

# **Basic Training Module on Key Humanitarian Standards: Sphere, INEE, LEGS, SEEP and CPMS**

## **Trainers notes**

**Version December 2013**

**This brief training module was developed jointly by representatives from CPMS, INEE, LEGS, MERS and the Sphere Project. Please send any comments on the Powerpoint or the trainers notes to the respective standard-setting initiatives or to [info@sphereproject.org](mailto:info@sphereproject.org)**

## Introduction

The Sphere minimum standards have from the outset focused on key life-saving areas of humanitarian response - that is: water supply, sanitation and hygiene promotion; food security and nutrition; shelter, settlement and non-food items; and health action.

However crucial the above-mentioned areas are, they do not exhaust the components of the humanitarian response to disaster and conflict. The Sphere Project has therefore recognized a series of standards produced by other organizations and networks active in specific sectors as companion standards to its own Handbook, *Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards in Humanitarian Response*.

Companion standards share the rights-based approach and are developed in a broad consultative and consensus-based manner. Through the companionship approach, they become formally related and cross-reference each other where feasible and promote complementarity between sectors. They are meant to provide humanitarian professionals with a harmonised set of quality standards that are easy to use and refer to. In doing so, these standards contribute to the broader goal of a better quality and accountable humanitarian response that considers humanitarian needs in a comprehensive way.

### **The Sphere Project has signed companionship agreements with**

- The Child Protection Working Group (CPWG, part of the Global Protection Cluster) for the **Minimum Standards for Child Protection in Humanitarian Action (CPMS)** (<http://cpwg.net/minimum-standards/>)
- The Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies, INEE, for the **INEE Minimum Standards for Education: Preparedness, Response, Recovery** ([www.ineesite.org](http://www.ineesite.org))
- The Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards Project for the **Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards (LEGS)** ([www.livestock-emergency.net](http://www.livestock-emergency.net))
- The Small Enterprise Education and Promotion (SEEP) Network for the **Minimum Standards on Economic Recovery (MERS)** ([www.seepnetwork.org/mers](http://www.seepnetwork.org/mers))

## Examples of cross-sectoral linkages:

Over time, the companionship approach has evolved into an informal standards network, with numerous cross-sectoral linkages among all Companion standards. It is these linkages that are important to recognise at all stages of a response, from preparedness to recovery.

**LEGS and Sphere:** Humanitarian actors need to be aware of the importance livestock has for many affected populations – and should where possible include planning for the care, shelter and support of livestock as part of their response

**INEE and Sphere:** School feeding programmes should follow the INEE standards as well as Sphere standards on hygiene promotion and nutrition.

**MERS and Sphere:** Agencies working on livelihoods and income generation should work with both MERS and the livelihoods section in Sphere’s Food security chapter.

**Child Protection and the other Companion standards:** The four Sphere Protection Principles are included in the ten Child Protection principles. The CPMS also include standards linking child protection to eight other humanitarian sectors, including WASH, Health, Nutrition Shelter, Education and Economic recovery.

**INEE and Child Protection:** School provides a sense of routine and normalcy for children during times of conflict.

If they are safe and positive spaces, schools provide a venue for the monitoring and identification of psycho-social trauma and physical and emotional well-being. More broadly, child-friendly spaces can provide both pre-school alternatives and after-school activities within the education structures. However, at times when education activities have broken down or are not yet resumed, child-friendly spaces may provide the only school-age activities. However, CFSs sometimes tend to be a ‘one-size-fit-all’ solution for psychosocial support activities without considering if schools or other structures could work better.

If child protection is not prioritized in education environments, students are at risk of sexual violence, corporal punishment, bullying, and forced recruitment, all of which are heightened in times of emergency or conflict.

Schools may also be able to provide important information for children increasing their ability to protect themselves and strengthening their resilience, like Mine Risk Education, information on where to seek child friendly medical or legal assistance etc.

**LEGS and protection:** The current edition of the LEGS Handbook has four cross-cutting issues, one of which is ‘protection and security’. In the forthcoming second edition (2014), one of the four cross-cutting themes is ‘protection’, which focuses on protection issues relating specifically to livestock interventions, while linkages are made with the Sphere Handbook’s Protection Principles and with the CPMS.

**LEGS and MERS:** LEGS and MERS complement each other. LEGS is complementary to MERS, to the extent that MERS provides guidance for analyzing and supporting livelihoods and related market processes and promotes the protection of existing markets. MERS-based livelihoods assessments may conclude that livestock are a significant part of the livelihoods of affected communities. LEGS contains tools and guidance to help in the design and implementation of livestock-based interventions to help ensure that they are timely and appropriate. MERS provides guidance on market assessments and cash transfer programmes that can inform livestock-related interventions as well as other livelihoods-based activities.

## **Minimum Standards for Child Protection in Humanitarian Action (CPMS)**

### **Child Protection in Emergencies**

CPiE can be defined as “the prevention of and response to abuse, neglect, exploitation of and violence against children in emergencies”. Emergencies often have disastrous effects on children, resulting in girls and boys being killed or injured, becoming orphaned, becoming separated from their families, being recruited into armed forces or groups, being sexually abused, becoming children with disabilities, being trafficked or experiencing several of these at the same time. In practice, child protection work includes specific programmes run by child protection specialists, as well as actions integrated into all other humanitarian sectors.

### **About the Child Protection Working Group**

The Child Protection Working Group (CPWG) is the global level forum for coordination and collaboration on child protection in humanitarian settings. The group brings together NGOs, UN agencies, academics and other partners. The CPWG led the development process of the CPMS and provides on-going support to the application and use of the CPMS.

### **About the CPMS**

The CPMS set out a common agreement on what needs to be achieved in order for child protection in emergency settings to be of adequate quality. The handbook contains 26 standards and 6 principles (10 including the CRC Principles). Each standard is accompanied by key actions, measurements (including indicators and targets), and guidance notes. In addition to addressing child protection needs and strategies, the CPMS contains 8 standards on mainstreaming child protection into other sectors (health, education, shelter, etc.)

### **Aims of the CPMS**

Establish common principles amongst those working in child protection, and to strengthen coordination between them

Improve the quality of child protection programming, and its impact for children

Improve accountability within child protection work

Further define the professional field of child protection

Provide a synthesis of good practice and learning to date

Enable better advocacy and communication on child protection risks, needs and responses.

### **Usage of the CPMS**

The CPMS can be used to plan and cost humanitarian interventions, to monitor and evaluate quality and effectiveness, to train staff and partner organisations, to enable advocacy on child protection issues and to support those working in other sectors of humanitarian action to protect children better.

The Handbook, launched in October 2012 and currently available in 6 languages, has been rolled out in a number of countries and regions, through the country-based child protection sub-clusters and government partners.

## **Education in Emergencies, INEE and INEE Minimum Standards**

### **Education in Emergencies**

Education is a fundamental human right. Education is critical for the tens of millions of children and youth affected by conflict and disasters, and yet it is often significantly disrupted in emergency situations, denying learners the transformative effects of quality education. In emergency situations through to recovery, quality education provides physical, psychosocial and cognitive protection that can both sustain and save lives.

### **About INEE**

The **Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE)** was established in 2000 to improve inter-agency communication and collaboration within the context of education in emergencies. INEE is an open, global, network of NGOs, UN agencies, donors, practitioners, researchers and individuals from affected populations working together within a humanitarian and development framework to ensure the right to quality education in emergencies and post-crisis reconstruction.

### **INEE Minimum Standards: Preparedness, Response, Recovery**

The INEE Minimum Standards Handbook was developed in 2004 through a highly consultative process involving over 2,250 educationalists from over 50 countries. The handbook was updated in 2010 through consultations with over 1,300 individuals.

The INEE MS are derived from human rights and specifically from the right to education, as expressed in key human rights documents and from Sphere's Humanitarian Charter.

The INEE MS are the only global tool that articulates the minimum level of educational quality and access in education policy and programming. The aim of the Handbook is:

- to enhance the quality of educational response in all stages of emergency response: prevention, preparedness, response, recovery and into long-term development
- to increase access to safe and relevant learning opportunities for all learners
- to ensure accountability and strong coordination in the provision of education policy and programming.

### **Usage of the INEE Minimum Standards**

The Handbook, now available in 22 languages, has been used in over 110 countries to strengthen education policies and programming.

A 2012 assessment of the INEE MS, which surveyed over 700 educationalists, found the MS to be widely used at both the international and country level to support advocacy for the recognition of education as a key humanitarian response, in disaster and preparedness planning, monitoring and evaluation and capacity building and trainings.

The INEE MS are also frequently used for proposal development, project design and in coordination efforts.

# **Livelihoods-based Livestock Interventions in Emergencies and LEGS**

## **Livelihoods and Livestock in Emergencies**

There is growing recognition that emergency responses need to take into account the livelihoods of the affected populations and that interventions should include *saving livelihoods* as well as *saving lives*. One billion people depend on livestock for their livelihoods, food security and nutrition, and many of them are vulnerable to disasters.

Protecting and rebuilding livestock assets in emergencies can help to maintain and protect livelihoods for both the short and the long term.

## **The Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards (LEGS)**

The LEGS Project grew out of concerns about repeated cycles of inappropriate and badly implemented livestock relief projects in emergencies; limited impact assessment; and weak coordination between development and emergency interventions.

The LEGS Steering Group (made up of representatives of a range of organisations including the United Nations, the African Union and Tufts University) facilitated a process of broad consultation with practitioners and policy makers followed by the commissioning of authors for each technical chapter.

LEGS draws on the international framework of human rights, in particular the right to food and the right to a standard of living.

The aim of LEGS is to support the saving of lives and the saving of livelihoods through two key strategies:

- Assist in the identification of most appropriate livestock-related technical interventions in emergencies.
- Provide standards, indicators and guidance notes for these interventions based on good practice.

LEGS also includes practical tools to assist in the identification and prioritisation of appropriate and timely responses in emergencies, based on participatory methodologies.

The LEGS Project receives both cash and in-kind support from a range of donors and remains independent of any single organisation.

## **Uptake of LEGS**

LEGS is available in English, French, Spanish and Arabic, via the website (soft copies) and for hard copy purchase (Arabic due in late 2013).

The LEGS Training Programme uses regional Training of Trainers courses to train LEGS Trainers (there are currently 260 LEGS Trainers in Africa, Asia and Latin America). To-date, these LEGS Trainers have carried out 126 LEGS Trainings in 26 countries, independently of the LEGS Project.

Practitioners such as NGOs like CARE, Save the Children, Trócaire and VSF use LEGS to support their project design and implementation. LEGS is also increasingly used by international agencies such as FAO (the Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations), and the European Union's Humanitarian Agency (ECHO) as a benchmark for assessing funding proposals and evaluating programmes.

## The Minimum Economic Recovery Standards (MERS)

Increasingly, practitioners and donors who respond to disasters recognize the need for rapid, tailored support for the livelihoods, enterprises, and economies affected in the wake of a crisis. This support is often in parallel with emergency efforts to meet basic human needs for shelter, water, food, and health services. In the past, economic recovery assistance has often been viewed as a later-stage activity.

However, disasters—such as the 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami, the prolonged conflicts in the Middle East and South Asia, and the 2010 Haiti earthquake—illustrate that an economy continues to function during a crisis, albeit at a reduced or shrinking rate of growth. Affected populations require sources of income, at a minimum to survive and at best to thrive once again.

Over the course of three years, the Minimum Economic Recovery Standards were sponsored by SEEP and developed by joint efforts of more than 60 discrete agencies, with several hundred individuals contributing or providing feedback to the Standards.

The MERS represent a consensus across agencies engaged in economic recovery and development on what constitutes an effective and appropriate response to help disaster-affected populations gain fair access to viable economic opportunities, allowing them to regain their livelihoods and provide for themselves and their families with dignity.

In order to ensure sustained and long-term economic recovery from crisis, the Minimum Economic Recovery Standards need to become just as integral a part of the development and implementation of humanitarian assistance. As the Sphere Guidelines are “common standards” and do not address economic recovery programming, the Minimum Economic Recovery Standards were developed, in coordination with the Sphere Project, to address this gap.

The standards highlight strategies designed to promote **financial services, productive assets, employment, and enterprise development** among livelihoods in areas affected by conflict or disaster. In putting forth these standards, SEEP aims to improve the capabilities and accountability of humanitarian and economic practitioners.

For more information, please visit: [www.seepnetwork.org/mers](http://www.seepnetwork.org/mers)

### **About The SEEP Network**

Established in 1985, The SEEP Network is a global network of over 130 international practitioner organizations dedicated to combating poverty through promoting inclusive markets and financial systems. SEEP represents the largest and most diverse network of its kind, comprised of international development organizations and global, regional, and country-level practitioner networks that promote market development and financial inclusion. Members are active in 170 countries and support nearly 90 million entrepreneurs and their families.

## The Sphere Handbook

The Sphere Project was created in response to the need for improved quality and for a rights-based humanitarian approach. Established in 1997 and governed by a Board of NGO representatives, the Sphere Project is not a membership organisation. Rather, it is today a vibrant community of humanitarian response practitioners worldwide. Developed through a broad consultative and consensus-based process across agencies engaged in humanitarian response, the Handbook enjoys broad ownership by NGOs and UN agencies for proposal writing and throughout the programme cycle. Numerous governments include the standards in their disaster law and policies and in their function as donors.

The Sphere Handbook – available in over 20 languages – is a widely known and recognised set of common principles and evidence-based universal minimum standards which articulate the minimum level of services for a quality response respecting the rights and the dignity of people affected by disaster and conflict. The Handbook covers four life-saving areas:

- Water supply, sanitation and hygiene promotion,
- Food security and nutrition,
- Shelter, settlement and non-food items,
- Health action.

### **The right to life with dignity**

Sphere places the rights of disaster affected populations to life with dignity, humanitarian assistance and protection and security at the center of humanitarian response. The Minimum Standards are an expression of these rights. They support humanitarian actors to continuously strive for more quality and accountability in humanitarian response towards affected populations, their constituents and donors.

The Sphere Handbook consists of a Humanitarian Charter, Protection principles, Core Standards and technical standards.

The **Humanitarian Charter** is the cornerstone of the Sphere Handbook. It contains the principles and beliefs – based on international law – which are paramount in guiding humanitarian organisations in humanitarian response and summarises the most fundamental rights involved in humanitarian response.

The **Protection Principles** give guidance on how to take a protection-sensitive approach to humanitarian work and how to respect the rights of people affected by disasters and conflict.

The **Core Standards** describe the processes which should inform any humanitarian response in order to provide a response in a spirit of quality and accountability to the affected populations

The **technical standards** describe the minimum level of services in the four sectors mentioned above. Upholding these standards will ensure that people to survive and recover in stable conditions and with dignity. Each standard is made of Minimum standards, key actions, key indicators and guidance notes.

The Handbook also includes cross-cutting issues: children, disaster risk reduction, environment, gender, HIV and AIDs, older people, persons with disabilities, and psychosocial support. It also considers other important issues such as climate change and early recovery.