10.4 million or 44% of all of the funding; the UK following with $2.3 million or 9%; unearmarked UN funds constituted up to 8% or $1.9 million.[223] Through the Appeal, the CERF was again the largest provider of funding, while Norway followed at $971,190 or 7%, and Sweden with $727,800 or 5% of the total through the Appeal.[224] In terms of agencies, the distribution of funding was uneven: FAO received 100% while many received 0% of funding, like UNHCR, which requested a total of $250,000, but received no funding. UNICEF followed FAO in receiving $3.8 million or 75% of its request for $5.2 million. NGOs did not do well: Oxfam UK requested $450,000 but received no funding, while Save the Children - UK appealed for $350,000 and received 0% funding. World Vision was the only NGO to receive funding, at $223,980 or 21% of its request.[225]

Funding of sectors was uneven. While some sectors faired well – the food sector received $3 million, coordination and support $2.8 million, agriculture received 109% of its request and multi-sector and shelter were both covered at 100% - several sectors received 0% funding, such as economic recovery, education, and protection.[226] The **Protection sector** requested $650,000 through the Flash Appeal – however, it was 0% funded. The sector had included two projects, through UNHCR at $250,000 and UNICEF at $400,000. The latter was directly related to child protection: "Child protection activities for the flood victims in South Central Somalia, including Protection Monitoring & Response". In sum, the Protection sector requested a small amount of funding through the Floods Response in 2006 with two projects: its child protection component represented almost 62% of its requests. Child protection thus represented just over 1% of the total requests within the Floods Appeal. However, child protection or protection activities were not funded at all.

Kenya Flash Appeal 2006: In August 2006, an inter-agency UN group developed an emergency response plan to manage the increasing number of Somali refugees estimated to be between 50,000 and 80,000. A total of $32.3 million was required, while CERF funding of $3.5 million was allocated, thus leaving a final appeal for almost $31.8 million.

---

[221] See FTS website, Somalia 2006, Table H: http://ocha.unog.ch/fts/reports/daily/ocha_R4_A696___08021516.pdf
[222] Note: some funding is unspecified, eg. "CERF allocation to project" or "awaiting allocation to specific sector/project", see FTS website, Somalia 2006 Flood Response Plan, Table F: http://ocha.unog.ch/fts/reports/daily/ocha_R2_A750___08021516.pdf, see also Table H for funding outside of the Appeal: http://ocha.unog.ch/fts/reports/daily/ocha_R4_A750___08021516.pdf
[223] FTS website, Somalia Floods November 2006, see Table B: http://ocha.unog.ch/fts/reports/daily/ocha_R24_E15202___08021516.pdf
[224] See FTS website, Somalia Floods November 2006, Table G: http://ocha.unog.ch/fts/reports/daily/ocha_R5_A750___08021516.pdf
[225] See FTS website, Somalia Floods November 2006, Table C: http://ocha.unog.ch/fts/reports/daily/ocha_R1_A750___08021516.pdf
[226] See FTS website, Somalia Floods November 2006, Table D: http://ocha.unog.ch/fts/reports/daily/ocha_R3sum_A750___08021516.pdf

The Protection sector requested a total of over $1.4 million through three projects by UNHCR at $1.1 million (supported with a CERF allocation of $276,360), UNICEF at $200,000, and UNFPA at $100,000. The Protection/Human Rights/Rule of Law received $862,380, or 61% of its requested amount. Among these three projects was a UNICEF project at $200,000 in support of child protection. The child protection project represented around 14% of the Protection sector requests, and half a percentage in relation to the entire appeal. However, child protection was not funded at all through the Kenya Flash Appeal.

IV.   Recommendations from the field

Recommendations to the global cluster and child protection actors:

- Clearer defining of lead roles
    o Especially issue of GBV and natural disasters
- Stronger global engagement of non-UN actors to participate at country level (e.g. ICRC, NGOs)
- Stronger support on how to engage as a cluster in "extraordinary" situations – e.g. with peace-keeping planning process
- protection cluster leads need to recognize that child protection should be an regular agenda item for the protection cluster where no separate child protection coordination mechanism exists

Tools and guidance requested:

- How to navigate the complexities of including governments/state actors
- Advice as to which model works best to ensure prioritization of child protection issues
- Advice as to how to engage with peace-keeping operations as a cluster

V.   Sources

Agencies and organisations interviewed:
- UNICEF
- National Network partners

Open sources consulted:

- **CERF:**
http://ochaonline.un.org/cerf/CERFFigures/CERFFigures/CountriesreceivingCERFfunds/tabid/1799/Default.aspx

- **IASC:**
IASC Cluster Approach Evaluation November 2007
IASC Somalia – Protection Cluster Update: 30 November 2007:
Population Movement Tracking (PMT) and Protection Monitoring Network (PMN)
IASC Interim Self-Assessment of Implementation of Cluster Approach in the Field

- **OHCHR:**
http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/ratification/11_b.htm

- **OCHA**:
Consolidated Appeals:
Consolidated Appeals Process: Humanitarian Appeal 2008

115

Kenya 2006 Flash Appeal
Somalia Consolidated Appeals Process 2008:
http://ochaonline.un.org/cap2005/webpage.asp?MenuID=10484&Page=1630
Somalia Consolidated Appeals Process 2007 Revision
Somalia Consolidated Appeals 2007
Somalia Consolidated Appeals 2006 Revision
Somalia Consolidated Appeals 2006
Somalia Floods Response Plan 2006

Financial Tracking System:
http://ocha.unog.ch/fts2/pageloader.aspx?page=emerg-emergencies&section=CE&Year=2007

Summary of requirements and Pledges:
http://ocha.unog.ch/fts/reports/daily/ocha_R21_Y2007___08010307.pdf

Inter-Agency Displacement Division: Mission to Somalia, 22 – 30 May 2006
http://www.reliefweb.int/idp/docs/reports/2006/IDD%20Somalia%20Mission%20Report%2022-30%20May%202006.pdf

- **UNICEF**:
UNICEF Humanitarian Action Donor Update, May 2007
UNICEF Humanitarian Action Report (HAR) 2007
UNICEF Humanitarian Action Report (draft) 2008
UNICEF Somalia Emergency Situation Report, October 24th - November 6th 2007

- **UN Security Council:**
Monitoring and Reporting on Grave Child Rights Violations Pre-Workshop work template
Report of the Secretary-General to the Security Council, Children and Armed Conflict, A/62/609-S/2007/757, 21st December 2007: http://daccessdds.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N07/656/04/PDF/N0765604.pdf?OpenElement

ANNEX **6.8**

UGANDA

I.   Background information

a. Humanitarian context

More than two decades of armed conflict between the Government and rebel Lord's Resistance Army (LRA) since 1986 have perpetuated a complex humanitarian situation in northern Uganda. This was marked by insecurity, massive internal displacements of approximately 1.8 million out of 28 million people into more than 200 camps in the Acholi and Lango sub-regions, with the violence affecting the lives of the most vulnerable populations in terms of nutrition, poor sanitation, and virtually no access to health care.[227] Thousands of children were walking long distances each night into urban centers to sleep the night in order to avoid being abducted by the LRA. One and a half years on from the start of the peace negotiations in July 2006 in Juba between the Government of Uganda and the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA), the humanitarian situation in northern Uganda has continued to improve. Following the Cessation of Hostilities Agreement (CHA) signed in August 2006, increased security in the North has accelerated the movement out of camps, although the majority, approximately one million IDPs, still remain in 120 camps and 395,000 in new sites/transit.[228]

Serious challenges remain in parts of north-eastern Uganda. Access to health, nutrition, safe water, education, protection, shelter and other essential services remain largely unfulfilled and severely affect several generations of children.

There is growing concern about the humanitarian situation in transit and return areas in eastern Teso sub-region, particularly Katakwi and Amuria, as well as the entire Karamoja sub-region. In particular, in **Karamoja**, the continued effects of extreme poverty, climatic hazards, insecurity resulting from small arms and light weapons (SALW) proliferation, livestock rustling/raiding activities and human rights abuses associated with disarmament will require continued advocacy for protection, as well as assistance for more than half a million people. Meanwhile, in Lango, Teso and Acholi, the lack of services in return/transit areas is jeopardising food security, contributing to voluntary family separation, and leaving hundreds of children alone in mother camps

In **Acholi**, approximately 321,000 persons have moved to 334 new settlement areas. While the humanitarian situation is stabilising in Acholi camps, in most of the new sites there is an appalling lack of social services that threatens the prospects for lasting stability for the inhabitants. Furthermore, the absence of schools and health facilities in the new sites forces families to adopt a pattern of commuting to the old camp which precipitates family separation exposing women and children to increased risks, including Gender Based Violence (GBV) and other forms of abuse and exploitation.

In **Lira, Oyam and Apac** more than 388,000 IDPs are now permanently resettled in their original homesteads and facing the challenge of rebuilding their lives and livelihoods. A survey conducted by Action against Hunger (ACF) shows that in Lira, where 83% of the population has returned, the prevalence of GAM has increased from last year and the mortality rate is higher than in the Acholi districts. Preliminary findings of a need assessment conducted in May 2007 indicate that there are critical gaps in access to water, education, health and protection services in new sites and in return areas. This is largely due to a breakdown of facilities, inadequate staffing and staff absenteeism.

---

[227] UNICEF Humanitarian Action Report 2007
[228] Consolidated Appeals Process CAP Mid-Year Review 2007

In Katakwi and Amuria, approximately 28,000 IDPs have moved into new sites and more than 110,000 remain in camps with rising fear of incursions of illegally armed Karimojong. For the majority of people in camps and in new sites, access to their fields is limited.

In Karamoja there is a high sense of insecurity, combined with a continuing deterioration of humanitarian and socio-economic indicators. Humanitarian indicators in north-eastern Karamoja remain persistently lower than national averages as the sub-region continues to experience an endemic conflict involving the agro-pastoralist Karamajong population. While the government's disarmament programme continues, it has not yet been accompanied by visible, significant investment. Disarmament operations continue to trigger human rights abuses, although community cooperation with Uganda People's Defence Forces (UPDF) appears to be improving in some districts. Rainfall has been late and inconsistent, causing fears of another poor harvest this year.

As a result of a growing number of one parent and child headed households caused primarily by the aids pandemic and poverty in general, social and family structures have deteriorated in Uganda. This contributes to heightening children's vulnerability to and exposure to violence abuse and exploitation, both within communities and in local public institutions. Uganda is ranked as low as number 146 among the 177 countries on UNDP's Human Development index. The mortality rate under five years is 141 per 1,000 children, and the maternal mortality ratio is 880 per 100,000 live births.

b. Protection concerns

The congestion in IDP camps has contributed to poor water and sanitation, human rights abuses including gender-based violence, disease outbreaks and wild fires, among others. Children and women – who comprise 80% of internally displaced persons (IDPs) have been direct targets of attacks, sexual violence and abductions perpetuated by the Lord Resistance Army (LRA) and others.

Human rights violations:
An improvement in the human rights situation in 2007 has been observed in northern and north-eastern Uganda, as well as in Karamoja, with the progressive return of law enforcement officials and judicial personnel contributing to the restoration of civilian rule of law. Housing, land and property rights emerged as issues of concern as increasing numbers of persons accessed their land, with disputes occurring at individual, family and clan levels. Additional challenges have emerged in ensuring the rights of the most vulnerable groups, such as single women, female- and child-headed households, orphans and unaccompanied children, persons with disabilities, as well as older persons. Access to justice for survivors of gender-based violence remains a significant challenge.

In Karamoja, however, there is a continued lack of systematic action taken by the UPDF to eliminate impunity and to hold members of the armed forces accountable for alleged human rights violations remains a source of concern. There is also a need for a more effective civilian law enforcement response to the activities of illegally-armed Karimojong.

Gender-based violence:
Twenty thousand children have been abducted, forced into combat, and subjected to rape and torture. Of the nearly 25,000 children abducted since the late-1980s, almost 7,500 are girls, of whom 1,000 returned from LRA captivity having conceived and borne children of their own.[229] According to the report of the Secretary-General on children and armed conflict in Uganda (May 2007), cases of rape and other forms of sexual violence against girls by Government military personnel, particularly in IDP camp settings and return areas continue to be reported. Women and girls have been subjected to sexual harassment, sexual intimidation and sexual abuse by UPDF soldiers, LRA combatants and community members, and have been intimidated not to report them.[230]

c. Child protection concerns – children associated with armed conflict

---

[229] UNICEF Humanitarian Action Report 2007
[230] Report of the Secretary-General on Children and Armed Conflict in Uganda, S/2007/260, May 2007, p. 5

Children and Armed Conflict:

The report on Children and Armed Conflict[231] referred to the following parties to the conflict that have been responsible for grave violations of children's rights: the Uganda People's Defense Forces (UPDF), and its allied Local Defence Units (LDUs), as well as the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA). Although the Government of Uganda does not have an official policy to recruit children, children are present among its armed forces, especially within the LDUs. Factors contributing to the problem of children joining elements of the armed forces include extreme poverty within IDP camps, and corruption among Local Council Executive Committees members providing birth certificates to teenagers on demand, for a fee.

According to the 2005 figures, as many as 25,000 children may have been abducted since the onset of the conflict in Northern Uganda in Kitgum and Gulu districts – leading to the phenomenon of night commuting. According to UNICEF, 44,000 children and adults were moving nightly during the peak of hostilities in 2004 to avoid the risk of being abducted or subjected to human rights abuses. Children have been used as combatants, porters, informants and other services providers including sexual slaves. It is estimated that the LRA may still hold about 2,000 women and children in its ranks.

SC Resolution 1612:

Despite repeated pleas by various stakeholders, the LRA has not released children, women or non-combatants from its ranks. In June 2006, the SRSG visited Uganda at the invitation of the Government. The Security Council Working Group on Children in Armed Conflict (SCWG-CAAC) has highlighted to the LRA that the liberation of children recruited in armed forces must be immediate. A report on Uganda and recruited children will be submitted at the start of 2008. The LRA's response will be addressed in the special report to the Secretary General addressed at the Security Council.[232]

In July 2005, the International Criminal Court issued arrest warrants for LRA leader Joseph Kony and other LRA commanders under charges of war crimes and crimes against humanity, including rape, murder, sexual enslavement and forced enlisting of children.

The Uganda Taskforce on Monitoring and Reporting (SCR 1612) worked with the Government of Uganda to develop an Action Plan to prevent the recruitment and use of child soldiers. A 1612 MRM was established, comprising 226 field monitors, all trained in ethical information collection and reporting. A total of 96 cases of gross violation of children's rights were verified by lead monitors, who ensured each case received an appropriate response or referral to services. These were all fed to the Security Council to inform discussions.

---

[231] Report of the Secretary-General on Children and Armed Conflict in Uganda, S/2007/260, May 2007
[232] Office of the SRSG on Children and Armed Conflict: http://www.un.org/children/conflict/pr/2007-07-20163.html

II. Child protection in emergencies – coordination structures
Highlights

Model used: Sub-cluster headed by UNICEF at national level; sub-groups at district level chaired by GoU and co-chaired by UNICEF; child protection is a standing item on the protection cluster agenda at national and district level.

Locus of decision-taking on child protection issues: within the child protection coordination structures; however specialised issues such as DDR and 1612 monitoring are in parallel structures outside child protection coordination

Staff time dedicated to child protection coordination (UNICEF at national level: 100%; at district level: 20%)

---

a. Pre-existing child protection coordination structures

Psycho-social support working groups at district level were in existence prior to the cluster approach roll out, and these were transformed (based on a consensual and consultative agreement by members) into Child protection sub cluster working groups. At national level no child protection coordination for a existed prior to the cluster approach (a national psycho-social core team was and still is in function and the CP sub cluster regularly participated in this for a and contributes to it).

b. Current child protection coordination structures and the protection cluster

At the ERC's request, an OCHA-IDD support mission to Uganda took place in November 2005 with the aim of supporting the HC and the IASC CT in preliminary capacity mapping and response planning in the context of the cluster leadership approach.[233] The Cluster Approach was adopted in Uganda in 2006 as one of the four pilot countries in addition to the DRC, Liberia and Somalia. Four Clusters were adopted, while three sub-clusters were created under Protection:[234]

- Early Recovery (UNDP)
- Health (WHO)
- Protection – UNHCR
- Water, sanitation and hygiene – UNICEF

Many cluster-related meetings are chaired or co-chaired by government representatives in Uganda.

i. Protection Cluster:

---

[233] See report on OCHA-IDD support mission to Uganda (14 – 16 November 2005): http://www.reliefweb.int/idp/docs/reports/2005/Ugandamissionreport14-18November05.pdf
[234] See UNDP Uganda Strategy on IDP Cluster Approach:

http://www.undp.org/cpr/others/download/recovery/june_06/UNDP_Uganda_strategy_on_IDP_cluster_approach.doc

Since assuming its cluster lead role for protection, UNHCR has increased its field presence and operations in Uganda. UNHCR has scaled up from what was once a refugee-only operation to include coordination and programming in IDPs protection and camp coordination/ management.

The protection cluster contains three sub-clusters:

- GBV (UNICEF until Dec. 07 and as of 2008, UNFPA)
- Child protection (UNICEF)
- Human Rights/Rule of Law (OHCHR)

Members of the protection cluster include:

Chair: UNHCR

UN: UNICEF; OHCHR, OCHA, WFP, UNFPA

Donors : ECHO

NGOs : ARC, ASB, AVSI, CARE, CARATONG, CCF, CESVI, COOPI, CRS, DRC, GOAL, GVC, IRC, LWF, NRC, OXFAM, RLP, SP, WARCHILD (CANADA AND HOLLAND) WVI.

NATIONAL BODIES: UHRC

OTHER: ICRC, IOM

ii. Child protection coordination

The child protection sub-cluster is led by UNICEF in Kampala and by UNICEF and local government officials (probation and social welfare officials) at the district level. Child protection is also a standing-item on the protection cluster agenda.

Members in **Kampala** include:

Chair: UNICEF

UN: OHCHR, UNFPA, OCHA, UNDP, UNHCR

Government: Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development (Commissioner for Children and Youth) and National Police HQ representative.(child and family protection unit)

Others: IOM, ICRC

INGOs: IRC, Save the children in Uganda, YSA, USAID, WVI, CCF, SC in Uganda, AVSI, COOPI, CARITAS, War child Holland, Trans-cultural Psychosocial Support Organisation,

Coalition to Stop the Use of Child Soldiers, Concerned Parents Association, Medair, ASB, Goal, WVI

Members at the **district level** include:

Chair: Government official and co chaired by UNICEF

UN: OCHA, UNHCR, OHCHR, UNDP (depending on field presence)

Government: District authorities, including Ugandan Human Rights Commission

INGOs: WVI, IRC, CCF, SCiU, AVSI, COOPI, Caritas, War child Holland/UK/Canada,

NGOs: incl. YSA, Concerned Parents Assoc, Empowering Hands, GUSCO, RUFOU, Noah's Ark, ACCORD, CCF Pader, COOPI, KICWA, CPA, Food for Hungry International, Mother's Union, CINS, URC, LFI, SAPAD, CADOVIC, Grassland Foundation, Right to Play, KCV, TKL, C&D, BISREP, AREMILOK, UHRC

ToRs: Generic ones are currently in use. Specific ones are to be drafted in 2008.

c. Other parallel child protection coordination mechanisms

i. M&R on SC Resolution 1612:

The Uganda Task Force on Monitoring and Reporting (UTFMR) has been in existence since June 2006. It is co-chaired by UNICEF and OHCHR, and includes UNHCR, Save the Children in Uganda and the Ugandan Human Rights Commission (UHRC). The first country report to the SC was presented to the Council and its Working Group on Children and Armed Conflict in May 2007. The UTFMR has recently started monitoring Teso region in Northeastern Uganda.

d. Joint child protection activities and initiatives
i. Child protection specific
- Joint needs assessments have been undertaken, also in the context of disaster response to the flooding (assessment tools developed for floods and to look into family separation).

ii. Tools:
- Service and contact mapping tool at the sub-county level (expanding from OCHA WWW, to include government and community based resources and to use for referrals)
- Standardised monthly child protection reporting tool
- Inter-agency assessment tools on Child protection
- IASC/MoGLSD Training package on child protection
- IASC/MoGLSD standards and guidelines for the establishment and support to child protection community based structures

III. Funding for child protection coordination activities

<u>**Summary of CAP Review (2007):**</u>

Uganda	2 child protection projects
	100% of CP request funded
	74 % of overall protection request funded
27%	**of sector funding for child protection**
2%	**of total CAP funding for child protection**
9%	**of total CAP funding for overall protection**

a. General observations

<u>**2007**</u>:
Uganda received a total of $291.3 million in humanitarian assistance of which 70% was through the Consolidated and Flash Appeals.[235] The largest donors included the US at $87.5 million or 30%, ECHO at $35.9 million or 12%, and the UK at $34.8 million or 12%. CERF funding for 2007 amounted to $7 million or just over 2% of the total funding. Outside the Appeal, $12.9 million was received.

Child Protection: In 2007, child protection projects were funded through the Appeal at a total sum of **$8.2 million** or 73% of the requested amount. This represented **28% of the Protection Cluster funding, and below 3%of the total funding allocated for the CAP in 2007**.

<u>**2006**</u>:
A total of $277.6 million was provided to Uganda to support emergency response. Of this amount, $225.8 million or more than 81% was through the CAP. The largest donors overall included again the US at $54.1 million or almost 20% of the total funding, the UK at $52.4 million or 19%, and carry-over funding of $43.3 million or almost 16% of the total funding.

Child Protection: In the CAP 2006, Uganda received $5 million for child protection projects through the protection sector. This represented 55% of the requested amount, 30% of the entire protection sector funding, and just over 2% of the total CAP funding in 2006. Outside of the CAP, Uganda received a total of $51.8 million. Of this, three projects amounting to just over $1 million covered child protection, or almost 2% of the funding received outside of the CAP. In sum, **Uganda received a total of $277.6 million in humanitarian funding in 2006 of which over $6 million went to child protection activities, or just over 2% of the total funding.**

b. Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF):

<u>**2007:**</u>
A total of $13 million was disbursed to Uganda through the CERF Rapid Response window, to cover the sectors of Camp Coordination/Camp Management (UNHCR), Health (WHO), Food (WFP and FAO), Coordination and Support (WFP), Water and Sanitation (UNICEF), Education (UNICEF), Shelter and NFIs (UNICEF), Agriculture (WFP). The second lowest allocation went to the Camp Coordination Camp Management covering a UNHCR project

---

[235] Consolidated Appeals Process: Humanitarian Appeal 2008, p.19

amounting to $287,950, not covering child protection specifically.[236] Of the total CERF amount allocated to Uganda in 2007, a little over $6 million or 46% (of the total amount) was directed towards covering the Flash Appeal needs in response to the floods.

2006:
Uganda did not receive any CERF funding.

c. Consolidated Appeals Process (CAP):

2007:
The original appeal was for $295.9 million and was revised to $348.8 million. This was funded at almost 80% or $278.4 million.[237] The largest donors were the US, which funded 32% of the appeal, followed by the UK at 13%, and ECHO also at 13%. CERF funding to the CAP amounted to $7 million or 3% of the total. In terms of relevant appealing agencies to Protection and Child Protection activities; UNHCR was well-funded appealing for $34.1 million and receiving 98% of its requests at almost $33.4 million, UNICEF requested a revised amount of $52.4 million and received $29.7 million or 57% of the requested amount, while UNFPA requested $3.3 million and received less than 39% or $1.3 million. The NGO Save the Children Denmark requested $1.7 million and was 100% funded. The number of NGO projects within the appeal amounted to 38%, while the number of NGO projects increased to 47% in 2008.[238]

The **Protection/Human Rights/Rule of Law Cluster** requested $36.7 million – the third largest sector requirement within the CAP. This was revised to $40.2 million, and was relatively well-funded at 74% or a total of $29.7 million.[239] Within the Cluster, the following **Child Protection** projects were included:

Project	Appealing agency	Original requirements USD	Revised requirements USD	Funding USD	% Covered
Child Protection[240]	UNICEF	$5.4 million	$6.3 million	$6.3 million	100%
Preventing and responding to gender-based violence	UNICEF	$2.3 million	$2.3 million	$1 million	45%
Return & reintegration of persons formerly with the LRA	UNICEF	$2.5 million	$2.5 million	$666,700	27%
Child resilience	SC– Denmark	$0	$177,550	$177,550	100%
Total	**3 UNICEF projects, one SC project**	**$10.2 million**	**$11.2 million**	**$8.2 million**	**73%**

---

[236] Did not find further information on the UNHCR project, but presume this not to have specifically covered Child Protection activities. See:
http://ochaonline.un.org/CERFFigures/CERFFigures/CountriesreceivingCERFfunds/tabid/1799/Default.aspx
[237] February 9th 2008, FTS: http://ocha.unog.ch/fts/reports/daily/ocha_R21_Y2007___08010307.pdf
[238] Consolidated Appeals Process: Humanitarian Appeal 2008, p.9
[239] The Protection Cluster was well covered, third after the Multi-sector, and Food Cluster in terms of percentage covered in relation to the requested amount.
[240] Objective: to increase access to integrated child protection mechanisms in Karamoja and IDP camps/communities of return.

Child Protection funding: The Protection Cluster included four child protection projects in the CAP 2007. This included three by UNICEF and one by Save the Children Denmark amounting to a total revised request of $11.2 million for child protection activities or 28% of the Protection Cluster appeal. This was funded at 73% of the request or $8.2 million. In sum, **funding of $8.2 million for child protection projects represented almost 28% of the Protection Cluster funding, and below 3%of the total funding allocated for the CAP in 2007**.

In addition to the above mentioned, two other projects included elements of Child Protection.[241] This included a protection by Cooperazione Internazionale (COOPI) on Protection from Sexual and Gender-Based Violence and Care of Survivors in Northern Uganda that addressed the rights of women and girls. The project requested $400,000 but was not funded.

Mine Action: The mine action section of the CAP is separate from the Protection Cluster. The sector projects do not include any UNICEF ones, but do contain NGO projects with elements of Child Protection, however, none of these were funded:

- AVSI on Community Based Mine Risk Education and Victim Assistance in Northern Uganda for $42, 789 (revised), but did not receive any funding.[242]
- Canadian Physicians for Aid and Relief (CPAR) on Mine Risk Education for Landmine Affected Communities and Schools in Northern Uganda for $505,600. However this project did not receive any funding.[243]

2006:

The CAP 2006 requested $222.6 million, revised to $263.4 million, and received $225.8 million or almost 86% of the revised appeal. The largest donors included the UK at $49.2 million or 22% of total funding; the US at $44.5 million or 20% of the funding; and carry-over funding at $43 million just less than 20%. While the food sector was by far the best funded receiving $147.4 million or 120% of its request, the **protection/human rights/rule of law sector** was relatively well-funded for its request for $15.6 million revised to $23.4 million, as it received 71% of this amounting to $16.5 million. In terms of agencies, UNHCR received almost 86% of its revised request for $26.7 million amounting to $22.9 million; UNICEF received $28.1 million or almost 53% if its revised request for $53.1 million; UNFPA received 67% or $2.2 million of its request for $3.2 million. An NGO carrying out protection related work, NRC, requested $770,000 and received $446,430 or 58% of its appeal.

Child Protection: Out of the 16 Protection sector projects, seven can be considered child protection ones. Most were UNICEF led projects, while one was an NGO project. The amounted to a total of $6.5 million, revised to $9 million, **funded at 55% or $5 million. This represented about 30% of the protection sector funding and just over 2% of the total CAP funding in 2006.**

Project Title	Organization	Original Request	Revised Request	Funding	% Covered
Integrated response to youth idleness in IDP camps	Associazione Volontari Servizio Internazionale (AVSI)	$200,000	$200,000	$200,000	100%
Community-based Child Protection	UNICEF	$2.7 million	$2.7 million	$2.7 million	102%
Humanitarian	UNICEF	$1.2 million	$1.2 million	$445,710	37%

---

[241] The Associazione Volontari per il Servicio Internazionale (AVSI) project on promotion of return and improved protection of IDPs and returnees in northern Uganda included the aim of increased access to integrated child protection mechanisms. It requested $313,434 and received $224,551 or 72% of the appeal.

[242] Targets children at schools, as well as IDPs, district authorities, UPDF, and police.

[243] Beneficiaries include primary school children, returning IDPs, and other affected populations

Protection					
Preventing and Responding to Sexual Violence	UNICEF	$1.6 million	$1.6 million	$0	0%
Separated children	UNICEF	$828,800	$828,800	$600,000	72%
Child Protection/SGBV sub-Cluster leadership	UNICEF	$0	$594,000	$0	0%
Child Protection	UNICEF	$0	$1.9 million	$1.1 million	58%
Total	**7 projects: 6 UNICEF ones, and one NGO project**	**$6.5 million**	**$9 million**	**$5 million**	**55% of revised request**

In addition to this, the Economic Recovery and Infrastructure sector included two IOM projects relevant to child protection; however, these activities did not receive any funding:

- IOM: "Demobilization, Repatriation, Rehabilitation and Rehabilitation of ex-combatants/ former child soldiers" requested $789,389 but was 0% funded
- IOM: Reintegration of ex-combatants/ former child soldiers in Northern and Eastern Uganda requested $739,767 but was 0% funded

The Mine Action sector is separate from the protection sector; however, none of the former projects were specifically targeted for children.

d. Other funding for child protection:

2007:
Uganda received $12.9 million outside of the CAP in 2007. This included an ICRC assistance and protection project for $529,800 funded by Austria, however, none of the funding outside of the Appeal was specifically for child protection.

Uganda Floods Flash Appeal 2007:

From the Flash Appeal Review (2007):

Uganda Floods	0 child protection projects out of 1 protection project total
	0% of overall protection request funded
0%	**of flash appeal for overall protection**

Of the 15 flash appeals issued in **2007**, only two pertained to CAP countries (Sudan and Uganda). To respond to the floods that started on the 20th August, a Flash Appeal was issued on the 21st of September for $41.5 million (unrevised).[244] This was covered at $17.7 million or 43% of the required amount.[245] The largest donors of the Flash Appeal were: the CERF providing $6 million (25% of the appeal); the US providing $2.9 million (12%); and the Netherlands providing 2.5% (10% of the appeal). UNHCR appealed for a total of $877,800 and received $287,900 or 33% of its requests; UNICEF required $7.2 million and received 81% of its request amounting to $5.8 million.

---

[244] Flash Appeal for floods to cover period from 21 September 2007 – 20th March 2008
[245] January 9th 2008, FTS: http://ocha.unog.ch/fts/reports/daily/ocha_R21_Y2007___08010307.pdf

The Protection/Human Rights/Rule of Law Cluster appealed for $205,800 through UNHCR, to ensure protection for IDPs in the Teso sub-region, and was complementary to the existing UNICEF programs in relation to SGBV and child protection issues. However, this project did **not receive funding**.[246] No specific child protection project were submitted under the Flash Appeal.

UNICEF funding: In 2007, UNICEF's financial needs for Uganda amounted to $48 million. Of this, $10.2 million (21% of the total request) was for Child Protection activities focusing on IDP children in camps and areas of return and resettlement in terms of interim care and transit facilities; early return support and reintegration assistance; psychosocial and medical care; family-tracing, family preparation and reinsertion support; strengthening of integrated protection mechanisms and case management systems, and of multi-sectoral prevention and response to gender-based violence.

2006:
Outside of the Appeal, Uganda received a total of $51.8 million in 2006 or almost 19% of the total humanitarian funding received in 2006. Of this amount the following three projects were identified as relevant to child protection amounting to a total of just over $1 million[247]:

- Psychosocial child support: SC-Denmark, funding received $194,508 (Denmark)
- Reintegration of ex-combatants in Uganda: CRN received $297,620 (Norway)
- Repatriation of ex-combatants: CRN received $537,580 (Norway)

Great Lakes Region Appeal (2006): The 2006 Consolidated Appeals Process (CAP) for the Great Lakes Region was launched in Nairobi and requested $154.5 million, revised to $149.4 million, and received $108.1 million or 72% of the requested amount. Of this, the protection/human rights/rule of law sector appealed for $2.4 million, revised to $2.1 million, and received merely $357,500 or just 17% of the requested sector amount. Most of the projects within the protection sector were to support the International Conference on the Great Lakes Region (IC/GLR), notably in relation to gender-based violence. However, none of the projects are disaggregated in terms of country specific support.[248]

IV. Recommendations from the field

Requests to the global and child protection actors:

- Guidance on the overall focus of the protection cluster
- Facilitation of inter-regional workshops to promote the sharing of lessons, practices and tools (including training materials)
- Guidance, best practices on transitioning from humanitarian to recovery
- Capacity-building opportunities for cluster members

---

[246] See Uganda Floods Flash Appeal 2007, p.18. In terms of largest funding amounts, the main recipients of funding were the sectors of Food, Sector not yet specified; and Coordination and Support Services, see FTS: http://ocha.unog.ch/fts/reports/daily/ocha_R3clu_A779___08010911.pdf

[247] See http://ocha.unog.ch/fts/reports/daily/ocha_R4_A697___08021207.pdf. Note that the following have not been included due to lack of more specific information on the nature of the projects: ICRC's programmes in Uganda that received $41,322; IMC "Protection activities'" for $393,966; IRC "Agriculture, food security, education, health, protection, water sanitation" for $1.1 million.

[248] See FTS website http://ocha.unog.ch/fts/reports/daily/ocha_R3_A695___08021207.pdf and Great Lakes CAP 2006
http://ochadms.unog.ch/quickplace/cap/main.nsf/h_Index/MYR_2006_GLR/$FILE/MYR_2006_GLR_SCREEN.pdf?OpenElement

- Guidance on provider of the last resort
- Establish virtual CP community for information sharing, regular updates, availability of roster experts, info management systems
- Tools to assess impact of cluster approach
- Guidance on mainstreaming CP in other sectors/clusters
- Methodology & tools in identifying & selection of vulnerable children (as potential project beneficiaries)
- Models of CP strategies in other countries
- Good examples of integrated CP & GBV programming & coordination

V.   Sources

Agencies and organisations interviewed:

- UNICEF
- UNHCR
- Save the Children in Uganda

Open sources consulted:

- CAP:

Consolidated Appeals Process (CAP): Humanitarian Appeal 2008
Consolidated Appeals Process (CAP) for Uganda 2008: http://ochaonline.un.org/cap2005/webpage.asp?Page=1632
Consolidated Appeals Process (CAP) for Uganda, Mid-Year Review 2007: http://ochaonline.un.org/cap2005/webpage.asp?MenuID=10502&Page=1583

- CERF:

CERF website: http://ochaonline2.un.org/Default.aspx?tabid=9941

- OCHA :

Report on OCHA-IDD support mission to Uganda (14 – 16 November 2005): http://www.reliefweb.int/idp/docs/reports/2005/Ugandamissionreport14-18November05.pdf

- OHCHR:

Website: http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/ratification/11.htm

- Office of the Special Representative of the Secretary General on Children in Armed Conflict:

Website : http://www.un.org/children/conflict/pr/2007-07-20163.html
Report of the Secretary General on Children and Armed Conflict in Uganda, S/2007/260, May 2007

- UNDP:

UNDP Uganda Strategy on IDP Cluster Approach: http://www.undp.org/cpr/others/download/recovery/june_06/UNDP_Uganda_strategy_on_IDP_cluster_approach.doc

- UNHCR:

UNHCR, 'Real Time Evaluation of UNHCR's IDP Operation in Uganda', August 2007

- UNICEF:

UNICEF Humanitarian Action Report 2007
UNICEF Humanitarian Action Report 2008