

# Evaluation of Save the Children Sweden's work in the follow-up of the UN Study on Violence against Children 2006-2010

---

Daja Wenke

2011



**Programme location:** International

**Date of evaluation:** August – October 2011

**Purpose of evaluation:** Evaluation of Save the Children Sweden’s international work to strengthen National Child Protection Systems and its impact on child protection, with special focus on advocacy work.

**Name of evaluator:** Daja Wenke  
Independent Researcher and Consultant, Child Rights / Child Protection

**Acknowledgements:** This study has benefited from the collaboration, comments and inputs from the following professionals in Save the Children Sweden’s Regional and Country Offices and the Child Protection Initiative: Eva Maria Cayanan, Roberta Cecchetti, Jerome Conilleau, Clare Feinstein, Enyo Gbedemah, Lena Karlsson, Deidre Kleynhans, Geoffrey Mugisha, Dominique Pierre Plateau, Dominique Sbardella, Angels Simon, and Denise Stuckenbruck. Jennie Asberg at the SCS Country Office Kenya liaised with SCS partners in Kenya and coordinated the schedule for key informant interviews. She also collected and shared key programme documents of the SCS Country Office in Kenya. Eva Bellander provided overall management, direction and supervision for the implementation of the study, in collaboration with Eva Geidenmark, Vibeke Jörgensen and Tove Strömsted who acted as members of the Reference Group. The draft report was reviewed by Eva Bellander, Eva Geidenmark and Lena Karlsson who provided valuable comments for its finalisation.

## Table of Contents

Acronyms .....	4
Executive Summary .....	5
I. Background and Programme Description .....	6
II. Scope and Purpose of the Evaluation .....	7
III. Methods .....	8
IV. Findings .....	9
IV.1 The organisational framework .....	9
IV.2 Strategic planning .....	14
IV.3 Building systemic approaches: The challenges of reaching conceptual clarity .....	18
IV.4 Promoting law and policy reform .....	21
IV.5 Juvenile justice and child-friendly procedures .....	23
IV.6 Promoting the participation of children .....	24
IV.7 Research, documentation and communication .....	25
IV.8 Fostering strategic partnerships .....	27
IV.9 Promoting systemic and rights-based approaches across all sectors .....	34
IV.10 Challenges and risks to the implementation of child protection programmes .....	36
V. Conclusions .....	38
VI. Recommendations .....	40
VII. Lessons Learned .....	44
VIII. Annex .....	46
VIII.1 Recommendations of the UN Study on Violence Against Children .....	46
VIII.2 Save the Children Sweden’s key recommendations in follow-up to the UN Study on Violence Against Children .....	46
VIII.3 Save the Children’s concept of a national child protection system and its components ..	47
VIII.4 Evaluation Schedule .....	48
VIII.5 Evaluation Questions .....	49
VIII.6 Key informants .....	50
VIII.7 Terms of Reference for the Evaluation .....	53
VIII.8 Bibliography .....	56

## Acronyms

CPI	Child Protection Initiative
CPIE	Child Protection in Emergencies
CRC	Convention on the Rights of the Child
CRGI	Child Rights Governance Initiative
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
ECAf	East and Central Africa
LAM	Latin America
MENA	Middle East and North Africa
NCPS	National Child Protection Systems
NGO	Non-governmental Organisation
OAS	Organisation of American States
PHP	Physical and humiliating punishment
SC	Save the Children
SAf	Southern Africa
SCA	South and Central Asia
SCI	Save the Children International
SCS	Save the Children Sweden
SEAP	South East Asia and the Pacific
SRSG-VAC	Special Representative of the Secretary General on Violence against Children
TOR	Terms of Reference
TPP	Thematic Programme Plan
UN	United Nations
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNOHCHR	United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights
UNVAC	United Nations Study on Violence against Children (UN Violence Study)
VAC	Violence against Children
WAf	West Africa

## Executive Summary

Save the Children Sweden (SCS) has a long-standing tradition on programming for the advancement of children's right to protection from all forms of violence. By taking the lead on child protection themes within Save the Children, and during the process for the UN Study on Violence against Children, SCS has been in a position to contribute its thematic and strategic expertise to the common development of SC's child protection programming. It also influenced the organisational development in this area.

This study was initiated to assess and evaluate Save the Children Sweden's child protection work in follow-up to the UN Violence Study. It identifies lessons learned from SCS's child protection work, including relevant achievements and challenges, as well as recommendations for the way forward. The study is based on a literature review and a survey with key informants in SCS Regional Offices, the CPI, and selected SCS national partners. It is global in scope and focuses on SCS's child protection work in development programming, in particular the advocacy and capacity building work to strengthen national child protection systems (NCPS), from 2006 to 2010.

The findings reveal that SCS has contributed significantly to moving the child protection agenda forward through relevant strategies, capacity building, the development and advancement of concepts and approaches. SCS has thus achieved progress for children at the local, country and regional levels, within SC and beyond. Thematically, SCS has developed its own niche in addressing the corporal punishment of children and has achieved significant progress in this area. Concerning strategic approaches, SCS has specialised on programming for the development of NCPS, especially through community-based approaches, and promoting children's participation in these processes. Room for further improvement of SCS child protection programmes is seen mainly with regard to sustainable implementation, monitoring, documentation and communication, and fundraising.

The NCPS concept has been widely communicated and its importance has been recognised within SC. SC/SCS staff are called upon to ensure that the organisations' thematic child protection priorities are being addressed within an overall systems building approach. The NCPS remains nonetheless a rather abstract construct and there is evidence to suggest that SC staff and their partners are struggling to understand how to translate it into concrete action. As a result, there is a risk that the NCPS approach remains vague and abstract and that some of the NCPS components are being neglected or overlooked in child protection programmes.

In its global programming, SCS has been addressing the NCPS components, but the priorities differ between programmes, regions and countries. The organisation was particularly active in developing the NCPS concept, conducting mapping and assessment studies of NCPS, promoting law reform to prohibit all forms of violence against children, creating opportunities for children's participation, and fostering coordination through strategic partnerships at the local and national levels as well as with regional and international bodies and networks.

Groundbreaking progress for children has been achieved through SCS active participation in multi-stakeholder cooperation mechanisms that involve governments, civil society, including children, and national and international organisations. When such partnerships are consolidated through regional networks and fora, there is likely to be an added value deriving from the regional dynamics and governments' common commitments. There are many examples of how SCS has initiated, sustained and promoted the multi-stakeholder and inter-agency regional cooperation on child protection. Whereas the specific role of SCS in bringing about change through regional initiatives is not always measurable or quantifiable, its impact is considered to be sustainable, rooted in national ownership, and has resulted in concrete outcomes for children.

## I. Background and Programme Description

In 2003, the United Nations Secretary General appointed the independent expert Paulo Pinheiro to conduct a global study on violence against children. The study results were presented to the UN General Assembly in 2006 and included strategic recommendations on how to strengthen the protection of children from violence (see Annex VIII.1).<sup>1</sup>

When the UN Violence Study (UNVAC) was initiated, Save the Children Sweden (SCS) took on the leading role to coordinate the contributions of SC Members to the study. In order to manage the coordination with other SC Members, SCS established a Global Task Group<sup>2</sup> and built up a network of regional and national focal points who gathered and communicated information from the local levels through country and regional offices to the Global Task Group. Through this globally coordinated initiative, Save the Children succeeded to contribute significantly to the process, content and the final recommendations of the UN Violence Study. It focused specifically on three main themes: a) juvenile justice, with a focus on diversion; b) sexual abuse and exploitation of children; and c) physical and humiliating punishment. Across all areas, particular attention was paid to gender based violence and the engagement of boys and men to address violence. In addition, Save the Children facilitated the participation of children in consultations and other processes to ensure that children's voices were heard and taken into account for the development of the UN Study.<sup>3</sup>

This consultative coordination process was also used as an opportunity to discuss and agree upon definitions of key concepts. Among others, a common definition of 'child protection' was developed and endorsed by the SC Members. Accordingly, child protection is understood as the "measures and structures to prevent and respond to abuse, neglect, exploitation and violence affecting children".<sup>4</sup> In addition, the concept of a 'national child protection system' was discussed and defined through its key components (see Annex VIII.3). This concept has been central to Save the Children's advocacy work during the process of the UN Violence Study and its follow-up.<sup>5</sup>

As the elaboration of the UN Violence Study evolved, Save the Children collaborated closely also with other organisations and external partners, from the local level of communities, to the national and regional levels, and globally. It thereby strengthened its role in regional and global networks of child rights and protection advocates, policy makers and practitioners.

After the launch of the UN Violence Study, Save the Children translated the UN Study's recommendations into a set of recommendations to guide SC's follow-up to the UN Study. A central aspect in this context was the call for the development of 'national child protection systems' as systemic and rights-based approaches to child protection (see Annex VIII.2).

In the years that followed the launch of the UN Violence Study, the SC Alliance continued giving attention to child protection programmes. Having a long-standing tradition and experience in addressing violence against children, SCS took the lead on child protection themes within the SC Alliance and later on Save the Children International (SCI)<sup>6</sup>, and led, for instance, the development of an online child protection resource centre. It also promoted

---

<sup>1</sup> Pinheiro, Paulo Sérgio, *World Report on Violence Against Children*, Published by the United Nations Secretary-General's Study on Violence Against Children, 2006. ['The UN Violence Study']

<sup>2</sup> The Global Task Group was comprised of SC Canada, Norway, Sweden, the United Kingdom, and the SCI's Advocacy Offices in Brussels, Geneva and New York.

<sup>3</sup> Nilsson, Mali, *Narrative Report on Save the Children Sweden's Involvement with the UN Study on Violence against Children*, Save the Children Sweden, March 2011, p. 1.

<sup>4</sup> Rädda Barnen (Save the Children Sweden), *Thematic Strategic Framework 2009-2012, Children's Right to Protection*, International Programme, 19 March 2008, p. 2.

<sup>5</sup> See: Save the Children, *Why Effective National Child Protection Systems are Needed, Save the Children's key recommendations in response to the UN Secretary-General's Study on Violence against Children*, 2006, pp. 4-5.

<sup>6</sup> As part of the organisational reform, the SC Alliance was transformed into Save the Children. Since 2010, this process is taking place gradually in different regions.

knowledge management and capacity building on child protection themes among SC Members.<sup>7</sup>

In order to strengthen the collaboration and coordination of SC Members in the area of child protection further, the Child Protection Initiative (CPI) was launched in November 2009. The CPI is one of Save the Children's six global initiatives that cover key thematic areas of SC's global strategy for 2010 to 2015: child protection, emergency response, child survival, education, child rights governance, and HIV and AIDS. The CPI is a mechanism that supports SC Members and international programmes to strengthen and improve the quality of their child protection programmes. By facilitating Save the Children's access to qualified technical expertise, providing mechanisms for knowledge management, capacity building and advocacy opportunities, and leveraging the organisation's capacity to mobilise increasing resources for child protection programmes, the CPI aims to support the organisation in achieving its strategic objectives. SCS is leading the CPI in collaboration with a Steering Group, in which nine SC Members are represented. During its first years, the CPI focused on two thematic areas: children without appropriate care and child protection in emergencies. In addition, child labour has been developed as a new priority area in 2011, and physical and humiliating punishment will be in the focus as of 2012.<sup>8</sup>

The role of SCS in following-up to the UN Violence Study is therefore two-fold: 1) It is implementing its own child protection programmes through regional and country offices and in collaboration with partners – as the transition is advancing, SCS's programmes will be implemented more and more through SCI; and 2) by leading the CPI, SCS is providing leadership on child protection in the joint initiatives of the SC Members. Both of these initiatives are guided by the UNVAC recommendations and SC's focus on promoting systemic approaches in line with the organisation's conceptual understanding of national child protection systems.

## **II. Scope and Purpose of the Evaluation**

The overall objective of this study is to evaluate Save the Children Sweden's child protection work in follow-up to the UN Study on Violence against Children. Initiated upon a request of Save the Children Sweden's Board, the study aims to identify lessons learned from SCS's child protection work in follow-up to the UNVAC, including relevant achievements and challenges, as well as recommendations for the way forward. The study is global in scope and focuses on SCS's child protection work in development programming, in particular the advocacy and capacity building to strengthen national child protection systems (NCPS). It covers the years from the launch of the UN Violence Study in 2006 up to 2010, and recent examples and developments of 2011 are also included.

In order to collect relevant data and information to reach this objective, the terms of reference for this study provided a list of evaluation questions. These questions intended to assess, through examples, how SCS advocacy and capacity building work has impacted on the establishment and strengthening of individual components of the NCPS. The majority of the questions are directed at SCS Regional Offices. In addition, several questions were targeted at a more in-depth assessment of the situation in one country (Kenya).

In light of the background described above, the study is guided primarily by the following reference documents and recommendations:

- The recommendations from the UN Study on Violence against Children;

---

<sup>7</sup> Rädda Barnen (Save the Children Sweden), *Thematic Strategic Framework 2009-2012, Children's Right to Protection*, International Programme, 19 March 2008, p. 2.

<sup>8</sup> Save the Children, *Child Protection: Taking action against all forms of abuse, neglect, violence and exploitation*, 2010, p. 1. Interview with Lena Karlsson, Director, Child Protection Initiative, Save the Children, 25 August 2011.

- SC's conceptual guidance on national child protection systems; and
- The SCS Thematic Strategic Framework for 2009-2012.

The SCS Thematic Strategic Framework for 2009-2012 focuses on child protection in development and emergencies. This evaluation concentrates on the SCS child protection work in development contexts and does not cover the programming on emergencies. As will be discussed later, these two areas are, however, understood to be closely related.

In the period covered by this study, the structures and forms of collaboration of the SC Members have been evolving. The ongoing process of harmonising and merging SC programmes has led to the foundation of the Save the Children International Programme. These developments have affected the role and scope of SCS's child protection work globally and its relation to other SC Members and external partners. One of the outcomes of this process is that SCI coordinates its programming work through global thematic initiatives, with individual SC Members taking the lead on specific thematic areas. Of particular relevance for this evaluation is the role of the Child Protection Initiative, which offers a platform for the coordination and collaboration of the child protection work of all SC Members. Whereas the process to establish the CPI is not a subject of this study, its way of working and its role in promoting Save the Children's child protection work in follow-up to the UN Study globally, and the role of SCS in leading this process, will be discussed.

### **III. Methods**

This evaluation is based on a literature review and a survey with key informants. The literature review has taken into account strategic documents related to SC's involvement in the UN Violence Study and the related follow-up. It included the relevant strategic programming and planning documents, such as the SCS Thematic Strategic Framework and the strategies developed by the CPI. Background documents on Save the Children's approach to child protection and national child protection systems were also consulted. From each of the regions, selected project reports, assessments and studies were reviewed.

To complement the literature review, key informant interviews were conducted with SCS Regional Advisers in all regions where SCS is represented. The Director and Global Programme Manager of the CPI were also interviewed as well as selected CPI Regional Representatives and the CPI Advocacy Manager based in Geneva. A list of the key informants who participated in interviews is included in the Annex (see VIII.6).

All key informant interviews were conducted by phone, mostly during the month of September 2011. The interview questions had been shared with the informants beforehand and each informant was informed about the background of the study, the purpose of the interview, and how the information that he or she shared would be used. Some informants preferred to respond to the questions in writing.

In addition to the survey with SCS regional and CPI staff, a more in-depth assessment was to be conducted in one country, and the SCS Headoffice selected Kenya for this purpose. In Kenya, additional interview partners were therefore chosen among key partners for the implementation of the SCS Kenya programme, including governmental and non-governmental, national, regional and international partners. The literature review was extended to annual reports and action plans of the SCS programmes in Kenya as well as country-specific studies, all for the time frame 2006-2010.

#### ***Limitations***

This evaluation study was implemented in a total of 20 working days between August and October 2011, and the objective was to present a report of no more than 40 pages. This

limited framework requires that the evaluation works through selected examples rather than covering, in a comprehensive way, all the child protection activities that SCS implemented globally, from 2006-2010. The study does, however, not aim to conduct any impact evaluations of specific projects or initiatives. Notwithstanding these limitations, the study offers an opportunity to gather the views of SCS staff in strategic positions and from different regions on how the follow-up to the UN Violence Study has been handled thus far.

## IV. Findings

The SCS Thematic Strategic Framework 2009-2012 summarises the main achievements that resulted from SCS leadership since the UN Violence Study was launched in 2006 as follows:

*For the years 2005-2008:* “Major achievements for Save the Children Sweden ... include the development and successful application of rights-, developmental- and community based approaches to its work. Additional SCS strengths include strong networks and strategic entry points to governments and other critical duty bearers. Constructive dialogue with duty bearers, including government and non-state actors, has led to the building up of trustful relationships through transparent and long-term processes.”<sup>9</sup>

*For the years since 2009:* “Children’s right to protection has gained a larger focus within the Save the Children Alliance over the past years. Major achievements include the agreement on a common definition of child protection and the fruitful cooperation on the UN Study on Violence, which was characterised by a consultative and transparent process and involvement at community-, national-, regional- and global level.”<sup>10</sup>

This chapter will explore these achievements in more detail. It will show that the above statements are realistic and reaffirmed also by the views of key informants and evidence available from relevant studies and reports. It will reflect these achievements however also in the light of reported challenges and constraints. The Chapter will further discuss, through examples, how SCS programmes have contributed to translating the UN Violence Study’s recommendations into programming and practice, and how SCS has positioned itself, and its approaches, in the international SC Alliance by providing leadership on the CPI.

### IV.1 The organisational framework

#### ***Save the Children Sweden’s child protection approach and priorities***

The SCS Thematic Strategic Framework 2009-2012 notes that SCS programme planning “... shall consider the fact that SCS has developed a particular niche in advocating for a ban against physical and other humiliating punishment of children and promoting positive discipline. SCS should maintain this focus and continue to develop this niche. ... It is suggested that sexual and gender based violence and domestic violence be given increased attention in this regard and that methodologies be developed on how to best address children’s protection rights in this respect. ... SCS has also a special niche in promoting a child friendly physical environment and training of peacekeepers and other humanitarian actors.”<sup>11</sup> Other child protection issues that SCS has been working on include armed

---

<sup>9</sup> Rädda Barnen (Save the Children Sweden), *Thematic Strategic Framework 2009-2012, Children’s Right to Protection*, International Programme, 19 March 2008, p. 2.

<sup>10</sup> Rädda Barnen (Save the Children Sweden), *Thematic Strategic Framework 2009-2012, Children’s Right to Protection*, International Programme, 19 March 2008, p. 2.

<sup>11</sup> Rädda Barnen (Save the Children Sweden), *Thematic Strategic Framework 2009-2012, Children’s Right to Protection*, International Programme, 19 March 2008, p. 4.

violence by youth, including violence in the streets; juvenile justice; child-led disaster risk reduction and emergency preparedness.<sup>12</sup>

The strategic focus on banning corporal punishment and strengthening the NCPS approach has successfully been reflected in the child protection programmes of SCS Regional Offices. In many regions, the organisation is considered to have provided expertise and leadership specifically on the following themes: a) the development and strengthening of NCPS, including through community-based approaches; b) banning all forms of corporal punishment of children and promoting child protection more broadly; and c) promoting the consultation with children, and their active participation, on matters affecting them.<sup>13</sup>

Among the various organisations that are involved in building systemic approaches to child protection, SCS is considered to be specifically engaged in promoting a) community-based approaches and the involvement of civil society in the development, implementation and monitoring of NCPS; b) the child friendliness of NCPSs; and c) children's participation in strengthening NCPS.<sup>14</sup> Despite the priority attached to strengthening NCPS, there are usually no projects or initiatives that are specifically focused on this matter, but the systems building approach shall provide overall guidance to SCS's thematic child protection work.<sup>15</sup>

In addition to expertise in these areas, SCS Regional Offices are engaged in other thematic areas as well that all relate to the broader context of strengthening NCPS; some of these are summarised hereunder since they constitute examples of strategic prevention programmes.

#### *Socio-economic marginalisation and discrimination*

The SCS Thematic Strategic Framework recommends that the causes of violence against children be explored and that links between child protection and socio-economic marginalisation of children be taken into consideration, including in relation to poverty and discrimination.<sup>16</sup> Several SCS Regional Offices mentioned that promoting gender sensitive approaches, equality and the right to non-discrimination are generally considered as cross-cutting and therefore mainstreamed into SCS child protection programmes.<sup>17</sup> In community activities, SCS MENA, for instance, seeks to encourage, through its national and local partners, a balanced involvement of men and women, boys and girls, different ethnic and religious groups, social and economic backgrounds, and national origins.<sup>18</sup>

Since 2006, the ECAf regional programmes provided for activities that are specifically targeted at children who are marginalised and experience discrimination. The Annual Summary Report of 2009 noted however that the concepts of marginalisation and inclusion

---

<sup>12</sup> Rädga Barnen (Save the Children Sweden), *Thematic Strategic Framework 2009-2012, Children's Right to Protection*, International Programme, 19 March 2008, p. 4.

<sup>13</sup> Interview with Jerome Conilleau, Child Protection Regional Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for South and Central Asia, 26 September 2011. Interview with Deidre Kleynhans, Regional Programme Officer, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Southern Africa, 26 September 2011. Interview with Eva Maria Cayanan, Regional Adviser Child Rights Governance and Protection, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Southeast Asia and the Pacific, 29 September 2011. Interview with Dominique Sbardella, Regional Child Protection Program Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for the Middle East and North Africa, 12 September 2011. <sup>13</sup> Interview with Geoffrey Mugisha, Regional Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for East and Central Africa, 4 October 2011.

<sup>14</sup> Interview with Denise Stuckenbruck, Program Manager, Child Protection Initiative, Save the Children, 20 September 2011.

<sup>15</sup> Interview with Deidre Kleynhans, Regional Programme Officer, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Southern Africa, 26 September 2011. Interview with Denise Stuckenbruck, Program Manager, Child Protection Initiative, Save the Children, 20 September 2011. Interview with Lena Karlsson, Director, Child Protection Initiative, Save the Children, 25 August 2011.

<sup>16</sup> Rädga Barnen (Save the Children Sweden), *Thematic Strategic Framework 2009-2012, Children's Right to Protection*, International Programme, 19 March 2008, p. 4.

<sup>17</sup> Interview with Jerome Conilleau, Child Protection Regional Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for South and Central Asia, 26 September 2011. Interview with Dominique Sbardella, Regional Child Protection Program Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for the Middle East and North Africa, 12 September 2011. Rädga Barnen (Save the Children Sweden), *Thematic Programme Plan, Protection – National child protection systems, Eastern and Central Africa, 2009-2012*, 7 December 2009, p. 3.

<sup>18</sup> Interview with Dominique Sbardella, Regional Child Protection Program Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for the Middle East and North Africa, 12 September 2011.

are not always clear and capacity building was required to train SCS partners on these concepts and how to mainstream them into their programme planning in order to enhance the inclusion of all children in their child protection and advocacy activities.<sup>19</sup>

### *Budget allocation, costing and financial monitoring*

The SCS Regional Office in MENA is, as part of its child protection work, developing expertise on the budget analysis of governmental bodies. The objective is to enable the monitoring of governmental bodies also from a financial point of view with regard to budget allocation and spending. This activity has been included into the regional programme plan and will be developed further in 2012.<sup>20</sup>

In the LAM region, the SCS Regional Office has hired an expert of economics to work with a group of leading economists in the region to develop tools for budget monitoring, advocating for more budget allocation, budget transfers in decentralised States, and financial reform. The objective is to understand how much it costs to build or strengthen NCPSs and how the budget can be spent effectively. In El Salvador, for instance, this group of experts supported the Government over a period of 18 months to assess how much the implementation of a new child protection law would cost. Evidence-informed knowledge about the costs related to NCPS is a precondition for successful advocacy, to ensure that the State has sufficient funding to make the NCPS sustainable, and that its implementation is addressing and not reinforcing inequalities, for instance between rural and urban areas.<sup>21</sup> If documented and analysed, these experiences might be of interest to other regions as well. The Committee on the Rights of the Child has already requested the SCS Regional Office in the LAM region to provide inputs to the drafting of a general comment on resources for children.<sup>22</sup>

A comparative advantage of SCS compared to other SC Members was noted in the LAM region: As SCS's principle donor, SIDA has not earmarked its funding to specific projects but to broad themes, such as enhancing the role of civil society and reducing poverty in the LAM region. This allows the SCS Regional Office to develop projects that best fit into the given contexts and needs of their national and regional partners.<sup>23</sup>

### ***The Child Protection Initiative***

The Child Protection Initiative (CPI) has been recognised by many key informants in SCS Regional Offices as an important partner who provides added value to the regional child protection work. SCS's strong support to it is considered essential. The CPI is appreciated by SC staff in Country and Regional Offices for being very strong and experienced on child protection themes, very proactive on fundraising, and for offering important technical support and advice, including in the review of programme plans and with regard to specific initiatives, consultations and other events. The regional consultations of child protection staff have offered opportunities for information sharing and capacity building on the NCPS approach.

---

<sup>19</sup> Interview with Geoffrey Mugisha, Regional Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for East and Central Africa, 4 October 2011. Save the Children Sweden, Eastern and Central African Regional Office (ECAf), *Annual Plan 2010*, Nairobi, undated, p. 6. Save the Children Sweden, Eastern and Central Africa (ECAf), *Summary Annual Report 2009*, Nairobi, undated, p. 16. Save the Children Sweden, *Plan of Action 2008*, Eastern and Central Africa, Revised January 2008, Nairobi, 2008, p. 11. Save the Children Sweden, *Plan of Action 2007*, Eastern and Central African Region, Revised January 2007, Nairobi, 2006, pp. 13-15. Save the Children Sweden, *Plan of Action 2006*, Eastern and Central Africa, Nairobi, 2006, pp. 14-16.

<sup>20</sup> Interview with Dominique Sbardella, Regional Child Protection Program Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for the Middle East and North Africa, 12 September 2011.

<sup>21</sup> Interview with Angels Simon, Regional Programme Manager, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean, 16 September 2011.

<sup>22</sup> Interview with Angels Simon, Regional Programme Manager, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean, 16 September 2011.

<sup>23</sup> Interview with Angels Simon, Regional Programme Manager, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean, 16 September 2011.

The CPI strategies are considered particularly useful for the work of regional and country offices, including due to their level of detail and clear structure.<sup>24</sup>

In the first years after the CPI was established, thematic task groups were set up to focus on the NCPS approach and on the follow-up to the UN Violence Study. These task groups were dissolved in 2010 since they had reached their objectives. The CPI Steering Group advised that the remaining task groups should focus on the CPI thematic priorities and integrate the NCPS approach. The task group for the follow-up to the UN Violence Study had focused on ensuring that the UN Study's recommendations were duly reflected in CPI plans and strategies, so that these ensured a continued follow-up. The NCPS task group was considered to have fulfilled its mandate when the concept paper on NCPS was completed, since the NCPS approach is to be mainstreamed into all thematic child protection work. Whereas the mainstreaming is a necessary approach, it may however also bear a risk that the priority attached to systems building is getting weaker, especially when there is no one body specifically dedicated to this matter.<sup>25</sup> A survey with SC Offices in the SEAP region, for instance, noted that funding is sometimes geared more towards thematic approaches than a systems approach.<sup>26</sup>

Among the remaining CPI task groups, SCS is taking the lead on child protection in emergencies, and will also lead the task group on PHP as of 2012.<sup>27</sup> A question for internal debate is whether there may be opportunities to maximise SCS leadership strategically on other child protection themes to ensure continuity with the priorities that SCS is pursuing in its child protection development work and the related expertise of SCS staff.

SCS has organised its international work through regional offices, whereas other SC Members conduct regional work mainly through regional projects. The thematic focus areas of these regional offices are overlapping to some degree with those of the CPI. In the SEAP region, for instance, a CPI Regional Representative is based in the SCS Regional Office, and the common location is seen as an opportunity that helps facilitating their cooperation. At the same time, there are significant overlaps in the child protection work of both offices, in particular with regard to the thematic areas of strengthening NCPS, addressing corporal punishment and child protection in emergencies. Technical advice and support in accessing funding are also being provided by both offices. Both work with similar networks of contacts and partners.<sup>28</sup>

The conformity – or overlap – of the child protection priorities of SCS Regional Offices and the CPI was noted also in other regions.<sup>29</sup> In addition, technical advisers from other SC Members operate on child protection issues at the regional levels, each with their own networks of partners. As a result, there is a significant risk of double representation of SC

---

<sup>24</sup> Interview with Jerome Conilleau, Child Protection Regional Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for South and Central Asia, 26 September 2011. Interview with Deidre Kleynhans, Regional Programme Officer, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Southern Africa, 26 September 2011. Interview with Dominique Sbardella, Regional Child Protection Program Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for the Middle East and North Africa, 12 September 2011. Interview with Denise Stuckenbruck, Program Manager, Child Protection Initiative, Save the Children, 20 September 2011. Interview with Dominique Pierre Plateau, Regional Representative, Child Protection Initiative in Southeast Asia and the Pacific, Save the Children, 15 September 2011. Interview with Angels Simon, Regional Programme Manager, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean, 16 September 2011. See also: Save the Children Child Protection Initiative, *Child Protection: Making a difference in children's lives*, May 2011, p. 5.

<sup>25</sup> Interview with Denise Stuckenbruck, Program Manager, Child Protection Initiative, Save the Children, 20 September 2011. Interview with Lena Karlsson, Director, Child Protection Initiative, Save the Children, 25 August 2011.

<sup>26</sup> Save the Children Southeast Asia and the Pacific, *Regional Consultation on the Child Protection Initiative, Pre-Consultation Survey, Summary of Findings*, Bangkok, Thailand, 28-29 September 2009, Bangkok, 2009, p. 15.

<sup>27</sup> Interview with Denise Stuckenbruck, Program Manager, Child Protection Initiative, Save the Children, 20 September 2011. Information provided by Lena Karlsson, 3 November 2011.

<sup>28</sup> Interview with Eva Maria Cayanan, Regional Adviser Child Rights Governance and Protection, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Southeast Asia and the Pacific, 29 September 2011.

<sup>29</sup> Interview with Jerome Conilleau, Child Protection Regional Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for South and Central Asia, 26 September 2011. Interview with Geoffrey Mugisha, Regional Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for East and Central Africa, 4 October 2011.

staff in regional networks.<sup>30</sup> When the CPI and SCS Regional Office are based in the same location, as is the case in SEAP, competition over funding can be minimised through their close collaboration. In other regions where this is not the case, this may however lead to a perceived competition over funding since SCS is also the primary donor of the CPI.<sup>31</sup>

It was noted that the involvement of many SC Members in the CPI impacts the working procedures and decision taking processes, which are perceived to be slightly lengthier than the internal processes within SCS, since approval from the CPI Steering Group has to be sought. Different approaches, focus areas and concerns of the various SC Members may create further challenges. Similar observations have been made by the SCS Regional Office in ECAf concerning its collaboration with other SC Members on child protection work during the global merger process. While these challenges are likely to be addressed as part of the overall harmonisation and transition process to form the SCI, their implications for SCS's and other SC Members' child protection work is not entirely clear at the moment and may need to be explored and debated further to establish more clarity.<sup>32</sup>

### ***CPI global advocacy on child protection themes***

The CPI coordinates Save the Children's contributions to global advocacy for the protection of children from violence, including through the following:

- As a member of the NGO Advisory Council for the follow-up to the UN Study on Violence against Children, formed in 2007;
- As a member of the NGO Group for the CRC, Working Group on Children and Violence;
- In dialogue with the UN Treaty Bodies, in particular the Committee on the Rights of the Child and the Human Rights Council, including through participating in sessions, special days of discussion, by providing inputs to draft resolutions and other documents, and through supporting alternative reports to State Parties' periodic reporting, which is also supported by SCS Regional and Country Offices;
- Advocacy for the establishment and appointment of the position of the Special Representative of the Secretary General on Violence against Children (SRSG-VAC), according to the UN Violence Study recommendations. Following the appointment of the SRSG-VAC, the advocacy work was continued in dialogue with the SRSG-VAC.<sup>33</sup>

The NGO Advisory Council sustains and promotes the involvement of NGOs in initiatives to advocate primarily with the SRSG-VAC at the national, regional and international levels, including by making available relevant information from the country and local levels. It also supports the SRSG-VAC in promoting the participation of children and young people in the follow-up activities to the UN Violence Study. In addition, advocacy work is supported at the national level with Governments and authorities, as well as internationally with UN Agencies and other relevant organisations and institutions. Through global NGO networks, the NGO Advisory Council informs about updates and progress made with the implementation of the recommendations of the UN Violence Study.<sup>34</sup> Activities further include the production of advocacy tools to facilitate the implementation and monitoring of the recommendations of

---

<sup>30</sup> Interview with Jerome Conilleau, Child Protection Regional Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for South and Central Asia, 26 September 2011.

<sup>31</sup> Interview with Eva Maria Cayanan, Regional Adviser Child Rights Governance and Protection, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Southeast Asia and the Pacific, 29 September 2011. Interview with Jerome Conilleau, Child Protection Regional Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for South and Central Asia, 26 September 2011.

<sup>32</sup> Interview with Eva Maria Cayanan, Regional Adviser Child Rights Governance and Protection, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Southeast Asia and the Pacific, 29 September 2011. See also: Save the Children Sweden, Eastern and Central African Regional Office (ECAf), *Annual Plan 2010*, Nairobi, undated, p. 4.

<sup>33</sup> See for instance: NGO Group for the CRC, Working Group on Children and Violence, *Talking Points*, Meeting with Marta Santos Pais, SRSG/VAC, 16 June 2009. *NGO Advisory Council*, undated. See: Child Rights Information Network, Children and Violence, International NGO Advisory Council, available at: <<http://www.crin.org/violence/NGOs/index.asp>>, accessed on 18 August 2011.

<sup>34</sup> *NGO Advisory Council*, undated. Child Rights Information Network, Children and Violence, International NGO Advisory Council, available at: <<http://www.crin.org/violence/NGOs/index.asp>>, accessed on 18 August 2011.

the UN Violence Study, in particular with a focus on children in institutions and detention, as well as violent sentencing of children.<sup>35</sup>

The NGO Advisory Council is composed of 18 members, nine of which represent international NGOs, and an additional nine members were selected from the different regions to represent national or regional networks of NGOs.<sup>36</sup> Some of the SCS Regional Offices have been requested to hand in nominations of regional representatives to the NGO Advisory Council and provide financial support to the appointed experts' participation.<sup>37</sup>

In coordination with the launch of a global report on violence against children by the NGO Advisory Council in October 2011, the CPI is organising the Day of Action to End All Forms of Violence Against Children, with events planned globally on 19 October 2011. SCI and Members will contribute to this event with country and programme specific activities. The objective of this global initiative is to provide an update and raise awareness on the current situation of violence against children, including among donors, governments, the media, and the general public. At the centre of the planned activities and events are advocacy initiatives in support of policy reform, budget allocation, cooperation and children's socio-political participation.<sup>38</sup>

The CPI is also a member of the Council of the Day of Prayer and Action for Children, which is focusing on ending violence against children in the three coming years. Members include faith based organisations, Plan International, the SRSG on Violence against Children and Unicef. The 20<sup>th</sup> of November is the main day for action.<sup>39</sup>

Through the CPI, SCS is therefore providing important support for child protection advocacy at many different levels. The representation of CPI in the NGO Advisory Council and its close collaboration with other international bodies and mechanisms enhance the visibility of the CPI and its approaches globally. The unified representation of SC Members in these networks gives more weight to their common voice and messages.

## IV.2 Strategic planning

### ***The SCS Thematic Strategic Framework 2009-2012***

The SCS Thematic Strategic Framework 2009-2012 emphasises the need to develop systemic and holistic approaches to child protection, in partnership with Governments, civil society and communities, and defines two specific areas of priority for Save the Children Sweden's work in this field: a) to ensure that children increasingly enjoy their protection rights and experience less violence in their daily lives; and b) to improve and strengthen child protection structures and measures at all levels of society.<sup>40</sup> The Thematic Strategic Framework 2009-2012 provides for the following parameters and activities that should form the basis of SCS child protection programming work:

- Development of programmatic contents and strategies, including relevant tools, methods and approaches for the strengthening of national child protection systems;

---

<sup>35</sup> NGO Advisory Council, undated. Child Rights Information Network, Children and Violence, International NGO Advisory Council, available at: <<http://www.crin.org/violence/NGOs/index.asp>>, accessed on 18 August 2011.

<sup>36</sup> Child Rights Information Network, Children and Violence, International NGO Advisory Council, available at: <<http://www.crin.org/violence/NGOs/index.asp>>, accessed on 18 August 2011.

<sup>37</sup> Save the Children, *Regional Office of South and Central Asia*, undated. Interview with Eva Maria Cayanan, Regional Adviser Child Rights Governance and Protection, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Southeast Asia and the Pacific, 29 September 2011.

<sup>38</sup> See: Save the Children, Child Protection Initiative, *Day of Action to End All Forms of Violence Against Children, Concept Paper*, undated.

<sup>39</sup> Information provided by Lena Karlsson, 3 November 2011.

<sup>40</sup> Rädda Barnen (Save the Children Sweden), *Thematic Strategic Framework 2009-2012, Children's Right to Protection*, International Programme, 19 March 2008, p. 3.

- Regional and national situation analyses, in particular mapping the forms of violence against children, and relevant actors and structures to address it, including at the local levels of the communities;
- A comprehensive analysis of the relevant actors involved to ensure that SCS's work is complementary to that conducted by others;
- Regional human and financial resources to be used with the maximum efficacy;
- Supporting the active involvement of children in the process of promoting and strengthening national child protection systems; and
- Partnerships with civil society and local communities, while recognising the accountability of governments.<sup>41</sup>

Neither the Thematic Strategic Framework, nor the components of a national child protection system that it commits SCS offices to strengthen, reflect one-to-one the UN Violence Study recommendations. Considered together however, the SCS strategic and conceptual planning have succeeded to capture the spirit of the UN Violence Study by breaking the rather vague and abstract recommendations down into concrete structural targets and strategic organisational guidance.

The Thematic Strategic Framework and SC's conceptual guidance on national child protection systems, and the way that they are interlinked, are however highly complex. Whereas the awareness and understanding of these concepts and strategies is assumed to be high among SCS staff who are involved in their development and application in the Headoffice and at the regional levels, their complexity implies a risk that some of the elements get lost in national and local implementation, as will be discussed in the next chapter with regard to the challenges of reaching conceptual clarity.

### ***CPI Strategies***

By providing leadership for the CPI, SCS has influenced the strategic development of SC's global child protection work, specifically in the CPI thematic priorities on children without appropriate care and child protection in emergencies.

The CPI Priority Area Strategy on Children Without Appropriate Care (2010-2015) is primarily a thematic strategy. An example of how the organisation's approach to a child protection theme changed in light of a more holistic approach is the strategy's approach to child trafficking: It advises that child trafficking be best addressed by targeting a broader group of 'children on the move', which is expected to widen not only the opportunities for prevention and response measures, but also for fundraising.<sup>42</sup>

The Strategy addresses many elements of a systemic approach, and yet they are not easily traceable to the components defined by the NCPS concept. Although it is a challenging task to reflect the NCPS approach in a global thematic strategy, a debate on how this can best be achieved, how to link the thematic focus with the systems approach, and what all this entails for the action at country level, is an issue that may be important to reflect upon more in-depth for future strategic planning. As will be discussed in the following chapter, key informants noted a need for more guidance on how to break down the NCPS approach into concrete direction for action at the national and local levels.

The CPI Priority Area Strategy on Children Without Appropriate Care affirms that progress has been achieved on a number of issues: The scope of SC's programmes concerning children without appropriate care and the number of children reached worldwide; consensus on key concepts such as 'children without appropriate care' and 'children on the move'; and strengthened partnerships with UN Agencies, national, regional and international

<sup>41</sup> Rädde Barnen (Save the Children Sweden), *Thematic Strategic Framework 2009-2012, Children's Right to Protection*, International Programme, 19 March 2008, pp. 3-5.

<sup>42</sup> Save the Children Child Protection Initiative, *Priority Area Strategy 2010-2015: Children without appropriate care*, pp. 23-24.

organisations, community-based organisations, and government authorities. The strategy notes that there are challenges with regard to the limited availability of funding for child protection work and the loss of organisational memory and expertise due to staff movements.<sup>43</sup> These achievements have been made also thanks to the SCS financial and leadership support to the CPI, whereas diversified funding from other SC Members to the CPI would be critical to confront some of the reported challenges.

The CPI Advocacy Strategy is directly linked to the CPI thematic strategies and aims to contribute to the achievement of their objectives. It informs therefore the development of annual plans and strategies of SC Country Offices.<sup>44</sup> The thematic and advocacy strategies thus complement each other: Whereas the thematic strategy focuses more on child protection action, the Advocacy Strategy seeks to promote the NCPS approach in SC's advocacy with governments and other relevant partners to achieve structural policy change. Lessons learned with the implementation of one strategy will therefore be of relevance also for the review and update of the others.

### ***Child Protection Programming in the ECAf Region: Country example Kenya***

The Thematic Programme Plan (TPP) on SCS child protection work in the ECAf region for 2009-2012 focuses on national child protection systems in the development context. In 2008, the Regional Office conducted a regional child rights situation analysis, which found that notwithstanding progress in law reform, child protection measures were often scattered and that implementation was not systematic. Against this background, the Thematic Programme Plan has formulated the objective that “[n]ational child protection structures and mechanisms ... are integrated and strengthened” in the region. This objective is considered to be in line with the first overarching recommendation of the UN Violence Study that calls upon governments to develop a multi-faceted and systematic framework to respond to violence against children, which is integrated into national planning processes.<sup>45</sup>

The TPP defines concrete objectives for the region and the countries where SCS is active, i.e. Ethiopia, Kenya, North Sudan, South Sudan, Rwanda and Tanzania. The country-specific objectives are complementing the regional ones and focus on the following components of an NCPS: the law and policy framework; creating coordinated services; national research that involves children; capacity building of civil society organisations; and awareness raising. Other components are not explicitly addressed, such as a coordinating agency or mechanism, budget allocation, standard setting, monitoring and oversight, and data collection systems. Thematically, the programme on the individual components of NCPSs is targeted specifically at addressing gender based violence, HIV and AIDS, and poverty. The TPP objectives were selected on the basis of previous lessons learned in SCS programming in the region, and the findings from a child rights situation analysis.<sup>46</sup> This reflects on the one side the importance of allowing some degree of flexibility to adjust regional and country programmes to the specific contexts and needs, as well as the difficulties of capturing all the components of an NCPS within one programme plan. Both issues will be discussed further in the next chapter.

The TPP provides the following specific objectives for child protection in Kenya for the period 2009-2012:

- By 2012, there will be a 20% increase in the number of children accessing protection services in SCS operation areas in Kenya;

<sup>43</sup> Save the Children Child Protection Initiative, *Priority Area Strategy 2010-2015: Children without appropriate care*, pp. 6-7.

<sup>44</sup> Interview with Roberta Cecchetti, Advocacy Manager, Child Protection Initiative, Save the Children, 12 September 2011. Save the Children Child Protection Initiative, *Advocacy Strategy, 2010-2015*.

<sup>45</sup> Rädda Barnen (Save the Children Sweden), *Thematic Programme Plan, Protection – National child protection systems, Eastern and Central Africa, 2009-2012*, 7 December 2009, p. 3.

<sup>46</sup> Rädda Barnen (Save the Children Sweden), *Thematic Programme Plan, Protection – National child protection systems, Eastern and Central Africa, 2009-2012*, 7 December 2009, p. 3.

- Legislation and national action plans that incorporate the recommendations of the UN Violence Study are enacted in Kenya by 2012;
- By 2012, children's views influence the operations of the National Council for Children Services and Area Advisory Councils in Kenya;
- By 2012, marginalised children in Kenya access child protection services;
- Child focused civil society organisations advocate for the establishment of a National Child Protection System in Kenya by 2012.<sup>47</sup>

As the regional objectives, also these country-specific objectives reflect the strategic goals of the SCS Thematic Strategic Framework for the same period and other key reference documents. The following observation is offered for consideration in future programme planning: With regard to law reform, the UN Violence Study provides important recommendations and guidance, but does not set legally binding standards. Programming objectives concerning national legislation will therefore be stronger and clearer if they refer to the relevant standards provided by international human rights law, i.e. the CRC and its Optional Protocols, ILO Conventions and other relevant treaties, and reference to the UN Violence Study would evoke the renewed political commitments of the partner governments to implement these standards.

The Government of Kenya has made it a priority to build systemic approaches to child protection, and a 'child protection framework' was developed through a joint effort of state and non-state actors to define the roles and mandates of all actors involved. Against this background, the SCS child protection programme in the country is considered to be in line with the national priorities.<sup>48</sup> In order to ensure that SCS country programme in Kenya is complementary to that of other actors, national and international, a close and institutionalised collaboration of the various actors involved is crucial. In this context, it was strategic that SCS was represented as a permanent member in the technical working committee of the National Council for Children Services (NCCS) in Kenya. After the term has expired, the NCCS encourages SCS to take that position again.<sup>49</sup> The SCS regional and country programme plans could contribute to strengthening the complementarity of SCS activities even further, if they explicitly address strategic partnerships in the country, with state and non-state actors, and national and international partners.

#### *Budget and cost-effectiveness*

SCS has made available a total of SEK 30,384,100 for the implementation of the TPP 2009-2012 for the ECAf region.<sup>50</sup> In addition, the SCS Regional Office has received funding from SIDA and is actively fundraising itself. The regional and Kenya national programmes reported an under-utilisation of funds in 2009 and 2010. Whereas the Kenya Country Office profited from sharing the presence and support services with the SCS Regional Office and thus increased its cost effectiveness, the Regional Office reported challenges in 2009 to address the cost effectiveness of the programme support, "... since the strategy so far has been to build the capacity of the programme staff and at the same time ensure that all requirements from HO, donors and Save the Children are adhered to. This has affected programme implementation and the achievement of results. This is expected to be resolved by reorganising the work and the recruitment of new senior staff."<sup>51</sup>

<sup>47</sup> Rädga Barnen (Save the Children Sweden), *Thematic Programme Plan, Protection – National child protection systems, Eastern and Central Africa, 2009-2012*, 7 December 2009, p. 7-13.

<sup>48</sup> Interview with Jonna Carlsson, Child Protection Officer, UNICEF Kenya, 26 September 2011. Interview with Jacinta Murgor, The National Council for Children's Services (NCCS), Kenya, 3 October 2011. Interview with Joy Okinda, The Kenya Alliance for the Advancement of Children (KAACR), Kenya, 28 September 2011.

<sup>49</sup> Interview with Jacinta Murgor, The National Council for Children's Services (NCCS), Kenya, 3 October 2011.

<sup>50</sup> Rädga Barnen (Save the Children Sweden), *Thematic Programme Plan, Protection – National child protection systems, Eastern and Central Africa, 2009-2012*, 7 December 2009, p. 4.

<sup>51</sup> Save the Children Sweden, Eastern and Central Africa (ECAf), *Summary Annual Report 2009*, Nairobi, undated, p. 2, 21. Save the Children Sweden, Eastern and Central Africa (ECAf), *Annual Report 2010*, Nairobi, undated, p. 2.

### IV.3 Building systemic approaches: The challenges of reaching conceptual clarity

During the process of the UN Violence Study, SCS engaged with other SC Members in a discussion of key concepts and definitions, including 'child protection', 'violence against children' and 'national child protection systems'. As SCS assumed the leadership of the CPI, it sustained this conceptual debate also after the UN Violence Study was launched.

The SCS Thematic Strategic Framework cites the definition of 'child protection' that has found consensus among the SC Members.<sup>52</sup> Notwithstanding this clear definition, key informants noted that reaching conceptual clarity on what 'child protection' all entails is still a challenge. Some degree of uncertainty remains, for instance, as to the relation between child protection and child rights.<sup>53</sup> The CPI Strategies and publications have helped SC Members to agree upon a common understanding and definitions of child protection terms that are central to the CPI's thematic priority areas. This function of the CPI is important and similar efforts may be useful with regard to other concepts and terms as well, in order to enable the CPI to promote conceptual clarity also on themes that are not among its focus areas.<sup>54</sup>

A number of conceptual papers on national child protection systems were published the CPI. They have helped to communicate and clarify the NCPS concept and its key components, which was clearly affirmed by the key informants.<sup>55</sup> Much appreciated in this regard was the publication "David's Story", which has gained a lot of attention within SC, and requests to use it were received also from external partners.<sup>56</sup> The booklet's easily accessible language gives it a nearly child-friendly character and widens the spectrum of potential target audiences. In addition to that, similar publications of a more technical nature and language, targeted at professionals, would also be considered useful.<sup>57</sup>

Notwithstanding these achievements of promoting and clarifying the concept of an NCPS, key informants noted that reaching conceptual clarity within SC and among its partners remains challenging. As a result, country offices work sometimes according to their own perceptions of what constitutes an NCPS.<sup>58</sup>

---

<sup>52</sup> Rädda Barnen (Save the Children Sweden), *Thematic Strategic Framework 2009-2012, Children's Right to Protection*, International Programme, 19 March 2008, p. 2.

<sup>53</sup> Interview with Dominique Sbardella, Regional Child Protection Program Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for the Middle East and North Africa, 12 September 2011. Interview with Denise Stuckenbruck, Program Manager, Child Protection Initiative, Save the Children, 20 September 2011. Interview with Roberta Cecchetti, Advocacy Manager, Child Protection Initiative, Save the Children, 12 September 2011.

<sup>54</sup> Interview with Denise Stuckenbruck, Program Manager, Child Protection Initiative, Save the Children, 20 September 2011.

<sup>55</sup> See: Save the Children, *Why Effective National Child Protection Systems are Needed, Save the Children's key recommendations in response to the UN Secretary-General's Study on Violence against Children*, 2006. Save the Children, *A 'Rough Guide' to Child Protection Systems*, undated. Rädda Barnen (Save the Children Sweden), *Thematic Strategic Framework 2009-2012, Children's Right to Protection*, International Programme, 19 March 2008. Save the Children, Child Protection Initiative, *Keys to Protect David From Violence, The Role of National Child Protection Systems*, 2011. Save the Children, Child Protection Initiative, *Building Rights-based National Child Protection Systems: A concept paper to support Save the Children's work*, 2010, pp. 6-7. See also: Interview with Eva Maria Cayanan, Regional Adviser Child Rights Governance and Protection, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Southeast Asia and the Pacific, 29 September 2011. Interview with Jerome Conilleau, Child Protection Regional Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for South and Central Asia, 26 September 2011. Interview with Dominique Sbardella, Regional Child Protection Program Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for the Middle East and North Africa, 12 September 2011. Interview with Deidre Kleynhans, Regional Programme Officer, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Southern Africa, 26 September 2011. Interview with Denise Stuckenbruck, Program Manager, Child Protection Initiative, Save the Children, 20 September 2011. Interview with Roberta Cecchetti, Advocacy Manager, Child Protection Initiative, Save the Children, 12 September 2011. Interview with Lena Karlsson, Director, Child Protection Initiative, Save the Children, 25 August 2011.

<sup>56</sup> Interview with Roberta Cecchetti, Advocacy Manager, Child Protection Initiative, Save the Children, 12 September 2011.

<sup>57</sup> Interview with Lena Karlsson, Director, Child Protection Initiative, Save the Children, 25 August 2011. See also: Save the Children, Child Protection Initiative, *Keys to Protect David From Violence, The Role of National Child Protection Systems*, 2011.

<sup>58</sup> Interview with Dominique Sbardella, Regional Child Protection Program Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for the Middle East and North Africa, 12 September 2011.

<sup>58</sup> Interview with Eva Maria Cayanan, Regional Adviser Child Rights Governance and Protection, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Southeast Asia and the Pacific, 29 September 2011. Interview with Dominique Sbardella, Regional Child Protection Program Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for the Middle East and North Africa, 12 September 2011. Interview with Roberta Cecchetti, Advocacy Manager, Child Protection Initiative, Save the Children, 12 September 2011. Interview with Lena Karlsson, Director, Child Protection Initiative, Save the Children, 25 August 2011. Interview with Enyo Gbedemah, Regional Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for West Africa, 4 October 2011.

A potential source of confusion might be the fact that the SC strategic and conceptual papers do not provide a unified, clear 'definition' of the NCPS, but rather a description of how the system is functioning and what its components and outputs are. Each new publication added new aspects, guidance and components, which demonstrates that the concept and its understanding are evolving. These different statements may add to the confusion that the concept's complexity is already creating. It will be important therefore to provide clearly identifiable key messages and avoid that components are being overlooked or neglected.

In addition to Save the Children, Unicef and other organisations have also developed concepts and definitions of the NCPS, which differ from each other. This reflects that there is a general consensus over the importance of supporting system-building approaches. The different concepts and definition are, however, likely to cause perplexity and misunderstandings when SCS and other international organisations are approaching Governments or donors to promote the(ir) systems approach. In order to strengthen national ownership of the processes, it is critical that the partner government is taking the lead and that NGOs and UN Agencies collaborate to support the government in this process.<sup>59</sup>

The SCA region, for instance, reports that many organisations in the region have reached consensus on the importance of promoting a systems building approach, while at the same time some differences remain with regard to the understanding of the components of an NCPS and their practical application. The general consensus is considered to some extent an outcome of SCS presenting the NCPS concept at the South Asia Coordination Group on child protection, an inter-agency forum involving 25 organisations that are actively involved in child protection work in the region, which SCS was chairing from 2009 to 2010.<sup>60</sup>

It was noted in the SEAP region, that the conceptualisation of an NCPS is different from country to country, as is the national terminology in use. SCS's programming work on the components of an NCPS depends therefore on the country situation: In some countries, for instance, the civil society is more established or free to act than in others, or child participation is organised and institutionalised to different degrees. Policy advocacy is done differently according to whether the State administration is centralised or decentralised.<sup>61</sup>

Key informants affirmed that the CPI's conceptual work on NCPS is very useful for SCS regional staff. At the same time, they noted that the rather theoretical and abstract nature of the NCPS concept might be difficult to understand for locally based staff, and that more concrete examples are needed to explain the concept to all those who are involved in the implementation on the ground and who are in most direct contact with national and local counterparts.<sup>62</sup> The primary responsibility for delivering child protection services and implementing child protection policies lies often with the authorities at the local level.<sup>63</sup> Strong and reliable structures, capacity and commitment of local government is therefore of critical importance for the NCPS. Some thoughts and guidance on what a 'systems approach' means at the local levels when SC works with communities have been presented

---

<sup>59</sup> Interview with Dominique Pierre Plateau, Regional Representative, Child Protection Initiative in Southeast Asia and the Pacific, Save the Children, 15 September 2011. Interview with Jonna Carlsson, Child Protection Officer, UNICEF Kenya, 26 September 2011.

<sup>60</sup> Interview with Jerome Conilleau, Child Protection Regional Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for South and Central Asia, 26 September 2011.

<sup>61</sup> Interview with Eva Maria Cayanan, Regional Adviser Child Rights Governance and Protection, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Southeast Asia and the Pacific, 29 September 2011.

<sup>62</sup> Interview with Jerome Conilleau, Child Protection Regional Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for South and Central Asia, 26 September 2011. Interview with Dominique Sbardella, Regional Child Protection Program Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for the Middle East and North Africa, 12 September 2011. Interview with Deidre Kleynhans, Regional Programme Officer, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Southern Africa, 26 September 2011. Interview with Denise Stuckenbruck, Program Manager, Child Protection Initiative, Save the Children, 20 September 2011. Interview with Dominique Pierre Plateau, Regional Representative, Child Protection Initiative in Southeast Asia and the Pacific, Save the Children, 15 September 2011.

<sup>63</sup> See for instance: Save the Children, *Stepping Up Child Protection: An assessment of Child Protection Systems from all countries in South Asia, including reflections from Central Asia*, Kathmandu, 2010, p. 15.

in an SC Alliance discussion paper on the role of community based child protection groups.<sup>64</sup> In addition, SC, Unicef and others in the WAF region have conducted an ethnographic study of the linkages between local and national child protection systems. The outcomes of these initiatives may be of interest for dissemination and discussion in other regions as well.<sup>65</sup>

More concrete tools and guidelines on the NCPS could help Regional and Country Offices to translate the concept into strategic programming and concrete action. Guidance is needed, among others, on the specific roles and responsibilities of the various actors involved making an NCPS operational, including at the local and community levels, and with regard to transnational child protection themes such as children moving across borders. Tools might comprise assessment and training packages. Positive examples from SCS programming and practice and how NCPS are being developed or strengthened in other countries would also be appreciated, especially when they come from countries with similar socio-economic or cultural backgrounds. The Policy and Programming Resource Guide for Child Protection Systems Strengthening developed in the WAF region may thus be of interest for wider distribution and debate. Finally, strengthening the consideration for the best interests of the child in systemic approaches and programming as well as procedures for best interests assessments and determinations are also considered areas that require further guidance.<sup>66</sup>

First steps have been taken in the SCA region to develop a document that spells out the role – or potential role – of different actors in a child protection system, such as politicians, teachers, parents, civil society, and children. The document discusses how the coordination of all these actors can be strengthened in order to prevent and respond to violence. It is seen as a tool that helps understanding the processes that follow law reform with a view to enabling the effective implementation of laws that prohibit violence against children.<sup>67</sup>

In the SAf region, a series of national studies to collect baseline data on national child protection systems have helped clarifying the concept and approach and building consensus on its meaning among different national and international partners, including Government departments, human rights institutions, civil society and the academia. The study was initiated before SC issued its conceptual paper on NCPS and does therefore not narrowly follow that concept but is closely aligned. The discussion focused mainly on the role of horizontal and vertical mechanisms and the role of customary laws in the NCPS. The role of social security for the NCPS was also discussed and it was concluded that social security systems are closely linked to NCPS and can offer preventive measures.<sup>68</sup>

In the ECAf region, the SCS Regional Office has noted a visible shift towards a systems-building approach in the child protection work in the region.<sup>69</sup> In Kenya, for instance, a process engaging all relevant national and international actors has helped to develop consensus over a 'child protection framework'. SCS participated in this process as a member of a sub-committee to support the participation of children. The resulting child

---

<sup>64</sup> International Save the Children Alliance, *A Common Responsibility: The role of community-based child protection groups in protecting children from sexual abuse and exploitation*, Discussion Paper, 2008.

<sup>65</sup> See: The Columbia Group for Children in Adversity, *An Ethnographic Study of Community-based Child Protection Mechanisms and Their Linkage with the National Child Protection System of Sierra Leone*, 25 July 2011.

<sup>66</sup> Interview with Jerome Conilleau, Child Protection Regional Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for South and Central Asia, 26 September 2011. Interview with Dominique Sbardella, Regional Child Protection Program Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for the Middle East and North Africa, 12 September 2011. Interview with Dominique Pierre Plateau, Regional Representative, Child Protection Initiative in Southeast Asia and the Pacific, Save the Children, 15 September 2011. Interview with Roberta Cecchetti, Advocacy Manager, Child Protection Initiative, Save the Children, 12 September 2011. Interview with Enyo Gbedemah, Regional Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for West Africa, 4 October 2011. See also: Plan International, Save the Children, Unicef, World Vision International, *Policy and Programming Resource Guide for Child Protection Systems Strengthening in Sub-Saharan Africa*, Resource guide, undated.

<sup>67</sup> Interview with Jerome Conilleau, Child Protection Regional Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for South and Central Asia, 26 September 2011.

<sup>68</sup> Interview with Deidre Kleynhans, Regional Programme Officer, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Southern Africa, 26 September 2011.

<sup>69</sup> Interview with Geoffrey Mugisha, Regional Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for East and Central Africa, 4 October 2011.

protection framework is not entirely in line with the concepts of an NCPS promoted by either SC or Unicef, but is, thanks to the consultative process involving key national actors in Kenya, rooted in national ownership.<sup>70</sup> The SCS Regional Office noted that "... it takes a long time for a new concept to be understood and owned by stakeholders ... any process involving the national country system has to be led by the government for it to take root and for ownership."<sup>71</sup> Notwithstanding this achievement, promoting knowledge and understanding of what constitutes a 'child protection framework' or 'system' remains a challenge also in Kenya, in particular among the local actors.<sup>72</sup>

The SCS Annual Plan for the ECAf region in 2010 illustrates that conceptual clarity is considered a basic precondition for child protection programming: "It is ... assumed that there will be a common conceptualisation of NCPS in the region and globally".<sup>73</sup> This assumption should be revisited in order to understand if or how the challenges of reaching conceptual clarity are affecting SCS's child protection work in this region and elsewhere.

In the LAM region, the situation is perceived to be slightly different from other regions, in that there is a longer tradition already in place to discuss and develop systemic approaches to the implementation of children's rights, at the national and regional levels. A particular important actor in this regard is the Inter-American Institute of Childhood, a body of the Organisation of American States (OAS), which has developed a concept of NCPS that is similar to that promoted by SC. The Institute supports governments in the region to enhance NCPS through technical advice.<sup>74</sup>

#### IV.4 Promoting law and policy reform

SCS Regional Offices provide support to country offices and other partners who are directly involved in the law and policy work at the national and local levels. This work has shown concrete results in many regions. In the SEAP and SCA regions, the SCS Regional Offices have focused their child protection work strongly on law and policy reform to prohibit corporal punishment of children, and collaborate closely with the Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children. Initially, SCS was a pioneer on this thematic area, until more and more organisations have recognised the importance of the issue and started working on it as well in recent years. SCS organised consultations and discussions around corporal punishment, and conducted research to collect data and information to inform advocacy work. In the SEAP region, a comprehensive law review revealed that corporal punishment was not covered comprehensively, although numerous national laws were in place to address individual aspects of violence against children. SCS's engagement on the issue is perceived to have shown success; it contributed to an evolving awareness and progress on law reform in the region.<sup>75</sup>

---

<sup>70</sup> Rädda Barnen (Save the Children Sweden), *Thematic Programme Plan, Protection – National child protection systems, Eastern and Central Africa, 2009-2012*, 7 December 2009, pp. 4-5. See also: *Framework for National Child Protection Systems in Kenya*, May 2011. Interview with Jacinta Murgor, The National Council for Children's Services (NCCS), Kenya, 3 October 2011.

<sup>71</sup> Save the Children Sweden, Eastern and Central Africa (ECAf), *Annual Report 2010*, Nairobi, undated, p. 20.

<sup>72</sup> Interview with Jonna Carlsson, Child Protection Officer, UNICEF Kenya, 26 September 2011. Interview with Mercy Mugane, Children's Legal Action Network (CLAN), Kenya, 29 September 2011. Interview with Wambui Njuguna, The African Network for the Prevention and Protection against Child Abuse and Neglect (ANPPCAN), Kenya, 23 September 2011. Interview with Job Ochieng, Regional Programme Manager, Save the Children Finland, 20 September 2011. Interview with Joy Okinda, The Kenya Alliance for the Advancement of Children (KAACR), Kenya, 28 September 2011.

<sup>73</sup> Save the Children Sweden, Eastern and Central African Regional Office (ECAf), *Annual Plan 2010*, Nairobi, undated, p. 20.

<sup>74</sup> Interview with Angels Simon, Regional Programme Manager, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean, 16 September 2011.

<sup>75</sup> Interview with Eva Maria Cayanan, Regional Adviser Child Rights Governance and Protection, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Southeast Asia and the Pacific, 29 September 2011. Interview with Jerome Conilleau, Child Protection Regional Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for South and Central Asia, 26 September 2011.

The WAf region is organising a regional consultation on legal reform, to support the law reform process for the prohibition of all forms of violence against children.<sup>76</sup>

The SAf region has built expertise, including with the support of the CPI, to engage through its partners in strategic litigation to advance the reform of child rights legislation, especially in South Africa. Bringing to court the case of an individual child can thus have an impact for entire groups of children affected by similar concerns and often accelerates the process of law reform in line with the jurisdiction of the higher or constitutional courts. In South Africa, for instance, a case concerning the exclusion of a child from foster care payments was won through SCS supported litigation and, in consequence, approximately 150,000 children who had been affected by the same situation benefited from the constitutional court's verdict as well. Another case concerned the criminal law regulation that under-age perpetrators could not be exempted from the minimum sentences, which was declared unconstitutional. SCS provides financial support to strategic litigation for children's rights in South Africa, and is organising a litigation conference to be held in the second half of 2011.<sup>77</sup>

A particularity in the African region, customary laws affect children in multiple ways and need to be taken into account for national law and policy review and systems building. The SAf Regional Office has conducted a study on this issue in South Africa and Zambia that aimed to analyse customary laws and practices in light of the CRC, the African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child, and national laws.<sup>78</sup>

In Kenya, the SCS Regional Office for ECAf supported a comprehensive review of the national laws pertaining to all contexts where children are at risk of violence: in the home, schools, institutional and non-institutional care settings, the penal system and courts. The findings from this review informed the drafting of legal amendments to prohibit corporal punishment in all settings and the review of the Constitution of Kenya. SCS supported also civil society organisations to lobby with the Committee of Experts that was drafting the new Constitution, to include child rights provisions. With the adoption of the revised Constitution in August 2010, a general prohibition of all forms of corporal punishment and all other cruel or degrading forms of punishment entered into force. Kenya was thus the first Sub-Saharan country to ban all forms of corporal punishment. In order to ensure that all national laws are in line with the new Constitution, the SCS Regional Office is supporting the Children's Legal Action Network (CLAN) to conduct a review of the national laws pertaining to children.<sup>79</sup> In addition, a project on the diversion of children from police units that SCS implemented successfully 2006, informed the drafting of an amendment to the Children's Act, which is expected to be passed into law in 2011.<sup>80</sup>

SCS's experience in Asia has shown that legal reform is an important element and the 'backbone' of addressing violence against children, while at the same time the understanding grew that it has to be backed up by all the other elements of an NCPS in order to enable the full implementation of the law.<sup>81</sup> The focus on policy reform is however

---

<sup>76</sup> Interview with Enyo Gbedemah, Regional Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for West Africa, 4 October 2011.

<sup>77</sup> Interview with Deidre Kleynhans, Regional Programme Officer, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Southern Africa, 26 September 2011.

<sup>78</sup> Interview with Deidre Kleynhans, Regional Programme Officer, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Southern Africa, 26 September 2011.

<sup>79</sup> *Contribution Towards the Alliance Annual Report 2010*, 2010. Interview with Geoffrey Mugisha, Regional Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for East and Central Africa, 4 October 2011.

<sup>80</sup> Interview with Jacinta Murgor, The National Council for Children's Services (NCCS), Kenya, 3 October 2011. Save the Children Sweden, Annual Report 2006, Eastern and Central Africa, Nairobi, 2007, pp. 6-7. Interview with Mercy Mugane, Children's Legal Action Network (CLAN), Kenya, 29 September 2011.

<sup>81</sup> Interview with Eva Maria Cayanan, Regional Adviser Child Rights Governance and Protection, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Southeast Asia and the Pacific, 29 September 2011. Interview with Jerome Conilleau, Child Protection Regional Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for South and Central Asia, 26 September 2011. Interview with Roberta Cecchetti, Advocacy Manager, Child Protection Initiative, Save the Children, 12 September 2011.

often addressed more strongly by SC's child rights governance sections than the child protection sections, as was noted in the SEAP region.<sup>82</sup>

#### IV.5 Juvenile justice and child-friendly procedures

In ECAf, SCS is particularly active on juvenile justice and child-friendly procedures, an area that other SCS Regional Offices are not as strongly involved in. The following two projects illustrate that significant achievements have been made in the region to safeguard children's right in juvenile justice matters and to support child-friendly procedures. Observations from key informants in Kenya offer recommendations on how local ownership and cost-effectiveness of these programmes might be strengthened further in future.<sup>83</sup>

The ECAf Regional Office has supported the reform of the juvenile justice system and the development of child-friendly procedures in Ethiopia since 1999. The reform led to the establishment of Child Friendly Benches (CFBs) within the Federal First Instance Courts since 2004, first in Addis Ababa and then also in four larger regional states. The CFBs offer possibilities for child victims of abuse and exploitation to make their statements in a separate room, which is then transmitted into the court room through a closed circuit video transmission. The risk of secondary victimisation of child victims due to their appearance and cross-examinations in the courtroom is thus reduced.<sup>84</sup>

In Kenya, SCS supported the setting up of Child Protection Units (CPUs) within municipal police departments that are specifically mandated and trained to handle law enforcement and criminal justice processes involving children and ensure that child-friendly procedures are applied. The CPUs' mandate is broad in that it addresses also the prevention of child abuse and juvenile delinquency, the treatment and support for child victims in need of care and protection, including referral to medical and psychological care and legal support, and the management of criminal cases involving children. In addition to the CPUs, Centres for Trafficked Children have been set up that address the specific needs of trafficked and migrant children, in particular with regard to transnational issues and family reunification.<sup>85</sup>

SCS partners in Kenya recognised the importance of this project and the achievements made. They noted however that only some CPUs were functioning well, whereas others were left incomplete or were closed down after a while. Police officers who had been trained to operate the CPUs did not always remain at the Unit long enough to make it operational, nor were provisions made that outgoing police officers passed the training on to others. The project that established the CPUs is therefore not yet considered fully sustainable. In addition, the training curriculum for CPU officers was newly developed, whereas there would have been an opportunity to build upon the content on child rights and protection in the existing curriculum, which required updating.<sup>86</sup> These assessments of key informants suggest that efforts to ensure local ownership, sustainability, and cost-effectiveness of SCS programming can still be strengthened in future, including through careful planning in consultation with national partners.

---

<sup>82</sup> Interview with Eva Maria Cayan, Regional Adviser Child Rights Governance and Protection, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Southeast Asia and the Pacific, 29 September 2011.

<sup>83</sup> Interview with Geoffrey Mugisha, Regional Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for East and Central Africa, 4 October 2011. Interview with Job Ochieng, Regional Programme Manager, Save the Children Finland, 20 September 2011. See also: Save the Children Sweden, *Regional Juvenile Justice Network, 4th Annual Meeting, Record of Proceedings, Kampala, 29-30 November 2006, undated*. *The 5th Annual East and Central Africa (ECAf) Regional Juvenile Justice Network Meeting, Report of the Proceedings, Mombasa, Kenya, 24-25 October 2007, Report prepared by Ezan Mwiluki, ANPPCAN Kenya, Revised by Tina Ojuka of Save the Children Sweden, undated*.

<sup>84</sup> Interview with Geoffrey Mugisha, Regional Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for East and Central Africa, 4 October 2011.

<sup>85</sup> Interview with Geoffrey Mugisha, Regional Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for East and Central Africa, 4 October 2011.

<sup>86</sup> Interview with Mercy Mugane, Children's Legal Action Network (CLAN), Kenya, 29 September 2011. Interview with Wambui Njuguna, The African Network for the Prevention and Protection against Child Abuse and Neglect (ANPPCAN), Kenya, 23 September 2011.

## IV.6 Promoting the participation of children

Promoting children's participation in processes and decisions that affect them is one of the thematic focus areas that SC, including SCS, is known to have specialised on, and that SCS Regional Offices are actively putting into practice. The SEAP region is considered to have developed and piloted standards for child participation initiatives during the process of the UN Violence Study, and SC collaborated in this process with other international agencies.<sup>87</sup>

In the Philippines, SCS contributed to the setting-up of a national committee for the socio-political participation of children and young people, which is an institutionalised mechanism mandated to facilitate the participation of children and young people throughout the country. The committee has developed guidelines, methods and information material for the hearing of children in government meetings and child protection focal points are in charge of ensuring the safety and well-being of the participating children.<sup>88</sup>

In the SCA region, recommendations on child-friendly services and referral mechanisms are currently being developed. As part of a regional child protection consultation held in September 2011, child representatives from the region were directly consulted on their views of what constitutes child-friendly services. On that basis, a definition of child-friendly service provision shall be elaborated and presented to the governments in the region.<sup>89</sup>

In the MENA region, the SCS Regional Office has developed two tools to facilitate children's participation in the development and implementation of SCS programmes: a) A child-led data collection toolkit helps involving children as young researchers. Over a two-year process, the tool was developed, field tested and reviewed by partners. The finalised toolkit will be used to enhance children's participation in SCS programming, including with regard to situation analyses and evaluations. b) A tool helping children to animate their drawings and produce short movies. The children choose a story, draw pictures to illustrate it, and put them together to make an animated cartoon. SCS uses these short movies a lot for its communication and advocacy work. In addition, children will also be involved in developing communication tools on sexual and reproductive health and rights.<sup>90</sup>

Child-led organisations are playing a strong role in the LAM region. The SCS Regional Office is supporting this at national and regional levels. National coalitions for children have established working relations with child-led organisations in El Salvador, Paraguay, Peru, and Venezuela. Child-led organisations are involved in the monitoring of child rights and contribute to awareness raising on child rights, with authorities, public bodies and children themselves. The SCS Regional Office has also raised awareness about the Committee on the Rights of the Child's general comment on child participation. The Inter-American Institute for Childhood, a sub-institution of the OAS and a partner of SCS in the region, had declared child participation its priority theme for 2009 and organised a high-level regional conference on this issue. The conference aimed to discuss children's participation in different settings, including in the NCPS and national ombuds-offices. As an outcome of the conference, the participating States committed to establish an advisory council of children to be consulted on national policies. Such councils have already been established by law in Ecuador, Peru and Uruguay, and the process is ongoing in Paraguay. In Ecuador and Peru, these councils work

---

<sup>87</sup> Interview with Eva Maria Cayanan, Regional Adviser Child Rights Governance and Protection, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Southeast Asia and the Pacific, 29 September 2011.

<sup>88</sup> Interview with Eva Maria Cayanan, Regional Adviser Child Rights Governance and Protection, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Southeast Asia and the Pacific, 29 September 2011.

<sup>89</sup> Interview with Jerome Conilleau, Child Protection Regional Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for South and Central Asia, 26 September 2011.

<sup>90</sup> Interview with Dominique Sbardella, Regional Child Protection Program Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for the Middle East and North Africa, 12 September 2011.

at the national and local levels. SCS Regional and Country Offices are supporting these processes by providing technical advice.<sup>91</sup>

In Kenya, the SCS Regional Office and SC Finland supported the development of a child-friendly toolkit to assess children's views of the NCPS. This toolkit was developed and applied alongside the Unicef toolkit for the assessment of the NCPS.<sup>92</sup>

Overall, Save the Children, including SCS, is known as an important actor when it comes to organising consultations with children and making children's voices heard in policy and programme planning and review processes. In Kenya, SCS partners recognised the role of SCS in this regard for its outstandingly professional approach to child participation.<sup>93</sup>

## IV.7 Research, documentation and communication

### *Research and analysis*

The Thematic Strategic Framework 2009-2012 emphasises the importance of conducting regional and national situation analyses in order to build an evidence base to inform SCS programming. It recommends that such studies assess the forms of violence against children and their scope, map and analyse the key actors and structures for child protection, including national and community based child protection systems, and identify how SCS programmes can best contribute to strengthening the prevention and response to violence against children.<sup>94</sup>

The SCS Regional Offices have mostly complied with this strategic guidance and conducted mapping and assessment studies of national child protection systems in several regions, often in cooperation with partners:

- In the LAM region, the implementation of the UNVAC recommendations was mapped in 10 countries in preparation for the 2011 South American Meeting for the follow-up to the UN Violence Study. The study was conducted by the University of Saõ Paulo in collaboration with the Global Movement for Children, of which SC is a member, and the Office of the SRSG-VAC.<sup>95</sup>
- The SCS Regional Office in SCA published a situation analysis and assessment of child protection systems in 2010, which covers all countries in the region.<sup>96</sup>
- In the SEAP region, a survey on SC's child protection work was conducted in preparation for a regional consultation for the CPI. SC Offices in 17 countries participated and provided up-to-date information on their achievements, challenges and needs with regard to child protection work in the two priority areas of the CPI.<sup>97</sup>
- In the SAf region, national baseline studies were conducted for South Africa, Swaziland and Zambia in 2010. The purpose of these studies was to generate data and knowledge

---

<sup>91</sup> Interview with Angels Simon, Regional Programme Manager, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean, 16 September 2011.

<sup>92</sup> *Framework for National Child Protection Systems in Kenya*, May 2011, p. 4.

<sup>93</sup> See also Chapter IV.1. on Save the Children Sweden's specialisation in the SC Alliance child protection work. Interview with Jonna Carlsson, Child Protection Officer, UNICEF Kenya, 26 September 2011. Interview with Wambui Njuguna, The African Network for the Prevention and Protection against Child Abuse and Neglect (ANPPCAN), Kenya, 23 September 2011.

<sup>94</sup> Radda Barnen (Save the Children Sweden), *Thematic Strategic Framework 2009-2012, Children's Right to Protection*, International Programme, 19 March 2008, pp. 3, 4.

<sup>95</sup> South American Meeting for Follow-up on the United Nations Report on Violence Against Children and Adolescents, *Executive Summary, Mapping the Implementation of the Recommendations of the Global Study on Violence Against Children*, Asunci3n, 28-29 April 2011. Interview with Angels Simon, Regional Programme Manager, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean, 16 September 2011.

<sup>96</sup> Save the Children, *Stepping Up Child Protection: An assessment of Child Protection Systems from all countries in South Asia, including reflections from Central Asia*, Kathmandu, 2010.

<sup>97</sup> Save the Children Southeast Asia and the Pacific, *Regional Consultation on the Child Protection Initiative, Pre-Consultation Survey, Summary of Findings*, Bangkok, Thailand, 28-29 September 2009, Bangkok, 2009.

- to inform SCS's future work on NCPS with a view to strategically support their further development in collaboration with governments, civil society and other partners.<sup>98</sup>
- The ECAf region conducted assessments in Ethiopia, Kenya, North Sudan and Rwanda that aimed to identify strengths and gaps of child protection structures and measures, especially at the community level. These assessments were informed by children, and their findings and recommendations informed the development of SCS advocacy measures.<sup>99</sup> The ECAf Regional Office participated also in the updating, printing and dissemination of the All Africa Report on Corporal Punishment 2010 and supported the update financially. The report informs advocacy by the members of the regional network on physical and humiliating punishment.<sup>100</sup>
  - The WAf Regional Office conducted mapping and assessment studies of NCPS in Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana, Niger, Senegal and Sierra Leone. The studies looked at the formal and informal systems and were implemented in partnership with SC Finland, Plan International and Unicef WCARO. The findings from these studies will be shared at national and regional consultations for policy makers and practitioners, and will inform the strategic planning for the strengthening of NCPS in these countries. In the context of this study, assessment tools and resources guides for policy and programming on NCPS were developed to support the work of country offices in this area.<sup>101</sup> In addition, SC partnered with Unicef and others to conduct an ethnographic study on community-based child protection mechanisms and their linkage to the NCPS in Sierra Leone. The study serves as a pilot study to be replicated also in Kenya.<sup>102</sup>
  - In the MENA region, the same questions that guided this evaluation study were used to conduct a survey on the status of national child protection systems in Lebanon, Palestine and Yemen. In addition, the SCS Regional Office is providing technical support to SC US to conduct a study on violence against children in Iraq. The study was commissioned by Unicef since Iraq had not been included in the UN Violence Study. It will inform the development of a national child protection policy.<sup>103</sup>

Whereas these studies are critical to analyse the NCPS components and to identify gaps, it was noted that there are significant limitations to the use of research to monitor and evaluate SCS child protection work and to measure its impact. The main challenge is that the achievements are not necessarily quantifiable in numbers and statistics. When SCS advocacy has supported law and policy reform processes, for instance, it is rarely possible to quantify how many children benefit from it, directly or indirectly.<sup>104</sup> In addition, there is no

---

<sup>98</sup> Save the Children, *2010 Baseline study on National Child Protection Systems in South Africa, Swaziland and Zambia*, 2010, p. ii. Save the Children, *Protecting Children in South Africa from Violence, Abuse, Neglect and Exploitation, Baseline 2010: National Child Protection System in South Africa*, 2010. Save the Children, *Protecting Children in Swaziland from Violence, Abuse, Neglect and Exploitation, Baseline 2010: National Child Protection System in Swaziland*, 2010. Save the Children, *Protecting Children in Zambia from Violence, Abuse, Neglect and Exploitation, Baseline 2010: National Child Protection System in Zambia*, 2010.

<sup>99</sup> *Contribution Towards the Alliance Annual Report 2010*, 2010. Save the Children Sweden, Eastern and Central Africa (ECAf), *Annual Report 2010*, Nairobi, undated, p. 2. Save the Children Sweden, *Final Regional Baseline Synthesis Report for Save the Children Sweden's Eastern and Central Africa Regional Office*, Cathy Chames, Nana Davies, Dena Lomofsky and Tracey Phillips, Southern Hemisphere, April 2011.

<sup>100</sup> Save the Children Sweden, Eastern and Central Africa (ECAf), *Annual Report 2010*, Nairobi, undated, p. 2.

<sup>101</sup> *WAf Update Work to Follow-up the UN Study on Violence against Children*, undated. *Contribution Towards the Alliance Annual Report 2010*, 2010. Interview with Enyo Gbedemah, Regional Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for West Africa, 4 October 2011. See also: Plan International, Save the Children, Unicef, *Mapping and Assessing Child Protection Systems in West and Central Africa, A five-country analysis paper*, Child Frontiers, June 2011. Plan International, Save the Children, Unicef, World Vision International, *Policy and Programming Resource Guide for Child Protection Systems Strengthening in Sub-Saharan Africa, Resource guide*, undated.

<sup>102</sup> The Columbia Group for Children in Adversity, *An Ethnographic Study of Community-based Child Protection Mechanisms and Their Linkage with the National Child Protection System of Sierra Leone*, 25 July 2011.

<sup>103</sup> Interview with Dominique Sbardella, Regional Child Protection Program Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for the Middle East and North Africa, 12 September 2011.

<sup>104</sup> Interview with Jerome Conilleau, Child Protection Regional Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for South and Central Asia, 26 September 2011.

system to document and monitor the progress made on the individual components of an NCPS in the countries where SC Members are working.<sup>105</sup>

### **Documentation and communication**

Some of the SCS Regional Advisors and CPI staff were directly involved in the process of the UN Violence Study, which enhances continuity and a thorough understanding of the process, as well as the connection to relevant networks at the national, regional and global levels. At the same time, however, key informants expressed concern over the high degree of staff movements and the resulting loss of organisational memory and contacts with networks, and discontinuity in relationships with national and local partners.<sup>106</sup>

In the SCA region, it was noted that the documentation and communication of the SCS child protection work can be strengthened within regions and beyond, in particular with regard to its approach, outcomes and impacts. The capacity to document and communicate the SCS child protection work is considered essential to enhance SCS credibility, visibility and to strengthen relations with partners.<sup>107</sup> The importance of conducting evaluations and documentations of SCS child protection work, communicating the results, and sharing SCS internal information and support, was noted also in the MENA and SAf regions. Regional Advisers are sometimes feeling isolated from other regions and would appreciate more feedback on the information that they supply to the SCS Headoffice and how it is being used, as well as receiving information on other SCS Regional Offices. The position of Mali Nilsson is perceived to provide important support and added value in that regard and it is considered critical that this support will be continued.<sup>108</sup>

## **IV.8 Fostering strategic partnerships**

The Thematic Strategic Framework for 2009-2012 provides the following strategic guidance on SCS partnerships:

“SCS shall develop and fine-tune its collaboration with civil society organisations in the work on strengthening national systems for safeguarding children’s protection rights. ... SCS recognises the importance of working in partnerships with the local communities and will continue to work with, and support capacity building of, local partners. The accountability of governments and other duty bearers at all levels of society must always be promoted.”<sup>109</sup>

The effective collaboration and coordination of different organisations and State partners is critical in order to maximise the impact of SCS child protection programmes. SCS is collaborating with state and non-state actors at the local and national levels and in regional and international networks. Examples of these partnerships are presented in this chapter.

---

<sup>105</sup> Interview with Dominique Pierre Plateau, Regional Representative, Child Protection Initiative in Southeast Asia and the Pacific, Save the Children, 15 September 2011.

<sup>106</sup> Interview with Eva Maria Cayanan, Regional Adviser Child Rights Governance and Protection, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Southeast Asia and the Pacific, 29 September 2011. Interview with Roberta Cecchetti, Advocacy Manager, Child Protection Initiative, Save the Children, 12 September 2011. Interview with Jacinta Murgor, The National Council for Children’s Services (NCCS), Kenya, 3 October 2011. Interview with Wambui Njuguna, The African Network for the Prevention and Protection against Child Abuse and Neglect (ANPPCAN), Kenya, 23 September 2011.

<sup>107</sup> Interview with Jerome Conilleau, Child Protection Regional Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for South and Central Asia, 26 September 2011.

<sup>108</sup> Interview with Dominique Sbardella, Regional Child Protection Program Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for the Middle East and North Africa, 12 September 2011. Interview with Deidre Kleynhans, Regional Programme Officer, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Southern Africa, 26 September 2011.

<sup>109</sup> Rädta Barnen (Save the Children Sweden), *Thematic Strategic Framework 2009-2012, Children’s Right to Protection*, International Programme, 19 March 2008, p. 4.

## **Partnership with governments and state actors**

SCS is engaging with governments and other state actors in many different contexts. A key area of SCS child protection work is the advocacy targeted at state actors, at the national and international levels. At the global level, SCS is providing leadership on child protection advocacy through the CPI and its advocacy with global partners (see Chapter IV.1). At the national level, SCS is building the capacity of national partners to advocate with policy makers. SCS activities in the area of strengthening NCPS, including the promotion of law and policy reform, child-friendly procedures, and children's involvement in governmental bodies and policy making processes, as described in this and the previous chapters all demonstrate important achievements of SCS engagement with state partners.

Due to the multiple actors involved in child protection work, there is a risk that the actions implemented by the many different organisations and services are fragmented and ad hoc rather than fitting into an overarching child protection system.<sup>110</sup> It is therefore critical that the accountability and leadership of governments is promoted, as noted by the Thematic Strategic Framework. In South Asia, Save the Children Sweden noted the following:

“Governments are critical of donors, INGOs and UN agencies for dictating national policy. Donors, in turn, often criticise governments for the misuse of funding and a lack of clear strategies, policies, programmes and results for children. Because of this, donors sometimes prefer to transfer funds for social programming through NGOs rather than coordinate through government mechanisms. The result is that child protection programmes in South Asian countries are fragmented, with little overall coordination between different agencies and the government.”<sup>111</sup>

Some of these observations and concerns were affirmed also by SCS partners in Kenya. When it comes to promoting systems building approaches that concern the development and reform of state structures, it is particularly important to ensure that all activities are rooted in national ownership and that the national government is taking the lead. In Kenya, it was observed that SCS's contribution to building the NCPS is likely to become more effective if SCS strengthen its direct collaboration with the Government in this regard and ensure that its partnerships with NGOs and CSOs are integrated into government-led approaches.<sup>112</sup> One proposal was for SCS to be more transparent about its budget and programme plans and to share them with the Government so that the workplans of the relevant ministries and organisations can be coordinated more effectively. If the Government is informed about the duration and budget of SCS activities, for instance, there are chances that the Government can plan in advance to continue supporting them when the SCS support is fading out.<sup>113</sup>

### **Local partnership: Strengthening civil society and community-based approaches**

The importance of fostering partnerships at the local level has been clearly recognised in most of the regions where SCS is active. Working in partnership with local actors and through community-based approaches is considered a key strategy to promote local ownership.<sup>114</sup> The SCS Regional Offices in ECAf, for instance, considers to have contributed significantly to reinforcing community-based approaches in the region.<sup>115</sup>

---

<sup>110</sup> Save the Children, *Stepping Up Child Protection: An assessment of Child Protection Systems from all countries in South Asia, including reflections from Central Asia*, Kathmandu, 2010, p. 25.

<sup>111</sup> Save the Children, *Stepping Up Child Protection: An assessment of Child Protection Systems from all countries in South Asia, including reflections from Central Asia*, Kathmandu, 2010, p. 14.

<sup>112</sup> Interview with Jonna Carlsson, Child Protection Officer, UNICEF Kenya, 26 September 2011. Interview with Mercy Mugane, Children's Legal Action Network (CLAN), Kenya, 29 September 2011.

<sup>113</sup> Interview with Jacinta Murgor, The National Council for Children's Services (NCCS), Kenya, 3 October 2011.

<sup>114</sup> Interview with Geoffrey Mugisha, Regional Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for East and Central Africa, 4 October 2011.

<sup>115</sup> Radda Barnen (Save the Children Sweden), *Thematic Programme Plan, Protection – National child protection systems, Eastern and Central Africa, 2009-2012*, 7 December 2009, p. 4.

An assessment of NCPS conducted by SCS in South Asia affirmed that community-based child protection services and the coordination of the different actors involved are key to preventing and responding to violence against children. The study concluded that “[s]ome of the most successful programmes in South Asia for ending violence have been those coordinated and run at the local level. ... When local governance and local groups and initiatives which engage with communities and families are promoted and supported, States can prevent violence, protect children from violence and ensure sustainability.”<sup>116</sup>

The SCS Regional Office in MENA has developed a strategic collaboration with Unicef in that Unicef focuses on supporting the central governments to build structures and mechanisms for child rights and protection, whereas SCS concentrates more on creating community based child protection mechanisms. This collaboration was perceived to be particularly strong and coordinated in Palestine, in regard to the development of standard protocols for the documentation and referral of child abuse cases: While Unicef negotiated these standard protocols with the Government, SCS supported their use at the community level. Finally, the protocols were presented to the Ministry of Social Affairs for official endorsement. Although developed for a national context, these standard protocols and the process of how they were developed and introduced in a collaborative effort by Unicef and SCS may form the basis for similar initiatives in other countries as well.<sup>117</sup>

National referral mechanisms for child victims of sexual violence are considered a particularly weak component of NCPS in the MENA region, due to the strong taboos attached to the issue. Safe houses for child victims of sexual violence are practically absent in the region. There are high risks of retaliations against children who denounce cases, as well as the service providers and police officers who would support them in reporting cases. The SCS Regional Office is currently conducting an assessment to understand better how the security of those organisations who decide to report cases of sexual abuse of children can be strengthened. The results are expected in October 2011 and will inform the further engagement of SCS in this area. Against this background, the community-based approach to child protection, including the development of the standard protocols described above, is even more important. It enables the provision of psycho-social and health services, education and, in some cases, legal advice and representation for children who have been exposed to violence in the home and in schools, including neglect and exploitation, but excluding sexual violence. In light of the existing taboos on sexual violence, the Regional Offices decided to focus more strongly on prevention measures by supporting the education on sexual and reproductive health and rights. SCS partners with schools and health clinics to provide education and information material for children, parents, community members, and service providers. The close collaboration with schools is also aimed strategically at getting the Ministry of Education on board to introduce modules on sexual and reproductive health and rights into the standard school curricula.<sup>118</sup>

These examples from the MENA region demonstrate how NCPS can be strengthened from a ‘bottom-up’ approach, by engaging particularly with community-based partners, while at the same time seeking to link these activities with the ‘top-down’ approaches to systems building supported by the Government and Unicef.

In the SAf region, community-based child protection work is a core element of the SCS programme, especially in South Africa. It aims to involve the communities in strengthening the NCPS and supports service delivery at the local level and the involvement of children. Traditional leaders act as gatekeepers of the communities and are key partners for SCS

---

<sup>116</sup> Save the Children, *Stepping Up Child Protection: An assessment of Child Protection Systems from all countries in South Asia, including reflections from Central Asia*, Kathmandu, 2010, p. 8.

<sup>117</sup> Interview with Dominique Sbardella, Regional Child Protection Program Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for the Middle East and North Africa, 12 September 2011.

<sup>118</sup> Interview with Dominique Sbardella, Regional Child Protection Program Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for the Middle East and North Africa, 12 September 2011.

community-based child protection work. The SCS Regional Office has funded a study on how to approach these leaders, how to advocate with them and get their commitment to child protection. One of these programmes implemented by an SCS partner organisation in South Africa has been endorsed by the Government as a good practice model.<sup>119</sup>

The lessons learned from the SAf region might be of relevance also for strengthening local ownership in other regions. One of SCS's partners in Kenya, for instance, noted that identifying the entry points to communities to ensure that they own the process remains a challenge and that this aspect of SCS child protection work can still be strengthened.<sup>120</sup> Another informant noted that the sustainability and local commitment to continue upholding child protection initiatives when SCS support is fading out is not always guaranteed.<sup>121</sup>

In the LAM region, SCS is pursuing slightly different approaches, since most countries work through more centralised governance structures and community-based approaches to service provision do not play the same role in SCS child protection programming as they do in Africa and Asia.<sup>122</sup>

### ***The added value of regional and inter-agency cooperation***

The added value of inter-agency cooperation has been clearly recognised and emphasised in many regions.<sup>123</sup> Save the Children has positioned itself as a key player in regional cooperation mechanisms concerned with child protection issues. Many of them were initiated or gained new momentum during the process of the UN Violence Study. Where these mechanisms were sustained also after the UN Study's launch, they provided important platforms for the national and regional follow-up and for the collaboration with international mechanisms such as the Committee on the Rights of the Child and the SRSG-VAC.

In South Asia, for instance, SCS has developed a close collaboration with the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC), and is using the relevant SAARC Conventions for child protection advocacy. The South Asian Initiative to End Violence against Children (SAIEVAC) was created as a result of the regional consultations for the UN Violence Study and has evolved significantly since then. It is comprised of representatives of the South Asian Governments and is mandated to follow-up to the Study's recommendations and monitor the compliance of the eight participating countries. SAIEVAC receives technical and financial support from the South Asia Coordinating Group on Violence Against Women and Children (SACG), an inter-agency group in which various UN Agencies and INGOs participate. Under the SCS chairmanship, the SACG provided technical support and assistance to SAIEVAC in organising the high-level 3<sup>rd</sup> SAIEVAC Ministerial Meeting in June 2011. At this meeting, the institutional structure of SAIEVAC and a five-year strategic workplan on child protection were endorsed by the ministerial representatives. The meeting was informed by the voices of children who had come together for a regional consultation prior to the ministerial meeting. SCS had been actively involved in planning and organising the consultation with the children. In follow-up to this consultation, SCS supports the SAIEVAC Secretariat in applying for the official recognition of SAIEVAC as an Apex Body of

---

<sup>119</sup> Interview with Deidre Kleynhans, Regional Programme Officer, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Southern Africa, 26 September 2011.

<sup>120</sup> Interview with Jacinta Murgor, The National Council for Children's Services (NCCS), Kenya, 3 October 2011.

<sup>121</sup> Interview with Mercy Mugane, Children's Legal Action Network (CLAN), Kenya, 29 September 2011.

<sup>122</sup> Interview with Angels Simon, Regional Programme Manager, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean, 16 September 2011.

<sup>123</sup> Interview with Jerome Conilleau, Child Protection Regional Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for South and Central Asia, 26 September 2011. Interview with Dominique Sbardella, Regional Child Protection Program Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for the Middle East and North Africa, 12 September 2011. Interview with Eva Maria Cayanan, Regional Adviser Child Rights Governance and Protection, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Southeast Asia and the Pacific, 29 September 2011. Interview with Angels Simon, Regional Programme Manager, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean, 16 September 2011. Rädna Barnen (Save the Children Sweden), *Thematic Programme Plan, Protection – National child protection systems, Eastern and Central Africa, 2009-2012*, 7 December 2009, p. 5.

SAARC. If SAIEVAC is granted this status, it would become the first body in SAARC to address specifically the protection of children from violence.<sup>124</sup>

Due to the high level ministerial representation in the SAIEVAC forum, its strategic planning on child protection work in the region and progress reporting at regional consultations, this forum is considered particularly powerful in bringing about political reforms. It has developed a strong interest in mainstreaming the child protection systems approach throughout the region. Through the forum, information is also channelled to the SRSG-VAC. SCS considers this regional set-up of governmental and inter-agency cooperation and coordination an “example of best practice and partnership that could be replicated elsewhere, and at national levels ... it demonstrates a consolidated effort of different stakeholders, including governments, to work together and find solutions to end violence against children.”<sup>125</sup>

In the MENA region, the SCS Regional Office in collaboration with the Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children organised a series of regional consultations to advocate for the ban of corporal punishment. In 2010, one of these consultations was co-organised with the League of Arab States and the Office of the SRSG-VAC. It brought together representatives of 18 countries and civil society organisations. As an outcome of the consultation, recommendations for law, policy and practice were developed, which called, among others, for the national replication of the consultation in the participating countries. SCS committed to support these events. Through these consultations, the League of Arab States became more familiar with the importance of banning corporal punishment and the NCPS concept and expressed interest to continue its partnership with SCS on other, related initiatives. Following a national workshop in Tunisia, a law to ban corporal punishment was adopted and a Government representative of Tunisia acknowledged that this law reform had been a direct result of the workshop.<sup>126</sup>

In addition to this initiative, SCS is also collaborating with the Arab Council for Childhood Development (ACCD) in the MENA region. This collaboration encompasses in particular the development of a regional advocacy strategy on law reform. The advocacy will focus on sexual and reproductive health education to be accessible and free of charge for each adolescent, the prohibition of FGM/C, and raising the minimum age of marriage to 18 years. In addition to targeting politicians and community leaders, the advocacy strategy seeks to involve religious leaders from the region, as well as a network of child rights organisations that are already collaborating with the SCS Child Rights Governance Programme.<sup>127</sup>

In Africa, SCS has established contacts with the African Union and is advocating and lobbying for child rights and protection themes with the Union, in particular through its role as chair of the African Child Rights Charter Network Africa Group.<sup>128</sup> The ECAf Regional Office emphasised in addition that partnerships to regional civil society partners are strategic, since the capacity and political influence of such bodies are often much stronger developed than it is the case with small NGOs and CSOs at the national and local levels.<sup>129</sup>

---

<sup>124</sup> Save the Children, *Regional Office of South and Central Asia*, undated. Save the Children, *Stepping Up Child Protection: An assessment of Child Protection Systems from all countries in South Asia, including reflections from Central Asia*, Kathmandu, 2010, p. 8. Interview with Jerome Conilleau, Child Protection Regional Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for South and Central Asia, 26 September 2011.

<sup>125</sup> Save the Children, *Stepping Up Child Protection: An assessment of Child Protection Systems from all countries in South Asia, including reflections from Central Asia*, Kathmandu, 2010, p. 8. Interview with Jerome Conilleau, Child Protection Regional Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for South and Central Asia, 26 September 2011.

<sup>126</sup> *Contribution Towards the Alliance Annual Report 2010*, 2010. Interview with Dominique Sbardella, Regional Child Protection Program Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for the Middle East and North Africa, 12 September 2011.

<sup>127</sup> Interview with Dominique Sbardella, Regional Child Protection Program Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for the Middle East and North Africa, 12 September 2011.

<sup>128</sup> Save the Children Sweden, Eastern and Central Africa (ECAf), *Annual Report 2010*, Nairobi, undated, p. 2. Save the Children Sweden, *Plan of Action 2006*, Eastern and Central Africa, Nairobi, 2006, p. 3.

<sup>129</sup> Save the Children Sweden, Eastern and Central Africa (ECAf), *Annual Report 2010*, Nairobi, undated, p. 21.

In the LAM region, SCS proposed in 2009 to establish a regionally coordinated initiative for the follow-up to the UNVAC recommendations and in support of the mandate of the SRSG-VAC. SCS took the lead on developing a concept note for a regional follow-up strategy and promoted that jointly with the Global Movement for Children, Plan International and REDLAMYC, a network of over 2,300 local and national NGOs, which is a key partner of SCS in the region. The SRSG-VAC, the UN Special Rapporteur for Children and Armed Conflict, members of the Committee on the Rights of the Child, Unicef and Plan International jointly reviewed and agreed upon the concept for a regional strategy. The regional strategy foresees that three sub-regional events be convened to present and inform about the UNVAC recommendations and the mandate of the SRSG-VAC, and to invite countries to report on their progress made with the implementation of the UNVAC recommendations since 2006. A first regional consultation took place in April 2011 and saw the participation of high level politicians, civil society, children, and ombudspersons for children. In preparation for the event, national mapping studies had been commissioned and the final mapping report was due for publication in September 2011. The regional consultation aimed further to develop a roadmap for the continued implementation of each of the UN Violence Study's recommendations in the participating countries. The roadmap was officially approved by the high-level participants and will thus guide the way forward.<sup>130</sup>

This regional initiative generated important momentum for the follow-up to the UN Violence Study, and the close collaboration with international and regional bodies was perceived critical to generate political will and commitment, as well as funding. It also helped defining priorities for the involvement of the SRSG-VAC in the region. The SRSG-VAC expressed an interest to publish the roadmap and have it inspire action in other regions as well.<sup>131</sup>

An unprecedented outcome of the regional event was the commitment by the ten participating States to create, consolidate and monitor mechanisms and processes for the implementation of the UNVAC recommendations, at the national and regional levels: Niñosur, a permanent body within MERCOSUR that is specialised on children's rights, decided to establish a regional reporting mechanism on the UN Violence Study follow-up: Each participating State is held to report to Niñosur once a year on its progress made with the implementation of the recommendations, and to share new laws, policies, good practices, etc. At the national levels, NGOs and others are stimulating the follow-up and special working groups shall be established and institutionalised to coordinate the national follow-up. The reporting of all countries will be peer reviewed and a compilation will be then sent to the SRSG-VAC for information.<sup>132</sup>

These regional events were costly; each demanded approximately USD 200,000 plus the staff time of all persons involved in the participating organisations and institutions. The main contributors are SCS and Plan International. The Government of Paraguay hosted the regional event. The collective investment has become sustainable thanks to the close involvement and leadership of regional bodies. The coordinated collaboration of all relevant actors involved, at the national and regional level, and including international organisations

---

<sup>130</sup> Interview with Angels Simon, Regional Programme Manager, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean, 16 September 2011. *Update from LAM*, undated. E-mail from Angels Simon, 13 July 2011. See also: Movimiento Mundial por la Infancia, *Eventos Sub Regionales Para Dar Seguimiento a las Recomendaciones del Estudio UNVAC en la Región de América Latina y el Caribe*, Borrador de Nota Conceptual, Buenos Aires, 21 junio 2010. Metodología Eventos Sub-regionales, Borrador, undated. Movimiento Mundial por la Infancia, Secretaría Nacional de la Niñez y la Adolescencia, Presidencia de la República del Paraguay, *Hoja de Ruta Para Contribuir a la Realización del Derecho de los niños, las niñas y adolescentes a la protección contra todo tipo de violencia en Sudamérica*, Producto del Proceso del Encuentro Sudamericano de Seguimiento al Estudio de las Naciones Unidas sobre la Violencia contra los Niños, las Niñas y Adolescentes, Asunción, 28 y 29 Abril 2011. *Precisión Sobre Los Contenidos, Alcances y Limitaciones del Mapeo Encargado por el MMI-CLAC Para el Evento Sub-regional América del Sur*, undated.

<sup>131</sup> Interview with Angels Simon, Regional Programme Manager, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean, 16 September 2011. *Update from LAM*, undated. E-mail from Angels Simon, 13 July 2011.

<sup>132</sup> Interview with Angels Simon, Regional Programme Manager, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean, 16 September 2011. *Update from LAM*, undated. E-mail from Angels Simon, 13 July 2011.

and institutions, has contributed to generating political will and commitment. A similar initiative is currently being rolled out also in the Caribbean.<sup>133</sup>

In the SEAP region, the SCS Regional Office is involved not only in the regional child protection networks and fora, but is liaising also with regional networks of human rights organisations that are not specifically concerned with children. It found that the UN Violence Study is not necessarily known among organisations that are specialised on human rights or women rights. Several of these human rights organisations and networks have a long-standing tradition on promoting systems building approaches to human rights implementation, including at the local level, and on advocating for human rights mechanisms at country and regional levels. The mutual exchange of information and lessons learned bears thus a potential to further the child rights agenda in the region, not only through the traditional child rights and protection 'channels' but also through other human rights networks.<sup>134</sup>

Internationally, the CPI represents SC in inter-agency fora and networks on child protection. An example, Save the Children is co-chairing with Unicef the Child Protection Monitoring and Evaluation Reference Group. It is also closely collaborating with the SRSG-VAC to promote child participation in her activities and has seconded a Child Participation Officer to her office.<sup>135</sup> In addition, the collaboration of the SCS Regional Offices with regional and international human rights bodies is important to give more weight to SCS recommendations for the strengthening of NCPS. To this end, SCS works with national partners on the development of alternative reports to the Committee on the Rights of the Child and the Human Rights Committee, for instance. The quality of alternative reports is crucial to ensure that the concluding observations issued by the Treaty Bodies are as close as possible to the country's reality. In addition, SCS is supporting reporting processes and partnerships with regional bodies such as the African Committee of Experts on the Rights and Welfare of the Child and the Inter-American Commission for Human Rights.<sup>136</sup>

### ***Partnerships for programme planning and implementation in Kenya***

SCS partners in Kenya appreciate the collaboration with SCS. The working relationship with SCS as a donor and partner is perceived as friendly, respectful, empowering, strengthening capacity, and showing interest for the needs and concerns of their national and local partners.<sup>137</sup>

In Kenya, SCS collaborates on child protection themes with SC Finland, SC Canada and SC UK. The collaboration is based on a shared understanding of child protection, a common vision and the shared objectives promoted by SCI. There is, however, no agreement in place to formally regulate their cooperation, which depends therefore on the initiative taken by the Directors and staff of the various offices. The SCI harmonisation process, which will lead to the creation of a joint presence in Kenya in 2012, is perceived as an incentive that strengthens the spirit of collaboration among the various SC Members.<sup>138</sup>

---

<sup>133</sup> Interview with Angels Simon, Regional Programme Manager, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean, 16 September 2011. *Update from LAM*, undated.

<sup>134</sup> Interview with Eva Maria Cayanan, Regional Adviser Child Rights Governance and Protection, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Southeast Asia and the Pacific, 29 September 2011.

<sup>135</sup> Save the Children Child Protection Initiative, *Child Protection: Making a difference in children's lives*, May 2011, p. 4.

<sup>136</sup> Interview with Angels Simon, Regional Programme Manager, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean, 16 September 2011. Interview with Deidre Kleynhans, Regional Programme Officer, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Southern Africa, 26 September 2011.

<sup>137</sup> Interview with Mercy Mugane, Children's Legal Action Network (CLAN), Kenya, 29 September 2011. Interview with Wambui Njuguna, The African Network for the Prevention and Protection against Child Abuse and Neglect (ANPPCAN), Kenya, 23 September 2011.

<sup>138</sup> Interview with Geoffrey Mugisha, Regional Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for East and Central Africa, 4 October 2011. Interview with Job Ochieng, Regional Programme Manager, Save the Children Finland, 20 September 2011. Interview with Sarah Hildrew, Child Protection Officer, Save the Children UK, Kenya, 17 November 2011.

During the elaboration of a national child protection framework in Kenya, the SCS Regional Office encouraged the collaboration of other SC Members in order to coordinate and consolidate their inputs to the process, which was perceived as an added value. SCS collaborated also very closely with SC Finland on the training of key staff on child protection themes in Kenya. A training protocol was elaborated jointly between the two organisations and trainers were recruited from Finland and Sweden. This initiative was initiated by the Directors of SCS and SCF in Kenya, and it is envisaged that joint activities following this example be implemented also in future.<sup>139</sup>

The SCS Regional Office for ECAf has made efforts to harmonise its child protection work with that implemented by other SC Members in all countries of the region. For this purpose, a regional Child Protection Task Force was established to coordinate the work of SC Members in that area through more formalised mechanisms and regular meetings. The Child Protection Task Force is chaired by SCS and helps also to align SC Members in collaboration with external partners. Notwithstanding these achievements, a common programme planning for all SC Members working in Kenya and the selection of programme priorities, as well as a coordinated representation with a unified voice at national and regional meetings and fora might still be strengthened in future.<sup>140</sup>

To its partners, the identities of SCS and other SC Members are however not always clearly recognisable. SCS partners in Kenya noted that SCS is usually clearly identified in its bilateral cooperation with partners, but when staff of SCS or other SC Members participate in multi-agency meetings, it is not always clear if they represent their specific organisation or the SC Alliance / SCI. The CPI is hardly known to SCS national partners in Kenya.<sup>141</sup> This may suggest that SC staff represent, in collaboration with external partners, common positions and approaches; on the other side, the complex internal structure of SCI and its members does not seem to be easily comprehensible to outsiders. What exactly this outside perception implies for SCS internal policies may need to be debated further.

#### **IV.9 Promoting systemic and rights-based approaches across all sectors**

This study is focused on SCS programming on child protection in development contexts and does not consider SCS child protection work in emergency situations, nor is the SCS programming on child rights governance being taken into account. SC strategic reports and guidance, and key informants, noted however the close linkages between all these sectors that the organisation is working on and the cross-cutting relevance of systemic approaches.

With regard to emergency interventions, SC noted that "... the opportunity is taken to begin to build, or to reinforce existing, core components of child protection systems .... Evidence suggests that functioning emergency child protection structures can develop into solid national child protection systems in the longer term."<sup>142</sup> The close connection of child protection in development and emergencies programming and the importance of linking up both these sectors with the systems building approach were affirmed also by some SCS staff in Regional Offices and the CPI.<sup>143</sup> In some regions development and emergency work go

---

<sup>139</sup> Interview with Job Ochieng, Regional Programme Manager, Save the Children Finland, 20 September 2011. Interview with Sarah Hildrew, Child Protection Officer, Save the Children UK, Kenya, 17 November 2011.

<sup>140</sup> Interview with Geoffrey Mugisha, Regional Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for East and Central Africa, 4 October 2011. Interview with Job Ochieng, Regional Programme Manager, Save the Children Finland, 20 September 2011. Interview with Sarah Hildrew, Child Protection Officer, Save the Children UK, Kenya, 17 November 2011.

<sup>141</sup> Interview with Jonna Carlsson, Child Protection Officer, UNICEF Kenya, 26 September 2011. Interview with Jacinta Murgor, The National Council for Children's Services (NCCS), Kenya, 3 October 2011.

<sup>142</sup> Save the Children, Child Protection Initiative, *Building Rights-based National Child Protection Systems: A concept paper to support Save the Children's work*, 2010, p. 6.

<sup>143</sup> Interview with Eva Maria Cayanan, Regional Adviser Child Rights Governance and Protection, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Southeast Asia and the Pacific, 29 September 2011. Interview with Dominique Sbardella, Regional Child Protection Program Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for the Middle East and North Africa, 12 September 2011. See also: Save the Children, *Stepping Up Child Protection: An assessment of Child Protection Systems from all countries in South Asia, including reflections from Central Asia*, Kathmandu, 2010, p. 26.

hand in hand, as is the case in almost every country in the MENA region where SCS is active.<sup>144</sup> In the ECAf region, the SCS Thematic Programme Plan on child protection in development notes that it has to be read in the light of other TPPs as well, such as the one on child protection in emergency, and others on education, child rights and civil society.<sup>145</sup>

In the MENA region, the SCS Regional Office entered into collaboration with OHCHR in 2008 to develop the concept of an NCPS specifically for emergency situations. In addition to the direct involvement of the Regional Child Protection Programme Adviser, four SCS child protection officers were seconded to OHCHR Country Offices. They were tasked to field test the draft concept.<sup>146</sup> The results of this initiative are expected to offer new insights and help evolving the conceptual understanding of the NCPS and its meaning for SC programming.

Key informants further pointed out that child protection needs to be understood in light of the human rights of the child as afforded under the CRC. Programmes and initiatives to safeguard children's rights therefore form an integral part of the child protection work as of the child rights governance work. The same applies to initiatives promoting structural reforms and the socio-political participation of children. It is however not always clear, how the related programming sections of SC/SCS and their specific expertise and competencies are distinguished from each other, and how to prevent overlap.<sup>147</sup>

The systems approach in child protection programming is particularly closely linked to the child rights governance work. Key informants noted that a 'systemic approach' is understood to be in line with what the Committee on the Rights of the Child described as the 'general measures of implementation of the CRC'. This understanding is reflected in the components of the NCPS that are closely oriented at these general measures. Working with the general measures to develop and strengthen child rights-based systems is also at the centre of Save the Children's child rights governance work. The competence of SC child rights governance staff might therefore be capitalised on more strongly to inform the child protection systems building. Strong expertise on child protection and child rights governance were noted particular in the LAM and SEAP regions, at the regional and national levels. Lessons learned from those regions might thus inform the work in other regions as well.<sup>148</sup>

A concrete example of how the collaboration between the CP and CRG work can be maximised was mentioned in the SEAP region and concerns SCS's involvement in the drafting of alternative reports to the Committee on the Rights of the Child: It was observed that inputs on child protection are often limited to specific thematic areas, whereas the bigger picture of child rights and a systemic approach to their implementation is all too often not yet fully developed, and could rather be contributed in collaboration with the child rights governance staff.<sup>149</sup> In the MENA region, a regional advocacy strategy on child protection themes is planning to link up with the network of child rights organisations that the SCS child rights governance programme works with.<sup>150</sup> In some Latin American countries, the concept

---

<sup>144</sup> Interview with Dominique Sbardella, Regional Child Protection Program Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for the Middle East and North Africa, 12 September 2011.

<sup>145</sup> Rätts Barnen (Save the Children Sweden), *Thematic Programme Plan, Protection – National child protection systems, Eastern and Central Africa, 2009-2012*, 7 December 2009, p. 6.

<sup>146</sup> Interview with Dominique Sbardella, Regional Child Protection Program Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for the Middle East and North Africa, 12 September 2011.

<sup>147</sup> Interview with Eva Maria Cayanan, Regional Adviser Child Rights Governance and Protection, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Southeast Asia and the Pacific, 29 September 2011. Interview with Jerome Conilleau, Child Protection Regional Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for South and Central Asia, 26 September 2011. Interview with Deidre Kleynhans, Regional Programme Officer, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Southern Africa, 26 September 2011.

<sup>148</sup> Interview with Eva Maria Cayanan, Regional Adviser Child Rights Governance and Protection, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Southeast Asia and the Pacific, 29 September 2011. Interview with Denise Stuckenbruck, Program Manager, Child Protection Initiative, Save the Children, 20 September 2011. Interview with Angels Simon, Regional Programme Manager, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean, 16 September 2011.

<sup>149</sup> Interview with Eva Maria Cayanan, Regional Adviser Child Rights Governance and Protection, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Southeast Asia and the Pacific, 29 September 2011.

<sup>150</sup> Interview with Dominique Sbardella, Regional Child Protection Program Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for the Middle East and North Africa, 12 September 2011.

of an NCPS appears to create some confusion among governmental partners since a child rights governance system is considered to be already in place and, rather than creating a distinct NCPS, child protection structures and measures in the existing governance structures might be strengthened.<sup>151</sup>

These reflections are of relevance also when it comes to the selection and training of country office staff. In some regions, it was noted that a thematic specialisation of child protection staff may be useful, but should be complemented by a solid understanding of children's rights and governance issues, which are all central to the work on systems building.<sup>152</sup> In the SEAP region, the combination of technical expertise and mandates in the area of child protection and child rights governance in the position of one Regional Adviser is seen as a potential added value, since the outcomes from both these areas inform each other.<sup>153</sup>

#### **IV.10 Challenges and risks to the implementation of child protection programmes**

SCS Regional Offices reported that the implementation of their programmes is at times challenged by internal and external factors. This chapter provides a summary of the reported challenges and risks.

##### ***Internal factors***

SCS regional staff struggle, to some extent, with the multiple tasks that they have to comply with in addition to their thematic specialisation. Their involvement in management and administrative tasks, such as the preparation of annual and donor reports, the TPP and project plans, is taking a significant amount of time away from their thematic work. It was advised therefore that management tasks be assigned to unit directors or other specialised staff. In the SCA region, the situation is complicated further by the relocation of the Regional Office to Singapore and the related restructuring.<sup>154</sup> In all regions, the structural reform for SCI's Unified Presence is taking staff time away from the thematic work.<sup>155</sup> A comparatively high turn-over of staff is considered to have an impact on the continuity of SCS programming, and to pose a risk to the SCS institutional memory and capacity. Human resources policies therefore need to seek to retain staff and to manage handover processes effectively. This challenge was noted also in the annual reporting of the ECAf Regional Office.<sup>156</sup>

In the ECAf region, SCS reported that the implementation of its child protection programmes experienced delays and deviated from the programme objectives and expected results. A primary reason for the deviations was related to human resources, i.e. the 'absence of a substantive CP manager' in 2010. In consequence, some activities were not undertaken at all, while others were reduced in scope.<sup>157</sup>

##### ***External factors***

In many regions, SCS child protection work is implemented in countries that are affected by poverty, weak state structures and rule of law, corruption, emergencies or conflicts. War and

<sup>151</sup> Interview with Denise Stuckenbruck, Program Manager, Child Protection Initiative, Save the Children, 20 September 2011.

<sup>152</sup> Interview with Eva Maria Cayanan, Regional Adviser Child Rights Governance and Protection, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Southeast Asia and the Pacific, 29 September 2011. Interview with Angels Simon, Regional Programme Manager, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean, 16 September 2011.

<sup>153</sup> Interview with Eva Maria Cayanan, Regional Adviser Child Rights Governance and Protection, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Southeast Asia and the Pacific, 29 September 2011.

<sup>154</sup> Interview with Jerome Conilleau, Child Protection Regional Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for South and Central Asia, 26 September 2011.

<sup>155</sup> Interview with Lena Karlsson, Director, Child Protection Initiative, Save the Children, 25 August 2011.

<sup>156</sup> Rädna Barnen (Save the Children Sweden), *Thematic Programme Plan, Protection – National child protection systems, Eastern and Central Africa, 2009-2012*, 7 December 2009, p. 22. Save the Children Sweden, Eastern and Central Africa (ECAf), *Annual Report 2010*, Nairobi, undated, p. 14. See also: Save the Children Child Protection Initiative, *Priority Area Strategy 2010-2015: Children without appropriate care*, pp. 6-7.

<sup>157</sup> Save the Children Sweden, Eastern and Central Africa (ECAf), *Annual Report 2010*, Nairobi, undated, pp. 5-6.

armed conflict are among the most serious threats to the SCS child protection programming work. It was noted, however, that war and armed conflicts, as well as other emergency situations, might also increase the funding opportunities.<sup>158</sup> A strong prevalence of armed conflict, violence and organised crime poses risks not only to the implementation of SCS programmes but also to the security of SCS staff and that of their partners.<sup>159</sup>

In the MENA region, SCS has experienced that conflicts and crisis situations have made long-term planning very difficult. Time-lines might be affected by the changing situations, development and emergency work are alternating. The community-based approach has proven successful in ensuring, to the degree possible, continuity and progress at that level even in instable situations. The SCS Regional Office in MENA is confronted with specific challenges in Palestine related to the vetting of implementing partners by some bilateral donors and governments. Due to a 'no-contact policy' concerning political groups enlisted on the terrorism list, SCS cannot work with the Ministries of Social Affairs, Education and the Interior in Gaza and the work with Palestine refugees in Lebanon is also to some extent affected by this policy.<sup>160</sup>

Taking political elections, including at the local levels, into account for the planning of child protection programmes is considered important in the SAf region. The changes brought about by elections can impact the political climate as well as the awareness, understanding and commitment to child protection by governmental partners and the judiciary.<sup>161</sup>

In 2011, the SAf Regional Office was challenged in adhering to its child protection programme plans due to the fact that a partner organisation was derailing the implementation of a project assigned to them. Although an isolated example, such incidents are difficult to resolve and impact the overall implementation of SCS programmes.<sup>162</sup>

In general, funding for child protection programmes is perceived to be significantly lower than funding made available for other areas.<sup>163</sup> It was noted in the ECAf region, for instance, that national child protection departments are among the least resourced departments.<sup>164</sup>

The programming of the ECAf Regional Office has been challenged in many ways while responding to the draught and food emergency in the Horn of Africa in 2011 and the independence of South Sudan. It concluded therefore that disaster risk reduction "... should be mainstreamed into all SC programmes. Even though it is classified as emergency preparedness, it is applicable to both, development and emergency programmes".<sup>165</sup>

In addition, challenges were reported from ECAf with regard to the legal regulation of NGOs. While many African governments support the role of CSOs in providing social services, they are often ambivalent or even hostile towards CSOs that advocate for human rights or other issues that are deemed 'politically sensitive', such as good governance or anti-corruption. In most of the countries in the ECAf region, national NGOs have therefore increasingly been confronted with legal regulations that limit or obstruct their work. An example, the 2009

---

<sup>158</sup> Interview with Dominique Sbardella, Regional Child Protection Program Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for the Middle East and North Africa, 12 September 2011.

<sup>159</sup> Interview with Angels Simon, Regional Programme Manager, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean, 16 September 2011.

<sup>160</sup> Interview with Dominique Sbardella, Regional Child Protection Program Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for the Middle East and North Africa, 12 September 2011.

<sup>161</sup> Interview with Deidre Kleynhans, Regional Programme Officer, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Southern Africa, 26 September 2011.

<sup>162</sup> Interview with Deidre Kleynhans, Regional Programme Officer, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Southern Africa, 26 September 2011.

<sup>163</sup> Save the Children, *Stepping Up Child Protection: An assessment of Child Protection Systems from all countries in South Asia, including reflections from Central Asia*, Kathmandu, 2010, p. 25. Interview with Lena Karlsson, Director, Child Protection Initiative, Save the Children, 25 August 2011.

<sup>164</sup> Interview with Geoffrey Mugisha, Regional Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for East and Central Africa, 4 October 2011.

<sup>165</sup> Save the Children Sweden, Eastern and Central Africa (ECAf), *Annual Report 2010*, Nairobi, undated, p. 20.

Charities and Societies Proclamation in Ethiopia prohibits NGOs to use foreign funding for work on 'politically sensitive' issues. The law provides that local CSOs are allowed to advocate for human rights only when they raise at least 90% of their funds from local sources. The majority of these organisations are however heavily dependent on foreign funding. This has seriously impacted SCS's support for the child rights and child protection work of local partners in the region, especially in Ethiopia. SCS reported also that donors were reluctant to allocate funds for child rights work in Ethiopia due to the new law.<sup>166</sup>

All the above has had multiple implications on SCS's programme implementation, including with regard to resources, staff capacity and general coordination.<sup>167</sup> In addition, the SCS Regional Office in ECAf noted also a risk concerning the harmonisation process within SCI: If NCPS are not made a thematic and strategic priority in child protection where there is a Unified Presence, programme support to strengthening NCPS might be reduced. A strengthened partnership within the SC Alliance is therefore considered critical to ensure continuity of the current approach.<sup>168</sup>

Many of the external challenges that have impacted SCS child protection programming are caused by structural issues such as weak governance, weak rule of law or conflicts. In the long term, SCS's contributions to building and strengthening national rights-based systems are therefore well placed to contribute also to a reduction of these type of risks.

## V. Conclusions

SCS has a long-standing tradition on programming for the advancement of children's right to protection from all forms of violence. By taking the lead on child protection themes within Save the Children, during the process for the UN Violence Study and in its follow-up, SCS has been in a position to contribute its thematic and strategic expertise to the common development of SC's child protection programming and to influence the organisational development in this area.

SCS thus contributed significantly to moving the child protection agenda forward through strategic planning, capacity building, the development and advancement of concepts and approaches within Save the Children and beyond. Thematically, SCS has developed its own niche in addressing the corporal punishment of children and has achieved significant progress in this area. Concerning strategic approaches, SCS has specialised on programming for the development of NCPS, especially through community-based approaches, and promoting children's participation in these processes. All these areas continue to be highly relevant and it is sensible therefore to maintain this organisational specialisation and to develop it further. Among its partners, SCS is renowned for this specialised expertise and for creating trustful and respectful working relationships with its national partners.

Many key informants share the view that SCS and its staff have achieved significant progress for child protection in follow-up to the UN Violence Study, at the local, country and regional levels. Room for further improvement is seen mainly with regard to sustainable implementation, monitoring, documentation and communication, and fundraising.

---

<sup>166</sup> Interview with Geoffrey Mugisha, Regional Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for East and Central Africa, 4 October 2011. Save the Children Sweden, Eastern and Central Africa (ECAf), *Summary Annual Report 2009*, Nairobi, undated, p. 1. Save the Children Sweden, Eastern and Central Africa (ECAf), *Summary Annual Report 2009*, Nairobi, undated, p. 2, 21.

<sup>167</sup> Interview with Geoffrey Mugisha, Regional Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for East and Central Africa, 4 October 2011.

<sup>168</sup> Save the Children Sweden, Eastern and Central African Regional Office (ECAf), *Annual Plan 2010*, Nairobi, undated, p. 21. Save the Children Sweden, *Plan of Action 2009*, ECAf Regional Office, Nairobi, 25 February 2009, p. 1.

The conceptual work on national child protection systems is critical and significant progress has been achieved to deconstruct the concept and define its elements. Since the UN Violence Study was launched in 2006, promoting the NCPS approach has become a central aspect of the work of SCS/SCI and other organisations working in the area of child rights and protection.

The NCPS concept has been widely communicated and its importance has been recognised within SC. SC/SCS staff are called upon to ensure that the organisations' thematic child protection priorities are being addressed within an overall systems building approach. The NCPS remains nonetheless a rather abstract construct and there is evidence to suggest that SC staff and their partners are struggling to understand how to translate it into concrete action. As a result, there is a risk that the NCPS approach remains vague and abstract and that some of the NCPS components are being neglected or overlooked in child protection programmes. Confronting these challenges by developing concrete and action-oriented guidance for SC/SCS staff requires vision and courage. A central aspect in this regard, there is a potential to link the activities to promote systems building at the local levels ('bottom-up') more closely with the systems building at the level of the central governments ('top-down'). Addressing these complexities of the NCPS approach will likely lead the organisation to break new grounds for the international debate on child rights and protection programming and practice.

The components of the NCPS as defined by SC are each and all considered to be relevant for sustainable programming to prevent and respond to violence against children. In its global programming, SCS has been addressing these components, but the priorities differ between programmes, regions and countries. Since 2006, the organisation was particularly active in developing and refining the NCPS concept, conducting mapping and assessment studies of NCPS, addressing law reform to prohibit all forms of violence against children, promoting children's participation, and fostering coordination through strategic partnerships at the local and national levels as well as with regional and international bodies and networks.

Partnerships are of critical importance to SCS child protection programming, especially considering its tradition of working with and through civil society and community-based approaches. Through some of the reported examples, it became evident that the local ownership, cost-effectiveness and sustainability of SCS programmes can be strengthened further if national partners are involved more closely in transparent programme planning processes.

As is evident from the testimonies of SCS Regional Advisers, groundbreaking progress for children has been achieved through SCS involvement in multi-stakeholder cooperation mechanisms that involve governments, civil society, children, national and international organisations. When such partnerships are consolidated through regional networks and fora, there is likely to be an added value deriving from the regional dynamics and governments' common commitments. There are many examples of how SCS has initiated, sustained and promoted multi-stakeholder and inter-agency regional cooperation on child protection. Whereas the specific role of SCS in bringing about change through regional initiatives is not always measurable or quantifiable, its impact is considered to be sustainable, rooted in national ownership, and has resulted in concrete outcomes for children.

An area that remains inconclusive is the inter-relation of different sectors of SCS programmes, especially child protection in development and emergency contexts and child rights governance. The relevance of systems building has been noted for each of these sectors and it is not entirely clear how the contributions that each of these sectors are making to systems building are linked or distinct. SCS's programmes overlap therefore to some degree.

An overarching conclusion and lesson learned from the follow-up to the UN Violence Study might thus be that the SCS programming itself might benefit from reflection and debate in light of the vision of a systemic approach that it seeks to foster. Two questions arise from the review presented in this report: a) Is a national child protection system considered to be distinct from, or integrated into, a national child rights governance system? Experience from the regions and SCS staff, and guidance deriving from international standards, tend to support the latter view. b) Is the organisational structure of SCS/SCI adequately prepared for the promotion of systemic approaches? The findings presented in this report suggest that there is an ambiguity between the SCS/SCI organisational structures that are primarily oriented at thematic focus areas, and the visionary objective to promote systems building, which is cutting across the different organisational sectors. There is a risk that this ambiguity creates confusion. In this regard, it might be useful to explore the commonalities and distinction of the different sectors of SCS programming, in particular between child protection and child rights governance, with a view to streamlining the systems approach across all relevant sectors that SCS is supporting.

These are new and complex questions and responses are not readily available from other organisations. SCS has pioneered on ground-breaking and visionary child protection work before, as demonstrated by its strong advocacy for the banning of corporal punishment and pushing for the NCPS approach in regional and global networks. It is therefore well prepared for continuing in this direction and striving for more clarity in these agendas also in future.

## **VI. Recommendations**

### ***Recommendations concerning SCS's role in SCI and the CPI:***

1. The strong focus on strengthening NCPS and each of its components is relevant and timely and it will be important to continue supporting this approach, and developing it further. To this end, it may be sensible to make time and space available for SCS and CPI staff to engage in creative and innovative thinking and debate around concepts, approaches and strategies.<sup>169</sup>
2. SCS is strategically well placed to ensure that child protection continues to be a priority within the SCI. SCS might reflect upon its strategic leadership on child protection themes within SCI and consider strengthening its leadership on areas for which SCS and its staff stand out due to their expertise, strength and vision, for instance by leading thematic working groups on systemic approaches, possibly combining child protection and child rights governance systems, physical and other humiliating punishment, and gender issues.
3. Maintaining SCS's current support to the CPI is important, as is the SCS leadership to the initiative. SCS might consider liaising with other SC Members to generate more support and diversify the funding sources for the CPI, also with a view to ensuring that the CPI is represented in all regions.<sup>170</sup>
4. The coordination and communication role of the CPI may need to be expanded and strengthened even further for instance by:

---

<sup>169</sup> Interview with Dominique Pierre Plateau, Regional Representative, Child Protection Initiative in Southeast Asia and the Pacific, Save the Children, 15 September 2011.

<sup>170</sup> Interview with Roberta Cecchetti, Advocacy Manager, Child Protection Initiative, Save the Children, 12 September 2011.

Interview with Denise Stuckenbruck, Program Manager, Child Protection Initiative, Save the Children, 20 September 2011.

Interview with Angels Simon, Regional Programme Manager, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean, 16 September 2011.

- Supporting the information exchange and sharing of expertise between and across regions and the SCS Headoffice, for instance by developing a pool of experts by their thematic specialisation, referring expertise to where there is a demand for it, and offering a system of mentorship to share senior expertise with SCS staff globally.<sup>171</sup>
  - Assist SCS Regional Advisers even more through communication of up-to-date information about child protection themes and SC's work in this area.<sup>172</sup>
  - Provide more direct fundraising support, including up-to-date information on fundraising opportunities, and technical advice on the drafting of proposals.<sup>173</sup>
  - The collaboration of the CPI, SCS Regional Advisers and staff from other SC Members who work at a regional level may need to be reviewed in order to maximise their coordination. One proposal suggests that the CPI takes the lead on SC's involvement in regional child protection networks and that SCS Regional Advisers be integrated into and more proactively involved with the CPI. In the context of the restructuring and integration of SCS Regional Offices into SCI Regional Offices, the CPI Regional Representatives may be well placed to ensure continuity.<sup>174</sup>
  - The CPI might be mandated officially to organise and manage SC's joint follow-up to the UN Violence Study.<sup>175</sup>
5. In order to prevent that fast and frequent changes in SCS staff is impacting the child protection programming and implementation work, human resources policies should find ways of enhancing continuity of staff placement, managing organisational memory and capacity, and ensuring that hand-over processes are conducted in an effective way.<sup>176</sup>

### **Recommendations on strategic planning:**

6. Consider exploring ways to reflect the NCPS approach more clearly in SCS programming and discuss the opportunities and challenges of gradually introducing programming on systems building (possibly combining child protection and child rights governance systems) to complement the thematic programming on individual child protection issues. Longer-term projects may be needed for the complex task of strengthening NCPS.<sup>177</sup>
7. Continue strengthening the transparency and coordination of national programme planning in consultation with the relevant national and international actors: Explore possibilities to partner with national and international actors on the analysis of national child protection systems where this has not yet been done, and consult on where best to fit in the contributions of SCS and each other actor, based on their specific strengths and areas of expertise, and with a view to promoting national and local ownership, from planning through to implementation.
8. In this context, it is also important to continue exploring how SCS can contribute to linking community-based systems with the systems of the central governments (linking

<sup>171</sup> Interview with Jerome Conilleau, Child Protection Regional Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for South and Central Asia, 26 September 2011.

<sup>172</sup> Interview with Jerome Conilleau, Child Protection Regional Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for South and Central Asia, 26 September 2011. Interview with Deidre Kleynhans, Regional Programme Officer, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Southern Africa, 26 September 2011.

<sup>173</sup> Interview with Jerome Conilleau, Child Protection Regional Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for South and Central Asia, 26 September 2011. Interview with Deidre Kleynhans, Regional Programme Officer, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Southern Africa, 26 September 2011.

<sup>174</sup> Interview with Jerome Conilleau, Child Protection Regional Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for South and Central Asia, 26 September 2011. Interview with Angels Simon, Regional Programme Manager, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean, 16 September 2011.

<sup>175</sup> Interview with Roberta Cecchetti, Advocacy Manager, Child Protection Initiative, Save the Children, 12 September 2011.

<sup>176</sup> Rädna Barnen (Save the Children Sweden), *Thematic Programme Plan, Protection – National child protection systems, Eastern and Central Africa, 2009-2012*, 7 December 2009, p. 22.

<sup>177</sup> Interview with Enyo Gbedemah, Regional Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for West Africa, 4 October 2011. Interview with Job Ochieng, Regional Programme Manager, Save the Children Finland, 20 September 2011.

'bottom-up' and 'top-down' approaches). Since Save the Children, including SCS, is working in both directions, and is renowned in many regions for its strong support to civil society, children, and community-based approaches, it is strategically well placed to lead discussions, internally and with its partners, on how the local, regional and central levels of a country can be mobilised to work together to strengthen the NCPS. One proposal is to support joint planning and implementation processes involving actors from the central government, local authorities and the civil society. Such comprehensive approaches are expected to strengthen the capacity, collaboration and accountability of actors from different levels. They generate local and national ownership and sustainability.<sup>178</sup>

### ***Recommendations for strengthening conceptual clarity:***

9. Emphasise that the framework for an NCPS was already provided for in the recommendations of the UN Violence Study; that link should be communicated more clearly.<sup>179</sup>
10. Within SC and the CPI, it might be useful to promote one standard wording for the NCPS concept and its components, so that it is easily recognisable. The general measures of implementation for the Convention on the Rights of the Child, as proposed by the Committee on the Rights of the Child, are an important point of reference in this regard. Using the language of the general measures would also visibly link the NCPS concept to the standards of the Convention and the international guidance issued by the CRC Committee.
11. Experiences in Kenya and elsewhere have shown that a national process to debate and develop the NCPS concept, with all its details and for the specific context of the country concerned, contributes to building consensus and conceptual clarity. The involvement of all relevant state and non-state, national and international actors, under the leadership of the national government is critical to ensure national ownership and commitment. SCS might take the initiative to initiate such processes where they have not yet taken place.
12. At the international level, SCS and/or the CPI might seek to continue engaging in an inter-agency debate on the NCPS concept and its components. A common concept or definition would be particularly useful if it is simple to understand and aligned with international standards. It would help reducing the level of confusion among governments and donors over the different concepts promoted by different organisations. An endorsement by the Committee on the Rights of the Child would foster the recognition of a common conceptual understanding and its promotion globally. A planned meeting on NCPS organised jointly by Unicef and SC in New Delhi in 2012 might offer a platform to engage in this type of debate.<sup>180</sup>
13. In order to uphold its leadership role on child protection and the strengthening of NCPS, SCS should seek to be represented in the UN Inter-agency Group on Violence against Children, jointly with SC UK.<sup>181</sup> In light of the global merger process of SCI, a unified representation by the CPI might also be proposed.

---

<sup>178</sup> Interview with Enyo Gbedemah, Regional Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for West Africa, 4 October 2011. Interview with Geoffrey Mugisha, Regional Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for East and Central Africa, 4 October 2011.

<sup>179</sup> Interview with Roberta Cecchetti, Advocacy Manager, Child Protection Initiative, Save the Children, 12 September 2011.

<sup>180</sup> Consolidation of recommendations from the following sources: Interview with Dominique Pierre Plateau, Regional Representative, Child Protection Initiative in Southeast Asia and the Pacific, Save the Children, 15 September 2011. Interview with Roberta Cecchetti, Advocacy Manager, Child Protection Initiative, Save the Children, 12 September 2011. Interview with Geoffrey Mugisha, Regional Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for East and Central Africa, 4 October 2011.

<sup>181</sup> Interview with Lena Karlsson, Director, Child Protection Initiative, Save the Children, 25 August 2011.

14. Continue building the capacity of SCS staff on the NCPS concept and how to incorporate a systems building approach into the thematic child protection work.<sup>182</sup> To this end, concrete guidance and tools may need to be developed on how to incorporate systemic approaches into child protection programming, especially at the community level, including assessment and training packages.<sup>183</sup>

***Recommendations on research, documentation and communication:***

15. Ensure that key findings and recommendations resulting from research, lessons learned, good practices and 'success stories' are disseminated and communicated within the organisation, including through mutual learning and exchange between the different thematic sections.
16. Child impact monitoring and evaluations could be strengthened, including with a view to ensure that their findings are used to inform future programming.<sup>184</sup>
17. SC might consider setting up an electronic system to document the status of the NCPS components, which might be developed jointly between the CPI and the CRGI, and could be used for the reporting and monitoring of progress and impact and to inform the drafting of alternative reports to international and regional human rights bodies.<sup>185</sup>
18. Key informants mentioned that it might be useful to have access to information and communication tools from the SCS Headoffice and the CPI, including brochures, briefing material and PowerPoint presentations that are ready for use by SCS staff to inform partners and donors in the regions. Concrete guidance and tools on how to advocate with politicians and parliamentarians on child protection themes would also be appreciated, for instance with regard to the banning of corporal punishment.<sup>186</sup>

***Recommendations on regional partnerships and collaboration:***

19. SCS's role in regional child rights and protection networks has been widely appreciated within and outside of the organisation and has shown significant impact on advancing the agenda for children, including in the areas of awareness raising and sensitisation, generating political will to address the protection of children from violence, advocating for law and policy reform, making the voices of children heard, and liaising with international bodies, such as the SRSB-VAC. SCS's regional work should therefore be sustained and, if and as appropriate, strengthened further, including by exploring possibilities for cooperation with human rights networks that are not specifically focused on children's rights.

***Recommendations on promoting systems building across all programme sectors:***

20. A strong focus on children's rights and an orientation at systemic approaches is considered to be at the heart of each thematic area and programme sector. It is

---

<sup>182</sup> Interview with Lena Karlsson, Director, Child Protection Initiative, Save the Children, 25 August 2011.

<sup>183</sup> Interview with Jerome Conilleau, Child Protection Regional Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for South and Central Asia, 26 September 2011. Interview with Dominique Pierre Plateau, Regional Representative, Child Protection Initiative in Southeast Asia and the Pacific, Save the Children, 15 September 2011.

<sup>184</sup> Interview with Enyo Gbedemah, Regional Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for West Africa, 4 October 2011. Interview with Mercy Mugane, Children's Legal Action Network (CLAN), Kenya, 29 September 2011.

<sup>185</sup> Interview with Dominique Pierre Plateau, Regional Representative, Child Protection Initiative in Southeast Asia and the Pacific, Save the Children, 15 September 2011.

<sup>186</sup> Interview with Jerome Conilleau, Child Protection Regional Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for South and Central Asia, 26 September 2011. Interview with Deidre Kleynhans, Regional Programme Officer, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Southern Africa, 26 September 2011.

however not yet clear from the organisational set-up of SCS, SCI and the thematic global initiatives, how these cross-cutting issues are to be addressed in the most effective way, with a view to minimise overlap and duplication and to maximise the output and impact. SCS might therefore consider initiating a debate within SCI on how to address rights-based and systemic approaches as issues that are cutting across the various programme sectors.

## VII. Lessons Learned

Lessons learned since the UN Violence Study was completed in 2006, demonstrate that the intense and globally coordinated consultation process that the SC Members engaged in under SCS leadership, required also an organised and systematic follow-up, including the consolidation of lessons learned from the process and the documentation and monitoring of the way that the recommendations are taken forward. Individual initiatives had been put in place to organise the follow-up to the UN Violence Study within SCI. A coordinated and systematic follow-up process has however not been ensured in a consistent way. After the UN Violence Study had been launched, the coordination process among SC Members was not pursued with the same intensity due to changes in staff and leadership. At the global level, the appointment of the SRSG-VAC was delayed whose role would have been critical for the prompt follow-up to the UN Study and the implementation of its recommendations. There was also a perception that SCS or SCI did not take or communicate a clear position on how the follow-up to the UN Violence Study was to be organised. As a result, much of the momentum that had geared SC's coordinated input to the UN Violence Study and much of the organisational memory of this process got lost.<sup>187</sup>

The development of the NCPS approach, which is a direct result of SC's involvement in the UN Violence Study process, is considered to be timely and suitable to strengthen the prevention and response to violence against children and to contribute to long-term and sustainable progress. It is also considered to help SCS child protection staff work together with a more concerted approach, since all the various thematic areas of child protection programmes can be addressed within it. As a result of the process for the UN Study, there is a perception that SCS staff have created a stronger working community on child protection in development. It also triggered processes to develop coordinated inter-agency and regional networks and initiatives, and strengthened the collaboration among SC Members. Lessons learned from that process, and its spirit, might be useful to guide the collaboration within SCI nowadays.<sup>188</sup>

The CPI appears to be well placed to lead the follow-up to the UN Violence Study within SCI in the future. Due to its strategic orientation at the UNVAC recommendations and the NCPS approach, and its close interaction and coordination with SC Offices globally, it is in a position to promote the common alignment of the SC child protection work globally at these strategies, to monitor progress made, to consult on the most appropriate ways forward, and represent SC Members in global child protection networks and fora. It would be sensible to

---

<sup>187</sup> Interview with Denise Stuckenbruck, Program Manager, Child Protection Initiative, Save the Children, 20 September 2011. Interview with Roberta Cecchetti, Advocacy Manager, Child Protection Initiative, Save the Children, 12 September 2011. Interview with Lena Karlsson, Director, Child Protection Initiative, Save the Children, 25 August 2011. Interview with Angels Simon, Regional Programme Manager, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean, 16 September 2011. See also: Rädna Barnen (Save the Children Sweden), *Thematic Strategic Framework 2009-2012, Children's Right to Protection*, International Programme, 19 March 2008, p. 3.

<sup>188</sup> Interview with Denise Stuckenbruck, Program Manager, Child Protection Initiative, Save the Children, 20 September 2011. Interview with Roberta Cecchetti, Advocacy Manager, Child Protection Initiative, Save the Children, 12 September 2011. Interview with Lena Karlsson, Director, Child Protection Initiative, Save the Children, 25 August 2011. Interview with Angels Simon, Regional Programme Manager, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean, 16 September 2011. Interview with Jerome Conilleau, Child Protection Regional Adviser, Save the Children Sweden, Regional Office for South and Central Asia, 26 September 2011.

ensure SCS's continued leadership of the CPI, while ensuring that other SC Members support the process financially and otherwise.

In the context of the international child protection work, the 'systems approach' appears to be a new approach. It entered the international debate as a result of the process of the UN Violence Study. In some countries and regions, the systems approach is however already known and has advanced in the area of human rights and child rights governance work, and key actors are familiar with what it all entails. There is thus a potential to build on these experiences to develop the NCPS approach further.

Lessons learned reveal further that it is challenging to conceptualise or implement a child protection system in isolation from child rights and governance programming. It is therefore important, that the organisation explores ways of addressing overlaps and bridging the gaps between different sectors of SCS programming and SC's global initiatives that are in practice all closely related, in particular child protection in development and emergencies as well as child rights governance. Due to its cross-cutting relevance, the systems building approach offers important opportunities to align these sectors more closely. After its introduction into the child protection programmes of SCS and the CPI, it is therefore timely to engage strongly in a discussion of inter-sectoral cooperation within the organisation.

## **VIII. Annex**

### **VIII.1 Recommendations of the UN Study on Violence Against Children**

The World Report on Violence against Children provides the following overarching recommendations, which were also reflected in the UN Secretary General's Report to the General Assembly following the study:

1. Strengthen national and local commitment and action,
2. Prohibit all violence against children,
3. Prioritise prevention,
4. Promote non-violent values and awareness-raising,
5. Enhance the capacity of all who work with and for children,
6. Provide recovery and social reintegration services,
7. Ensure participation of children,
8. Create accessible and child-friendly reporting systems and services,
9. Ensure accountability and end impunity,
10. Address the gender dimension of violence against children,
11. Develop and implement systematic national data collection and research,
12. Strengthen international commitment.

Other recommendations refer to the follow-up to the UN study at the national, regional and international levels and include a proposal for the appointment of a Special Representative to the UN Secretary General on Violence against Children.<sup>189</sup>

### **VIII.2 Save the Children Sweden's key recommendations in follow-up to the UN Study on Violence Against Children**

"States should:

1. As a matter of urgency, explicitly prohibit all forms of violence against children, including sexual abuse and exploitation; corporal punishment and all other forms of degrading punishment, in all settings, including the home.
2. Develop a national child protection system and allocate sufficient funds to undertake a wide range of measures to prevent (and respond to) all forms of violence against children, including educational and media campaigns, the provision of child-friendly legal, medical and psychosocial services, and disaggregated data collection capable of monitoring the prevalence of violence against children.
3. Establish mechanisms for listening to girls and boys with the aim of involving children directly in the design and implementation of policies (and programmes) that address the violence against them. Children's own actions to address violence should also be supported.
4. Do their utmost to minimise the number of children coming into conflict with the law. They should establish comprehensive and child-friendly juvenile justice systems,

---

<sup>189</sup> Pinheiro, Paulo Sérgio, *World Report on Violence Against Children*, Published by the United Nations Secretary-General's Study on Violence Against Children, 2006, pp. 17-25.

complying with international standards, which aim to rehabilitate children and divert them away from criminalisation and detention.

5. Make particular efforts to promote the active participation of boys and men in ending gender discrimination and violence against children.
6. Support the appointment of a Special Representative of the UN Secretary General on the Elimination of Violence against Children, with the mandate and resources required to provide leadership and oversight on this issue.”<sup>190</sup>

**Source:** Save the Children, 2006

### **VIII.3 Save the Children’s concept of a national child protection system and its components**

Save the Children describes a national child protection system as follows:

“A rights-based national child protection system recognises the State’s responsibility and human rights obligations to children and provides governments with a coordinated and sustainable way to protect children. A good system is made up of a set of laws and policies; a central government coordination mechanism with a clear mandate; effective regulation and monitoring at all levels; a committed, competent workforce; and child-friendly, non-discriminatory services, accessible to all children. Children and other members of society should be involved in developing and monitoring the system. And it must be connected with and support informal community mechanisms that are better placed to recognise problems and respond to them quickly, such as extended family, friends and neighbours, and religious and cultural networks.”<sup>191</sup>

In 2011, the CPI provides the following summary list of the key components that a national child protection systems is comprised of:

- A national strategy;
- The relevant legal framework in line with the CRC;
- A coordinating agency or mechanism;
- Preventive and responsive services at the local level that are accredited and regulated;
- Child friendly justice system;
- Child participation;
- An aware and supportive public;
- Committed (and skilled) workforce;
- Adequate resources;
- Standards, regulations, monitoring and oversight; and
- Data collection systems.<sup>192</sup>

---

<sup>190</sup> Save the Children, *Why Effective National Child Protection Systems are Needed, Save the Children’s key recommendations in response to the UN Secretary-General’s Study on Violence against Children*, 2006, p. 3.

<sup>191</sup> Save the Children, *Child Protection: Taking action against all forms of abuse, neglect, violence and exploitation*, 2010, p. 6.

<sup>192</sup> See: Save the Children, Child Protection Initiative, *Keys to Protect David From Violence, The Role of National Child Protection Systems*, 2011. Save the Children, Child Protection Initiative, *Building Rights-based National Child Protection Systems: A concept paper to support Save the Children’s work*, 2010, pp. 6-7.



## VIII.5 Evaluation Questions

How has the SCS advocacy work and capacity building of governmental and non-governmental actors impacted on the establishment or strengthening of the following:

- Laws or policy provisions for prohibition all forms of corporal and all other forms of humiliating punishment and sexual abuse and exploitation.
- Lead government department or agency with responsibility for the coordination of child protection across government.
- Effective monitoring, referral and response system for survivors of sexual and/or physical violence in place.
- Child-friendly procedures and/or programs, including opportunities for children to be heard in judicial and administrative proceedings affecting the child.
- Community protection services addressing forms of discrimination and ensuring the meaningful participation of children and their families in formulating such services.
- To what extent have the indentified development, as a result of SCS intervention, been supported or hindered/challenged through external factors.
- Outline lessons learned from implementation of the interventions and recommendations.

Country specific questions (Kenya):

- To what extent do development changes accord with the planned results of the intervention, in relation to objectives in thematic development/programme plans, and 2009-2012 objectives in SCS strategic plans.
- What deviations towards objectives in thematic development/programme plans and SCS objectives 2009-2012 can be seen, and what are the reasons for these deviations?
- What resources have been used for the interventions (project-costs at country level)?
- Could the interventions be implemented with fewer resources without reducing the quality of or quantity of the results?
- How has SCS ensured that the intervention is consistent with stakeholders needs and priorities?
- How has SCS ensured that the interventions are complementary to other SC members interventions?
- Are requirements of local ownership satisfied? How has children participated in the planning and implementation of the intervention and influenced the outcome?

**Source:** Terms of Reference, see Annex (Chapter VIII.7)

## VIII.6 Key informants

### Key informants in SCS Regional Offices

Africa		
<b>Enyo Gbedemah</b> Regional Adviser Save the Children Sweden Regional Office for West Africa	<a href="mailto:EnyoG@waf.savethechildren.se">EnyoG@waf.savethechildren.se</a>	Response in writing, 4 October 2011
<b>Deidre Kleynhans</b> Regional Programme Officer Save the Children Sweden Regional Office for Southern Africa	<a href="mailto:DeidreK@saf.savethechildren.se">DeidreK@saf.savethechildren.se</a>	Telephone interview 26 September 2011
<b>Geoffrey Mugisha</b> Regional Adviser Save the Children Sweden Regional Office for East and Central Africa	<a href="mailto:Geoffreym@ecaf.savethechildren.se">Geoffreym@ecaf.savethechildren.se</a>	Response in writing 4 October 2011
Asia		
<b>Eva Maria Cayanan</b> Regional Adviser Child Rights Governance and Protection Save the Children Sweden Regional Office for Southeast Asia and the Pacific	<a href="mailto:evamariac@seap.savethechildren.se">evamariac@seap.savethechildren.se</a>	Telephone interview 29 September 2011
<b>Jerome Conilleau</b> Child Protection Regional Adviser Save the Children Sweden Regional Office for South and Central Asia	<a href="mailto:jeromec@sca.savethechildren.se">jeromec@sca.savethechildren.se</a>	Telephone interview 26 September 2011
Latin America		
<b>Angels Simon</b> Regional Programme Manager Save the Children Sweden Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean	<a href="mailto:Angels.Simon@lam.savethechildren.se">Angels.Simon@lam.savethechildren.se</a>	Telephone interview 16 September 2011
Middle East and North Africa		
<b>Dominique Sbardella</b> Regional Child Protection Program Adviser Save the Children Sweden Regional Office for the Middle East and North Africa	<a href="mailto:DSbardella@mena.savethechildren.se">DSbardella@mena.savethechildren.se</a>	Telephone interview 12 September 2011

### Key informants in the CPI

Child Protection Initiative		
<b>Roberta Cecchetti</b> Advocacy Manager Child Protection Initiative Save the Children	<a href="mailto:roberta@savethechildren.ch">roberta@savethechildren.ch</a>	Telephone interview 16 September 2011
<b>Clare Feinstein</b> Regional Representative West and Central Africa Child Protection Initiative	<a href="mailto:claref@waf.savethechildren.se">claref@waf.savethechildren.se</a>	

Save the Children		
<b>Lena Karlsson</b> Director Child Protection Initiative Save the Children	<a href="mailto:lana.karlsson@rb.se">lana.karlsson@rb.se</a>	Telephone interview 25 August 2011
<b>Dominique Pierre Plateau</b> Regional Representative Southeast Asia and the Pacific Child Protection Initiative Save the Children	<a href="mailto:DominiqueP@seap.savethechildren.se">DominiqueP@seap.savethechildren.se</a>	Telephone interview 15 September 2011
<b>Denise Stuckenbruck</b> Program Manager Child Protection Initiative Save the Children	<a href="mailto:Denise.Stuckenbruck@rb.se">Denise.Stuckenbruck@rb.se</a>	Telephone interview 20 September 2011

### Key informants in Kenya (SCS partners)

SCS partners in Kenya		
<b>Jonna Carlsson</b> Child Protection Officer UNICEF Kenya	<a href="mailto:jcarlsson@unicef.org">jcarlsson@unicef.org</a>	Telephone interview 26 September 2011
<b>Sarah Hildrew</b> Child Protection Officer Save the Children UK, Kenya	<a href="mailto:s.hildrew@scuk.or.ke">s.hildrew@scuk.or.ke</a>	Telephone interview 17 November 2011
<b>Mercy Mugane</b> Children's Legal Action Network (CLAN)	<a href="mailto:mwmugane@gmail.com">mwmugane@gmail.com</a>	Telephone interview 29 September 2011
<b>Jacinta Murgor</b> The National Council for Children's Services (NCCS)	<a href="mailto:nccs2002@yahoo.com">nccs2002@yahoo.com</a>	Telephone interview 3 October 2011
<b>Wambui Njuguna</b> The African Network for the Prevention and Protection against Child Abuse and Neglect (ANPPCAN)	<a href="mailto:wjuguna@anppcan.org">wjuguna@anppcan.org</a>	Telephone interview 23 September 2011
<b>Job Ochieng</b> Regional Programme Manager Save the Children Finland	<a href="mailto:job@savethechildrenfin.or">job@savethechildrenfin.or</a>	Telephone interview 20 September 2011
<b>Joy Okinda</b> The Kenya Alliance for the Advancement of Children (KAACR)	<a href="mailto:jokinda@hotmail.com">jokinda@hotmail.com</a>	Response in writing 28 September 2011

#### **Note on SCS partners in Kenya:**

The African Network for the Prevention and Protection against Child Abuse and Neglect (ANPPCAN) is a regional network that collaborates with SCS in Kenya and regionally on preventing and responding to child abuse and neglect.

The Children's Legal Action Network (CLAN) is an NGO that runs an on-going programme geared towards lobbying and actively participating in law reform of child related statutes and policy reform among stakeholders involved in children's issues at all levels to enhance the status of children.

The Kenya Alliance for the Advancement of Children (KAACR) is an NGO that monitors the domestication of international and regional laws that concern children and youth. It also works to ensure the harmonization of laws and policies concerning children and youth and promote their implementation in Kenya.

The National Council for Children's Services (NCCS) is a key governmental actor responsible for child protection services in Kenya. Save the Children Sweden supports the NCCS, mostly through its local partners such as ANPPCAN.

## VIII.7 Terms of Reference for the Evaluation

### Evaluation of Save the Children Sweden's work in the follow up of the UN Study on Violence against Children 2006-2010

#### Background

Save the Children defines child protection as measures and structures to prevent and respond to violence, abuse, exploitation and neglect affecting children. The goal of child protection is to promote, protect and fulfil children's rights to protection from violence, abuse, exploitation and neglect as expressed in the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child and other human rights, humanitarian and refugee treaties and conventions, as well as national laws.

The UN Study on Violence against Children (VAC) was launched in October 2006. The study emphasizes the importance of states to develop multifaceted and systemic framework to respond to violence against children which is integrated into national planning processes. States are urged to prohibit all forms of violence against children, in all settings, prioritize prevention and enhance the capacity of all who work with and for children. States are further recommended to actively engage with children and support child-led initiatives to address violence.

To strengthen National Child Protection Systems (NCPS) was the overarching recommendation from Save the Children to the world's governments when the UN Study on VAC was launched in New York<sup>193</sup>. This recommendation was later developed into Save the Children's Concept Paper on NCPS<sup>194</sup>. This paper describes an effective national child protection system as consisting of:

- laws and policies that protect children from abuse, neglect, exploitation and violence and respond in the best interests of the child when violations occur
- a central government coordination mechanism for child protection, bringing together central government departments, different provinces, central and local levels of government and civil society
- effective regulation and monitoring at all levels of child protection standards, for instance, in childcare institutions and schools
- a committed workforce with relevant competencies and mandates.

Furthermore, a functioning child protection system is informed by children's views and experiences and strengthens families in the care and protection of their children. It connects child and family support mechanisms in the community with child-friendly services at all levels, regulated by quality standards and delivered by the government or accredited social agencies.

SCS Strategic Plan 2009-2012 has two objectives related to child protection:

- All children benefit from national and local rights based child protection systems, based on legal framework, policy and integrated and comprehensive services. Systems are guided by the principles of the best interest of the child, child participation, non-discrimination, survival and development and prevent and respond to violence against and abuse, neglect and exploitation of children in all settings.
- Children involved in or affected by armed conflict, natural disasters or other emergency situations benefit from specific, appropriate and well coordinated child protection measures provided by governments, civil society and international organizations involved in humanitarian actions.

---

<sup>193</sup> Why effective national child protection systems are needed. Save the Children's key recommendations on response to the UN Secretary-General's Study on Violence against Children (2006)

<sup>194</sup> Building rights based national child protection systems: a concept paper to support Save the Children's work (2010)

## Purpose and scope of the evaluation

The purpose of this study is to evaluate Save the Children Sweden's international work with strengthening National Child Protection Systems, (NCPS as described in the SC Concept Paper) and the impact on children's protection, as defined by SCS 2009-2012 objectives. This task is requested by the board of Save the Children Sweden.

The scope of the study is SCS's global and regional (including country level) and the work to strengthen NCPS, 2006-2010, with special focus on SCS's advocacy work. During the period 2006-2010 the internal SC process to unite into what today has become the Save the Children International Programme changed the landscape in terms of leading thematic coordination among SC members.

Global Initiatives are the new platforms for collaboration and Save the Children Sweden is leading the Child Protection Initiative (CPI). The process to establish the CPI will not be covered by this study. The Study will not cover efforts to strengthen child protection systems in emergency situations.

## Objective and key evaluation questions

The objective of the evaluation is to provide SCS with lessons learned, recommendations and suggestions on a way forward to further strengthen SCS work with NCPS in line with UNVAC recommendations. The following key evaluation questions should be covered by the evaluation:

To access through selected examples how SCS advocacy work and capacity building of governmental and non-governmental actors impacted on the establishment or strengthening of:

- Laws or policy provisions for prohibition all forms of corporal and all other forms of humiliating punishment and sexual abuse and exploitation.
- Lead government department or agency with responsibility for the coordination of child protection across government.
- Effective monitoring, referral and response system for survivors of sexual and/or physical violence in place.
- Child-friendly procedures and/or programs, including opportunities for children to be heard in judicial and administrative proceedings affecting the child.
- Community protection services addressing forms of discrimination and ensuring the meaningful participation of children and their families in formulating such services.
- To what extent have the identified development, as a result of SCS intervention, been supported or hindered/challenged through external factors.
- To what extent do development changes accord with the planned results of the intervention, in relation to objectives in thematic development/programme plans, and 2009-2012 objectives in SCS strategic plans.
- What deviations towards objectives in thematic development/programme plans and SCS objectives 2009-2012 can be seen, and what are the reasons for these deviations?
- What resources have been used for the interventions (project-costs at country level)?
- Could the interventions be implemented with fewer resources without reducing the quality of or quantity of the results? (country level)
- How has SCS ensured that the intervention is consistent with stakeholders needs and priorities? (country level)
- How has SCS ensured that the interventions are complementary to other SC members interventions? (country level)
- Are requirements of local ownership satisfied? How has children participated in the planning and implementation of the intervention and influenced the outcome?
- Outline lessons learned from implementation of the interventions and recommendations.

## Methodology and review process

- Review of SCS documents: annual plans and reports from HQ and regional offices.
- Interview with staff at SCS International Program Department and selected regional offices.
- Visit one regional offices (suggestions: ECAF)
- Visit SCS's partners in the selected country and appropriate governmental bodies.
- Interviews with UNICEF, other SC members and other child protection actors in the selected country.
- Interviews with coordinator and former members of the advisory group to the UNVAC study.

## Organization , roles and responsibilities

Project manager: Eva Bellander, International department, Thematic Section.

Reference group: Eva Geidenmark, Vibeke Jørgensen, International department, Tove Strömstedt, Finance Department,

The report will be presented to SCS Senior Management Team, and approved by SCS board.

## Deliverables

A detailed plan for the evaluation to be approved by the project manager.

Draft to be presented 1<sup>st</sup> of October 2011.

A final report not exceeding 40 pages to be presented on the 15<sup>th</sup> of October 2011. The final report should contain the following headings:

### a) Title Page

Name of program / project being evaluated, location of the project/ program, date of evaluation, one line description of the evaluation and the name (and/or the institute) of the evaluator, and acknowledgements

### b) Table of Contents and List of Acronyms

### c) Executive Summary

A brief description of the context and the thematic area, the objectives of the evaluation, the methodology used; key findings and conclusions, recommendations and lessons learnt

### d) Background and program description

A description goals, objectives, indicators and key activities for SCS work with the recommendations of the UNVAC study.

### e) Rationale: scope and purpose of the evaluation

Explaining why the evaluation is being conducted and how the results will be used, as well as clearly identifying the geographic and thematic coverage

### f) Methods

### g) Findings

A description of the findings against the objective and key evaluation questions.

### h) Conclusions

Conclusions derived from the findings that are consistent with the data and methodology used

### i) Recommendations

### j) Lessons Learned

Both positive lessons and on-going challenges

### k) Annexes

Example annexes might include the project results framework or logframe; the evaluation TOR; the evaluation schedule; the list of people interviewed; data collection tools; bibliography and list of documents reviewed.

## Plan for Dissemination and learning

The results of the report will be presented to the board of SCS and will inform continuous work of the follow up of the UN study on violence against children.

## VIII.8 Bibliography

Cayanan, Eva Maria, *Update on the Follow-up to the UN Study on Violence against Children in the Southeast Asia and Pacific Region*, Save the Children Sweden, 2010.

*Contribution Towards the Alliance Annual Report 2010*, 2010.

*Framework for National Child Protection Systems in Kenya*, May 2011.

International Save the Children Alliance, *A Common Responsibility: The role of community-based child protection groups in protecting children from sexual abuse and exploitation*, Discussion Paper, 2008.

Metodología Eventos Sub-regionales, Borrador, undated.

Movimiento Mundial por la Infancia, *Eventos Sub Regionales Para Dar Seguimiento a las Recomendaciones del Estudio UNVAC en la Región de América Latina y el Caribe*, Borrador de Nota Conceptual, Buenos Aires, 21 junio 2010.

Movimiento Mundial por la Infancia, Secretaría Nacional de la Niñez y la Adolescencia, Presidencia de la República del Paraguay, *Hoja de Ruta Para Contribuir a la Realización del Derecho de los niños, las niñas y adolescentes a la protección contro todo tipo de violencia en Sudamérica*, Producto del Proceso del: Encuentro Sudamericano de Seguimiento al Estudio de las Naciones Unidas sobre la Violencia contra los Niños, las Niñas y Adolescentes, Asunción, 28 y 29 Abril 2011.

NGO Advisory Council, undated.

NGO Group for the CRC, Working Group on Children and Violence, *Talking Points*, Meeting with Marta Santos Pais, SRSG/VAC, 16 June 2009.

Nilsson, Mali, *Narrative Report on Save the Children Sweden's Involvement with the UN Study on Violence against Children*, Save the Children Sweden, March 2011.

Pinheiro, Paulo Sérgio, *World Report on Violence Against Children*, Published by the United Nations Secretary-General's Study on Violence Against Children, 2006.

Plan International, Save the Children, Unicef, *Mapping and Assessing Child Protection Systems in West and Central Africa, A five-country analysis paper*, Child Frontiers, June 2011.

Plan International, Save the Children, Unicef, World Vision International, *Policy and Programming Resource Guide for Child Protection Systems Strengthening in Sub-Saharan Africa, Resource guide*, undated.

*Precisión Sobre Los Contenidos, Alcances y Limitaciones del Mapeo Encargado por el MMI-CLAC Para el Evento Sub-regional América del Sur*, undated.

Rädda Barnen (Save the Children Sweden), *Thematic Programme Plan, Protection – National child protection systems, Eastern and Central Africa, 2009-2012*, 7 December 2009.

Rädda Barnen (Save the Children Sweden), *Thematic Strategic Framework 2009-2012, Children's Right to Protection*, International Programme, 19 March 2008.

Save the Children, *2010 Baseline study on National Child Protection Systems in South Africa, Swaziland and Zambia*, 2010.

Save the Children, *A 'Rough Guide' to Child Protection Systems*, undated.

Save the Children, *Child Protection: Taking action against all forms of abuse, neglect, violence and exploitation*, 2010.

Save the Children, *Child Protection Initiative, Taking action against all forms of abuse, neglect, exploitation and violence*, April 2011.

Save the Children, *Protecting Children in South Africa from Violence, Abuse, Neglect and Exploitation, Baseline 2010: National Child Protection System in South Africa*, 2010.

Save the Children, *Protecting Children in Swaziland from Violence, Abuse, Neglect and Exploitation, Baseline 2010: National Child Protection System in Swaziland*, 2010.

Save the Children, *Protecting Children in Zambia from Violence, Abuse, Neglect and Exploitation, Baseline 2010: National Child Protection System in Zambia*, 2010.

Save the Children, *Regional Office of South and Central Asia*, undated.

Save the Children, *Stepping Up Child Protection: An assessment of Child Protection Systems from all countries in South Asia, including reflections from Central Asia*, Kathmandu, 2010.

Save the Children, *Why Effective National Child Protection Systems are Needed, Save the Children's key recommendations in response to the UN Secretary-General's Study on Violence against Children*, 2006.

Save the Children Child Protection Initiative, *Advocacy Strategy, 2010-2015*.

Save the Children Child Protection Initiative, *Building Rights-based National Child Protection Systems: A concept paper to support Save the Children's work*, 2010.

Save the Children Child Protection Initiative, *Child Protection: Making a difference in children's lives*, May 2011.

Save the Children Child Protection Initiative, *Day of Action to End All Forms of Violence Against Children, Concept Paper*, undated.

Save the Children Child Protection Initiative, *Keys to Protect David From Violence, The Role of National Child Protection Systems*, 2011.

Save the Children Southeast Asia and the Pacific, *Regional Consultation on the Child Protection Initiative, Pre-Consultation Survey, Summary of Findings*, Bangkok, Thailand, 28-29 September 2009, Bangkok, 2009.

Save the Children Southeast Asia and the Pacific, *Southeast Asia Pacific Consultation on the Child Protection Initiative (CPI), Report of Proceedings*, Bangkok, Thailand, 28-29 September 2009, Bangkok, 2009.

Save the Children Sweden, *Annual Report 2006*, Eastern and Central Africa, Nairobi, 2007.

Save the Children Sweden, Eastern and Central Africa (ECAf), *Annual Report 2010*, Nairobi, undated.

Save the Children Sweden, Eastern and Central Africa (ECAf), *Summary Annual Report 2009*, Nairobi, undated.

Save the Children Sweden, Eastern and Central African Regional Office (ECAf), *Annual Plan 2010*, Nairobi, undated.

Save the Children Sweden, *Final Regional Baseline Synthesis Report for Save the Children Sweden's Eastern and Central Africa Regional Office*, Cathy Chames, Nana Davies, Dena Lomofsky and Tracey Phillips, Southern Hemisphere, April 2011.

Save the Children Sweden, *Plan of Action 2006*, Eastern and Central Africa, Nairobi, 2006.

Save the Children Sweden, *Plan of Action 2007*, Eastern and Central African Region, Revised January 2007, Nairobi, 2006.

Save the Children Sweden, *Plan of Action 2008*, Eastern and Central Africa, Revised January 2008, Nairobi, 2008.

Save the Children Sweden, *Plan of Action 2009*, ECAf Regional Office, Nairobi, 25 February 2009.

Save the Children Sweden, *Regional Juvenile Justice Network, 4th Annual Meeting, Record of Proceedings, Kampala, 29-30 November 2006*, undated.

South American Meeting for Follow-up on the United Nations Report on Violence Against Children and Adolescents, *Executive Summary, Mapping the Implementation of the Recommendations of the Global Study on Violence Against Children*, Asunción, 28-29 April 2011.

*The 5th Annual East and Central Africa (ECAf) Regional Juvenile Justice Network Meeting, Report of the Proceedings, Mombasa, Kenya, 24-25 October 2007, Report prepared by Ezan Mwiluki, ANPPCAN Kenya, Revised by Tina Ojuka of Save the Children Sweden*, undated.

The Columbia Group for Children in Adversity, *An Ethnographic Study of Community-based Child Protection Mechanisms and Their Linkage with the National Child Protection System of Sierra Leone*, 25 July 2011.

*Update from LAM*, undated.

*WAf Update Work to Follow-up the UN Study on Violence against Children*, undated.