Annual Meeting
Education Cluster and Child Protection Working Group
Geneva, October 29-31, 2013

MEETING REPORT
Annual Meeting Education Cluster and Child Protection Working Group

Meeting Objectives

- to strengthen links and collaboration between Child Protection and Education;
- to facilitate dialogue and learning amongst field based coordinators and practitioners, international organizations, academics and donors on emerging issues and identify areas for further learning; and
- to ensure a mid-term review of the respective work plans.

Participants

This visionary meeting of the global Education Cluster and Child Protection Working Group (CPWG) attracted 132 participants from around the world including Ministry of Education representatives from Mali and the Central African Republic; country level Cluster coordinators / focal points for Child Protection and Education; a wide range of organizations, including Catholic Relief Services (CRS), CESVI, Child Frontiers, Child Fund Alliance, Child Helpline, Danish Refugee Council (DRC), Education for All (EFA), Family for Every Child, Finn Church Aid (FCA), GenCap, Geneva Call, International Rescue Committee (IRC), ICRC, ILO, the Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE), Islamic Relief Worldwide, NORCAP, the Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC), the Open Society Foundation (OSF), Plan International, Refugee Education Trust (RET), Refugee Point, Save the Children (SC), SOS Children’s Villages, Terre des hommes, UNESCO-IIEP, UNHCR, UNICEF, War Child Holland, Watchlist, Women’s Refugee Commission, World Vision International; donor agencies; independent consultants; academic partners at the Child Protection in Crisis network and the University of KwaZulu Natal; and the global level teams of the Education Cluster Unit (ECU) and the CPWG.

Throughout the report the following symbol will be used to find additional information (presentations, reference documents) on the shared Dropbox and Box: 
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Day 1 – Tuesday October 29

Welcome and opening
Ellen van Kalmthout, Katy Barnett, Sabine Rakotomalala & Landon Newby

During the 2012 global Education Cluster meeting it was decided to prioritise collaboration with other clusters. The links between education and child protection sectors are many and strong, as they both focus on children and adolescents in emergencies. The organization of a joint global Education Cluster and Child Protection Working Group (CPWG) annual meeting was seen as a good opportunity to formalize and strengthen the more ad hoc efforts towards their rapprochement.

These three days brought together in a single place much expertise -- from national, regional and global levels. Throughout the sessions, we will constantly keep in mind the situation in the field and reflect on how to ensure a more conclusive and efficient response in order to reach the affected and most vulnerable children in emergencies.

The agenda for this meeting has been developed based on the responses received from a survey that was sent to practitioners of both sectors earlier this year.

Global Updates
Katy Barnett & James Sparkes

Both Cluster work plans were presented, as it was a great opportunity to inform, update on progress, share learning but also to prompt cross-fertilization between both sectors in the future.

Common improvements achieved by both groups over the last year are:

- Improved support to the field through Rapid Response Teams (RRT) and direct and global supports.
- Following the Transformative Agenda (TA), there has been a big push for more integration within and between clusters. As a result, there are now a number of fora where global clusters come together to work on the TA and common tools that can be then tailored when responding to emergencies, especially around Information Management (IM).
- Inter-agency technical guidance has been strengthened, enabling more time to focus on elements of coordination.
- The global cross-cluster unit is beginning to provide supports.
- Co-leadership has been strengthened, and more is taking place at the country level.
- Partners are increasingly seeing the benefits that cluster work can bring, and thus intensifying their investment in those processes.
- Greater visibility of Child Protection (CP) & Education in emergencies within humanitarian response as a result of advocacy (particularly over Syria).

Education Cluster Update

- Update on changes to the Education Cluster unit, with more focus on communications (new website and newsletter)
- In the four areas of work:
  - Capacity development
  - Knowledge & Information Management
Field Operations has seen a continued expansion of RRT and deployments, with 14 crises supported and over 570 days spent in the field this year.

**Strategy & Advocacy**

- **Challenges:**
  - Funding limits the support unit’s capacity for outreach; want to be more proactive;
  - Want to support more in-country advocacy;
  - Short IM deployable capacity.

Next year the focus will be on:

- Changes in Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) protocols.
- Maintain and intensify the efforts towards professionalisation of humanitarian coordination.
- Developing the strategic plan for 2015 and beyond.

**Child Protection Working Group Update**

The 2013-2015 Work Plan is ambitious and covers needs and interests of the overall group, where tasks are taken by different members or associates with the support of the CPWG support unit. The work plan is framed by the *Minimum Standards for the Protection of Children in Humanitarian Action* (CPMS). $3.2 million of funding flowed through the CPWG this year, from four main donors. In-kind donations and funds channelled directly to partners were also substantial.

The main achievements in 2013 are:

1. **CPMS and programming:**
   - 1a. Introduce and implement CPMS
   - 1b. Improve programming, including progress on the following standards:
     - 1) UASC: standard UASC registration forms and Alternative Care in Emergencies toolkit finalized; UASC Handbook in final stages of completion.
     - 2) Case Management: case management guidelines and training materials developed through Task Force and piloted in a number of countries.
2. Improve coordination: on-going, with increased time of RRT members in-country and providing remote support. Update and disseminate a starter pack for field based coordinators and hold an updated global coordination training.
3. Improve capacity: Supporting development and piloting of seven packages stemming from various task groups; using new ways of reaching practitioners through technology; and developing the post-graduate diploma in Child Protection in Emergencies (CPiE) which is now in the second phase of curriculum development.
4. Strengthen Assessment & Measurement.
5. Advocacy.

**Questions and comments from the floor:**

- Need to discuss Child Friendly Spaces (CFS) jointly from CP & Education perspectives and to resolve tensions as far as possible. It’s an important issue for donors, too.
- Need to have more discussion on peace-building, education and advocacy.
- CPWG also looks at technical areas/quality; whereas the Education Cluster focuses on coordination and Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE) more than technical programming issues.
- Must increase focus on children “outside of the (Education) system,” but many are outside of schooling before the emergency. Need to clarify who is responsible for identifying and working on solutions.
Panel on Changing Humanitarian Landscape
Mark Canavera (facilitator)

Robert Smith (OCHA) on how humanitarian crisis patterns and responses are changing
Food insecurity crises are increasing. In 2002-2003, 30 Appeals out of 39 were conflict related and five were specifically about food security. Ten years later, 17 out of 40 were conflict, six purely food security while the others were mixed. While there is currently a relative decline of conflict-based emergencies, it might not be permanent. We are seeing a general increase of response capacity and early warning in conflict-affected areas by government and civil society. There are more humanitarian actors (Korea, Brazil, Germany, etc.), and more countries are joining the ranks of large economies. However, national governments are more often determining what type of international help they wish to receive and how it should be done, even if they sometimes overestimate their capacities. In this landscape, the Transformative Agenda (TA) is to make sure the humanitarian community does its job (accountability, responsibility). OCHA’s priority is to help the system to have good leaders and coordinators on the ground and make sure they have the adequate training, tools and authority to use them. The different sectors need to put the required importance on consistent program cycle management based on reliable and comprehensive data in relation to the identified needs.

Key ideas prompted by the presentation:
- How can affected communities hold sectors to account?
- Prioritisation exercises in countries lead to CP & Education coming last.
- How to marry the top-down ability to deliver humanitarian response with the need to engage communities contextually / develop partnership approaches?

Q: How do we talk about resilience when clusters are only operational during crisis?
A: Structures that exist in a more normal and development setting, like a sectoral working group, should be used to pursue resilience building and preparedness. One issue is that funding schemes for preparedness and resilience are still very weak and it falls between the cracks. There is a need to work with humanitarian donors and to influence the part of the system in place for non-crisis settings. With the general increase of disaster vulnerability, clusters and humanitarian response will continue to be predominant until preparedness and resilience capacities are really on board. Some progress has been achieved on this but much is to be done.

Heather MacLeod (WVI) on why technology and the networked world link to the humanitarian world
We are living in a networked age and humanitarian actors need to engage with it more fully and without fear. If they avoid doing so, they will become irrelevant. Cash-based programming is a good example, since the use of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) eliminates the middlemen. Reflecting around the ways of working with volunteers and the diaspora using more effectively social media is another way forward. Taking advantage of the place and role of technology while continuing to draw on the engagement and interaction with the affected population would ensure that the work environment doesn’t become only a virtual world.

Key ideas prompted by the presentation:
- How do we use technology to empower beneficiaries?
- Feedback mechanisms using technology with community must be explored.
- UNHCR uses text message to register refugees for services.
- Social media removes (our) control; how can we capitalize on that to empower communities?
- Proliferation of complex humanitarian structures while people in need can use social media to communicate with diaspora and others.
- Capacity Building in using technology, including government counterparts.
• Considering the risks of using technology.
• How to work at a cluster level to influence cash transfer consortia in emergencies to promote CP & Education outcomes?
• Cash-assistance: work with governments as entry points to better use resources.

Q: How can we make the best use of technologies? How to use technologies to empower beneficiaries? Are we even on the technology (express) train?
A: The train is moving and we need to decide whether to catch it. The humanitarian industry, and we as individuals, needs to be part of this fast train. Consult the section on Ethics of Humanitarianism in the Networked Age by OCHA and the most recent World Disasters report from ICRC has a chapter on ICT. Reflection should evolve around what is our collective strategy to address ICT, and are the right people at the discussion table?

Aninia Nadig (Sphere) on how the role of Standards is evolving and changing humanitarian work
Professionalisation is about managing complexity with more predictability in diverse environments. Standards should be considered as benchmarks and not certification of work, as they provide guidance towards response and accountability, as well as coherence among partners, phases of response and processes. There is a need to ask ourselves if the use of Standards helps improving the work and is not instead a veil to make the process even more complex, and if compliance kills creativity. To maintain meaningfulness, the Standards must be referred to consistently. Standards seem to be common sense and straightforward, but there is a need for clear commitment when using them. Using the standards collaboratively could change the power dynamics and perception of being top-down when considering them as an expression of rights. The recent meeting in Istanbul of all eight Sphere Companion Standards was a great opportunity for future collaboration.

Key ideas prompted by the presentation:
• What is the link between INEE and CPMS?
• Would it possible to create peer network amongst governments to support Standards?
• The government’s involvement in monitoring Standards should increase their application.

Q: How can the bottom-up mechanism work for monitoring Standards?
A: They are very good tools for empowering a bottom-up approach and should be developed as inclusively as possible. The challenge is for ownership to be wide. Volunteerism has a role, indeed many of us started there; it allows for close work with individual children.

Guilhem Ravier (ICRC) on the changes in the environment for protection and the professional standards of protection work
The revised version of the Protection Standards was released earlier this year. These standards, which received consensus amongst humanitarian organizations, hope to contribute to the professionalization of the work and maximize the impact of the response while minimizing the impact of the crisis. The revision was prompted by the presence of new actors in the field (such as peacekeepers), non-state actors taking greater role (how should humanitarian and human resources (HR) actors relate to them?), the increased use of new ICT (management of personal information, guidance for ICT developers), the greater desire of emergency-affected communities to be involved in humanitarian response, and the improvement of assessments. These standards can be used to reflect on our practice but also orientate the response. Finally, they are also relevant to non-protection actors, in particular the section on data management and monitoring.

Key ideas prompted by the presentation:
• Food insecurity – protection issue complementary to resilience and response.
- New humanitarian drivers and global protection structures challenge “universalism” – the need to contextualize Standards to ensure relevance.

**Q: How do big agency politics / power struggle play out in Standard setting?**

**A:** Their experience was very collaborative and open to wide agency consultation. For example, UNHCR participated fully and owned the final document.

**Market Place**

Following the plenary discussion, a Market Place was held. This was buzzing and vibrant, as any great market would be. Below, the list of agencies that presented during the two hours. All materials can be found on the drop box.

**Education and Child Protection global and field coordination groups:**

A.1 CP Working Group - Jordan
A.2 CP Sub Cluster - Pakistan
A.3 Education Cluster - Pakistan
A.4 Education Cluster - DRC
A.5 Education Cluster - Mali
A.6 Education Cluster - Somalia
A.7 Education Cluster - South Sudan
A.8 Global Education Cluster
A.9 Global CPWG - Child labor Task Force
A.10 Global CPWG - Case management Task Force
A.11 Global CPWG - CPMS Task Force
A.12 IA CP IMS Steering Committee - IA CP IMS

**Initiatives by Child Protection partner organizations:**

B.7 UNICEF - HQ
B.8 UNICEF - WCAR
B.9 UNICEF - Uganda
C.1 Child Helpline International
C.2 IRC
C.3 Plan International
C.4 RefugeePoint
C.5 UNHCR
C.6 UNICEF – Uganda
C.7 Watchlist on Children and Armed Conflict
C.8 World Vision International / CU
C.9 CESVI

**Initiatives by Education partner organizations:**

B.1 Education for All
B.2 Education for all
B.3 INEE
B.4 INEE
B.5 UNESCO - IIEP
B.6 UNICEF - EAPRO

**General humanitarian Initiatives:**

D.1 ACAPS
D.2 IASC - GENCAP
D.3 OCHA
D.4 RRT-IMS

**Achieving CP & Education Outcomes through Economic Strengthening**

**Josh Chaffin**

Economic Strengthening (ES) is based specifically on livelihood programs. There is a lot of rigorous evidence on livelihood programs’ outcomes, challenges and research gaps that focus on household economic strengthening and working with older children and youth. ES programs focusing on caregivers through improved health, nutrition, and living standards have had many positive outcomes such as greater attendance in school, better living conditions, less “at-risk” or vulnerable children and lower incidence of depression and risky sexual behaviour. While there is no evidence at this stage in emergency contexts, studies found that cash transfer programs have many positive impacts on children and youth in development settings but also produce negative outcomes on parental behaviour in relation to incentives provided at community levels and with payment of school fees for examples.

Looking at ES programs through CP lenses helps to identify key modalities to put in place and monitor in order to avoid inverted benefits in relation to school attendance, Gender-Based Violence (GBV) issues, child labour, etc. An
example from the Population Council study on GBV states that girls were more likely to be harassed if they participated in individual capital programs while this could be mitigated by group capital programs.

In general, ES programming is an after-thought of humanitarian programming but should be instead considered from the inception of the programs. Multi-sectoral, integrated ES programming is known to be a stronger delivery model.

Gaps in research:
- Role of gender in ES programs;
- Cash and children in humanitarian settings;
- Longer term impact of cash transfers on children;
- Monitoring of outcomes and the use of indicators of ES programs on CP & Education; and
- Impact of livelihood and economic programs on keeping families together.

A study and toolkit have been developed on how to maximize benefits and minimize harm of ES programs on the protection of children. (Please see Key Principles in the ppt.) In particular, CP needs to build internal capacity in implementing and designing plans related to ES programs.

**Plenary session: Questions and comments:**
- How much training or expertise does a CP or Education person need to do ES programs?
  Experts are needed in ES interventions but people, such as programme managers, can be trained to incorporate it at the design and planning stages. The biggest impediment to success is the low understanding of the village economy and its processes. Field staff need to increase communication with local businesses, community needs, and find out what challenges exist.
- Income-generating activities can increase child labour in certain circumstances (household businesses etc.). Difficult to see a way around it as ethical and cultural opinions crop up. Need to sensitize households and communities about this problem (SIDA study).
- Financial education is seen as a necessary component to any ES work, especially when there is direct interaction with children who are beneficiaries. A review of the quality of existing financial education is needed.
- Income-generating projects and activities are regarded as peace-work – mainly home-based. Possible to do this with PTAs and other platforms at community level.
- There is a need to have more research done on links between ES and CP programs.

**Evaluation of UNICEF as Cluster Lead Agency**

Hetty van Doorn (Avenir Analytics) & Reuben McCarthy (UNICEF)

The presentation is on the findings of the evaluation done by the independent consulting group Avenir Analytics. It tries to answer two questions: how is UNICEF doing as Cluster Lead Agency (CLA), and what to do to do better in the future? As a reminder, UNICEF is responsible for five clusters and Areas of Responsibility (AoRs): education, WASH, nutrition, Child Protection and GBV. We were asked to bear in mind: do the recommendations resonate within your work and how should these be taken forward?

*The presentation followed the [powerpoint](#) very closely and thus will not be presented in depth in the following.*

**Key findings on external coordination performance:**
- UNICEF was found effective at country level in coordination with a high level of satisfaction from partners.
Thematic and geographical coverage has increased. But handover from cluster coordination to sector coordination remains a challenge, even if UNICEF was successful in involving the government and national authorities.

Transparency was the least developed partnership principle. On the global level, UNICEF has developed much guidance, but at country level it is very dependent on the skills of the country representative.

**Key findings on internal cluster lead agency performance:**
- Role of regional offices remain unclear even though coordination is in their mandate. There is no performance review system in place; reporting by the country is voluntary.
- 72% of cluster coordinators are double-hatting; this is linked to how clusters are activated. Some partners see it as strength while others find it more difficult to work with a double-hatting person.

**Key findings on human resources performance:**
- The development of the Rapid Response Team (RRT, average five people by cluster) made a huge difference in surge capacity. But the Department of Human Resources (DHR) roster is not working so well for various reasons (lots of retirees on the roster, no incentives to take coordination roles). Both technical and coordination (soft) skills are important, but strong technical skills alone are not enough to be in a coordinator’s role.
- 50% of cluster coordinators are recruited through stand-by partner rosters and RRT, and 50% locally recruited on short-term and Special Service Agreement (SSA) contracts.

**Key findings on scope and boundaries:**
Clusters are increasingly filling gaps beyond emergency coordination. Deactivation mechanisms and procedures are inadequate. There were cases where the government felt more comfortable having an ongoing coordination mechanism in place. But what do you do when there is no authority to hand the coordination over to? Finally, it wasn’t clear what the role of cluster is in supporting the local government capacity development -- where does it start? How much effort to put into that?

**Key findings on cost effectiveness:**
Cross-cluster coordination is generally insufficient, even if there are good examples of education and child protection collaboration and joint planning.
Day 2 – Wednesday October 30

The group was welcomed back with a reminder that the purpose of the parallel sessions is for the two sectors to look at common challenges and opportunities. Listing key action points from each session will be capital to move forward collaboratively and consistently.

Based on the report from eyes and ears of Day 1: While recognizing affective achievements in the areas of linkages between CP & Education sectors, Gender and Information Management (including during the Market Place) requires more focus and attention should be given to the following during further sessions and discussion:

- Gender equality remains a key priority for CP;
- Grounding programmes on evidence through the Programme Management Cycle;
- Monitoring of impact including of livelihoods programs need to be considered from the beginning, so we need to focus in on what indicators on child well-being and education outcomes we deem important;
- Need to align IM tools between the two sectors.

### Theme 01: Advocacy and Funding

**Katy Barnett, Ellen van Kalmthout, Anna Barrett & Solene Edouard**

Presentation of brief overview of advocacy and funding in the CP sector (see ppt):

- Global Protection Cluster (GPC) study on funding of protection 2007-2012 highlights once more the lack of funding, where education is the only sector that received less.
- The main conclusions regarding donors are the lack of a simple conceptual framework for the protection sector, quality of protection programming, need of better outcome evaluation and reporting and increase emphasis on mainstreaming.
- The lack of understanding of what is CP and CP system continues to be a big challenge.
- A funding handbook on CP and GBV sectors will be available soon.

Presentation of brief overview of advocacy and funding in the Education sector (see ppt):

- Global advocacy has put a lot of importance around the post-2015 agenda. Education Cannot Wait (ECW) provides a good platform for further advocacy opportunities. Education in Emergencies (EiE) partners dedicated much effort around the event in UN GA, the Education Cannot Wait framework.
- There is still a tendency on how donors perceive education in emergencies while OCHA is showing growing interest. Education has shown drops of funding on the Financial Tracking Service (FTS).

Presentation of successful advocacy strategy from South Sudan Education Cluster (see ppt).

Discussion of lessons learned, good practices and opportunities for advocacy and funding:

- All humanitarian actors need to contribute to increase the focus on protection, including advocacy, within own organisations and multi-sectoral or integrated programming.
- Need to use the Transformative Agenda (TA) as an opportunity (within its framework for integration) for advocacy using terminology and language understood by all.
- Advocacy should be practical, using our sectors as entry points and showing results-based evidence of positive impacts on children.
- Should invite donors to the field to witness achievements and challenges we are facing and holding a donors’ conference.
- Need to advocate for increased humanitarian funding and approach non-traditional donors.
• Need to change the way of tapping into development funding, such as World Bank.
• We need to advocate to be present (together) where decisions are made – from or before “day one.”
• Think in a different light.
• Need to find and collect existing research of good practices, more rigorous academic research to help make the case.
• Budget for and do impact assessments after every intervention as Food Security and Livelihoods (FSL) is currently doing.
• Map at which levels funds are raised and not raised in order to differentiate our strategies for the different levels (community, cluster, country, donor capital).
• Messaging should differentiate for different audiences.
• Need to think in a way outsiders from our sectors can respond to, framing the advocacy in terms of children and adolescents’ wellbeing, etc. and not limiting to CP & Education.
• Provide guidance to the field on making the case differently, including elements of discussion in the funding handbook (e.g. 10%, 10%, 80%; Q&A standard questions on fundraising, etc.).
• Research successful programmes which we can showcase (get impact studies funded and / or get the research funded) and make this evidence bank available to implementers for their fundraising (E.g. pooled fund for impact studies; approach global challenge fund; use neuroscience evidence e.g. from the States; predictive as well as responsive evidence; focus on integrated programmes).
• Projecting how many children we could reach if we had double the funding, and then making a business case.

Discussion on collaboration between CP & Education sectors:
• Document and share good practice of collaboration happening between both sectors, such as in South Sudan.
• Look at joint coordinated advocacy between CP & Education, as well as linking with other sectors.
• Advocate and organize joint trainings / meetings especially at field level, including joint community of practices.
• Enlarge focus of CPWG Advocacy Task Force to include education issues (joint advocacy Task Force). Link with Strategic Advisory Group (SAG) for follow-up.
• Country-level guidance around areas of intersection to explore for advocacy in practical areas (e.g. schools are not safe – CP & Education intersection).
• Propose to change to “Children and Youth” Cluster with links up humanitarian and development sides, CP & Education, children and youth wellbeing.
• Evaluate programmes that integrate CP & Education i.e. Somalia where education was a platform to deliver and access other services.
• Integrate CP & Education into OCHA’s tipping point analysis.

Theme 02: Working with Government and Managing the Transition Process
James Sparkes & Tina Fischer

The session looked at the key steps in planning and implementing the transition process from a formally activated cluster system to a government-led or alternative model. A key part of this process -- how do we measure government’s capacities -- was also tackled.

Presentations (see resources) outlined:
• How government capacity (including emergency capacity) and government engagement (especially in conflict) can influence the transition process.
• The linkages with government for both the CP & Education sectors were discussed with a focus on not just linking UN, NGO and government, but also fostering the inter-government linkages between ministries (especially the National Disaster Authority).

oPt case study on Education: Stijn Wouters (UNICEF) & Peter Hyll-Larsen (Consultant)
This case study outlined how the Education Cluster considered transition after the Humanitarian Country Team (HCT) directed all clusters to evaluate the relevance of the cluster system in oPt. An overview of the situation in oPt described it as a protection crisis with humanitarian elements.
• In March 2013, the Cluster commissioned a report that reviewed the mandate and arrangements as well as the gains that had been made, with the aim of making recommendations on the possible transition outside the Cluster structure. A consultation with a wide range of stakeholders was conducted and the following a set of three options presented as the recommendations.
• So far, progress on transition has been slow. The plans are for: a capacity assessment of the ministries, a contingency planning workshop with a strong process; the recruitment of an Education Coordinator with expertise in capacity building and institutional reform; and the ongoing reform of the sector’s Education Working Group. They are looking at a two-year timeline for the transition, but little global guidance has been provided to date.

The Philippines case study on Child Protection (Jesus Far)
The country suffers 20-25 typhoons per year, plus ongoing conflict and other possible disasters. The CP sub-cluster is co-led between the government and UNICEF, with close links on advocacy and programming with GBV.
• They have identified seven steps to transitioning, including a review of national legislation to identify existing structures whose mandates could include CPiE.
• Key learning was identified and ways forward mapped out.

Q&A:
• Q. How to understand and maximize communication channels of government counterparts?
  There is a need to ensure that the mapping of government and other national partners is done from the outset and not as part of the transition, and that it searches widely. It is very challenging when a government’s commitment is weak and that local structures are dysfunctional. Funding for it has to be budgeted at that local level.
• Q. It appears easier to activate than dis-activate Clusters. Thus can we think of de-activation before children’s issues have been resolved?
  A. Absolutely. Indeed, identifying triggers for deactivation should be part of initial discussions. Also, there are many variations and contexts, and thus we need to accept that there are multiple appropriate models.
• Q. Do politically sensitive issues affect transition?
  A. The Cluster might not be the place to discuss everything, and it is understandable to have other fora. There might be key issues that need to continue to be monitored or dealt with by the international community.
• Q. In the Philippines example, is there an MoU with government that is broken down by levels?
  A. Not at the moment. However, there were road maps that were signed off at very high level. Example from Myanmar of on-going Education Sector Working Group has a task group on emergencies.
• Q. What are the roles of donors in transition processes?
  A. They are often in advance with their timelines.

More discussion was done around the following issues:
What are the key steps in planning and implementing transition?
Government Capacity – what and how to do we measure it?
What are the challenges and issues when clusters look at transition?

**Theme 03: Needs and Capacities Assessment**
Lauren Burns (ECU, Save the Children), Elaine Jepsen (RRT CPWG), Joa Keis (Save the Children), Jean Mège (RRT CPWG), Landon Newby (RRT Education Cluster) & Katherine Williamson (Save the Children)

Katherine Williamson opened the session by saying that during the humanitarian landscape session it was highlighted good data and evidence is needed for good and contextualized programming. Needs Assessment is therefore essential. Although there has been a lot of progress towards the development of guidance and tools and to help with the collection of good data, there are still issues that will be discussed during the session. The Needs Assessment session was framed around the following case studies from Mali, Syria and CAR to discuss successes and challenges of four different aspects of assessments as follows:

1. **Secondary Data Review (SDR)**
The first thing to do is find out what has been already collected. This is essential before even selecting your indicators. You need to think about what you want to collect. Secondary Data Review is capital and can save time, energy and money. In CAR, they had to plan a response without being able to go out and collect primary data in the field, so response was based on secondary data review. All information (from sitreps, websites, etc.) was compiled in a database, which allowed defining what the gaps were.

**Q&A:**
**Inter-cluster collaboration:**
- **Q. Did CP reached out to the Education Cluster (EC) in Syria for desk review, and did EC reach out to CP in Mali?**
  - A. The work couldn’t have been done better in Mali, but the CP sub-cluster wasn’t up and running when EC did their assessment. In Syria, CP used some of the education pre-crisis data.

**Timeline for SDR:** In Syria, given the sensitive context, the variety of sources of information and the credibility of the sources of information, they needed time to do a report. In CAR, the Education Cluster did the secondary data review quickly (within a week) but didn’t produce a report. SDR never really stops -- you do it intensively when you plan your primary data collection, but you keep on looking at secondary data throughout the management cycle.

**Strategic Planning:** The importance of strategic planning and the need of an integrated strategic planning with other sectors was reminded.
- **Q. When do you start the strategic planning?**
  - A. Discussion around strategic planning starts during SDR when people share information and start talking to each other.

2. **Implementation of the assessment**
A presentation of the Child Protection Rapid Assessment (CPRA) toolkit and the Short Guide to Rapid Education Joint Needs Assessments were presented. In Syria, CP identified key informants to have sample populations. Finally data needs to be triangulated. The CPRA is a positive example of how tools can be designed with full awareness of gender.

**Pilot Assessment:** They are different types of assessment: multi-sectoral assessment, MIRA assessment, cluster-specific assessment. The main lessons learned regard the need to pilot the assessment tools and train the enumerators to ensure that the wording of questions is not problematic and that contextualization is suitable. It will save much time by resulting in clean data.
Logistics: It requires money to do an assessment! Budget allocation in advance is capital (gas, SIM card, etc.), but also consider the bureaucracy around budget allocation. In many countries, sorting such issues as safety of collecting data and security aspects has delayed launching the assessment in the field. In Lebanon, the assessment was led by an NGO, World Vision, and procedures were more flexible. The panelists shared additional challenges and lessons learned during the implementation of an assessment: When getting the buy-in on reporting at the initial stage, some agencies don’t want too many details while others really want it in the report. Managing expectations is important, in particular in context where access is difficult. Don’t make promises!

Q&A:
Timeline: It depends on the context. For instance in CAR, they needed information quickly, so they did a rapid assessment with sample of schools (about 10%) and talked to inspectors who supervise 20 schools rather than going to each of the schools. In some cases when the assessment has a very big scope, it is important to have a dedicated assessment coordinator which will reduce the timeline. Nevertheless, in many cases it has been challenging to keep-up to the time-line.
Involvement of children: Make sure that voices of children are included in the needs assessment (NA).
Preparedness:
- Q. Are there any good examples of preparedness, as it helps doing a good assessment?
- It should to be part of all country contingency planning including the adaptation of the prepared tools and sharing them with the government. In Kenya, they trained government staff in advance in case violence would emerge after the election. They also asked agencies to pre-approve trained staff to be released quickly if needed. Inter-clusters at global level are developing a set of indicators.

3. Analysis and reporting, use of information for the development of strategies
Data entry and cleaning takes an enormous amount of time. Budgeting to have a team of trained people who will enter data can save time. University students are good at excel. Doing data entry in the same room is a good idea when possible. The sensitivity of the data should also help to decide who should be in charge of the data entry.

Q&A:
Mobile data collection: it saves time and money on data entry. There are less data errors and risks of losing the data since they are stored on the server. But you have to take time to train your enumerators. In Mali, they are looking at possibilities to do their next NA using the new technologies, and the same in Somalia.
Use of data:
- Q. Does data need to be presented to donors, and do they need to agree the data can be rolled out?
  Discussion is on-going at the global level on support to be provided in terms of advocacy within countries. In Syria, the context was really sensitive, so they didn’t use the findings for open advocacy but did quiet and closed-door advocacy. In Mali, they use the NA report for political dialogue.

4. Collaboration between education and child protection
- Q. How can the two sectors better collaborate in NA?
  The EC worked with CP and shared data to prioritize schools in Mali while in Ethiopia Education, CP and GBV shared tools and worked together. But more dialogue throughout the whole process should happen in the future. We are all working towards more integrated strategic planning across clusters, so we need to work out on how to better integrate assessment.
Major Emergencies

Mali crisis
The shift from development to emergencies has been a big challenge for all sectors and actors in Mali. Mali is no longer a Level 2 emergency, even though it is getting more complex. After an update, this session discussed the issues of funding and complementarity between the two sectors.

Child Protection
National level CP & GBV sub-clusters exist under the Protection Cluster; working groups are active on coordination tasks (i.e. strategy). Two sub-national coordination structures exist but are supported remotely. Education might be coordinated through the Protection Cluster. Some of the main identified needs: unexploded ordnance (UXOs), Mental Health and Psychosocial Support (MHPSS), Children Associated with Armed Forces and Armed Groups (CAAFAG), Unaccompanied and Separated Children (UASC) (that might have some linkage with CAAFAG). Actors are moving towards an interagency case management model that will capture all forms of vulnerability and enable the teams to explore “proactive family separation.” Sexual violence numbers are hard to pin down; domestic violence is a problem. The coordination group is advocating on the many risks to children from the imminent massive peacekeeping deployment.

Jointly
Collaboration with Education has been ad hoc, prioritizing Mine Action in schools, training on MHPSS & Mine Risk Education (MRE), joint birth registration initiatives, discussing Consolidated Appeals Process (CAP) process, and others. Education and CP sectors agree that there is capacity within the civil society, but it is constrained by the development mentality and in some cases by politicisation. There is good HR to undertake effective mapping and assessing of existing structures, monitoring mechanisms, tools, etc. Accessing adequate funds would require bridging the humanitarian/development divide. Ministry of Education (MoE) believes that the Cluster has contributed channelling resources to the sector.

There are differing views on whether it is time to start the transition process. From its activation, the Education Cluster has framed its interventions on a phasing-out strategy. Co-leadership is the key pre-cursor of transitioning. CP has found that the government would benefit having more dedicated staff to coordination where secondment could be an option to consider but will require high level commitment to develop institutional capacities with the perspective of sustainability.

Syria crisis
Four groups discussed the following topics: Child Labour (Alyson); programming in urban host communities (Lotte); curriculum pressures inside Syria from various actors (Dean); non-formal education (in countries responding to the Syrian crisis (Rachel).

One common outcome was the agreement that there needs to be technical discussions happening at regional level that looks into all these issues. There is a need for follow-up to reach out to coordination and discussion across UNICEF, UNHCR etc. and take all these issues forward at regional and global levels. INEE is very interested in doing so in the MENA region (technical side - NFE).

Central African Republic crisis
Main issues for Child Protection by Katherine Williamson (Save the Children) and Jean Mège (RRT, Global Child Protection Working Group), see snapshot of CP needs △:

- Total lack of Child Protection system: how do we organise CP system with the government?
- Recruitment
• Gender-Based Violence (GBV)
• Early marriage (from the age of 12)
• Gender
• Recruitment: challenge to find good, French-speaking people. It is an issue for education as well (no UNICEF Chief of Education in CAR).

Presentation of the findings of the Education Needs Assessment report by Landon Newby (RRT, Global Education Cluster). The NA was done in August, but fighting broke out again which is not reflected in the report.

• 79% of schools still closed (86% were closed).
• Fear of violence: need to support livelihood, and girl exploitation prevented students from returning to school. There were already fewer girls in school pre-coup, but even less after because of sexual exploitation.
• School infrastructure is poor.
• Attacks on schools (64% were looted).

Fear of violence is a clear link between Child Protection and Education sectors. There is a general sense (even if not measured) that parents take the argument of violence for not sending their kids back to school, even if there was no violence in the area they live in. Instead, they send their children to the field to support family livelihoods.

CAR is a country in chronic with low level of development. Lots of children were already excluded before the crisis. Reports from ICRC and IOM show an increase of CAR refugees crossing the border to Chad, and that’s a main concern making it also a cross-border issue. There is a need to consider that it’s the dry season and the nomadic population from Chad cross into North CAR with the potential risk of conflict.

Security is an issue. There are some provinces in CAR where there are no Child Protection and no Education actors. It is very difficult to prioritize, as we have no information but lots of provinces have been neglected for many years. There is a need to deepen local connections, with local groups to improve our response. Katherine Williamson (SC) mentioned that Catholic missions are very active, even during the coup (for instance, Catholic schools are open and stayed open during the fighting). Long-term lessons learned from Nepal were reminded: local actors have long-term relations with armed groups, so we need to think about how to extend support to those groups.

The representative of the Ministry of Education (MoE) in CAR highlighted that the events in the country severely affected the education system while it was already facing major challenges before the crisis. The MoE divided the country in two areas of teaching observation: the West (less or later affected by the fighting) where end-of-the-year exams were organised and where the new school year started early October (regular school year starts in September); and the East where they haven’t had the chance to organise end-of-the-year exams yet. Thanks to UNICEF support, the MoE succeeded in training 3,000 teachers and sent them back to the Eastern zone where classes slowly resumed and hopefully end-of-the-year exams will be organized in December and the new school year will start in January 2014. Schools were severely affected (either bombed or looted), and students and teachers were killed -- as well as two staff of international organisations. Mr. Ngoaka, while thanking the organisations that are currently supporting the country, requested nonetheless that there is a dire need for increased attention to the situation in CAR that experienced five coups since its independence. There is a need for peace and support to rebuild the education system and ensure the protection of all children.

The discussion was concluded by recognizing that some crises, such as Syria, get a lot of attention, but not CAR. The availability of data is important in order to think about solutions, and there is a need to be creative and consider both sectors. These solutions are important for a good advocacy campaign. For instance, CP & Education sectors
address the specific needs of children and adolescents, and this is seems to be better way forward than bringing up the life-saving argument.

**Theme 04: NGO Co-leadership**

Janis Ridsdel & James Sparkes

Save the Children undertook a mapping of where it co-leads clusters
This showed that the organisation was active in a number of different sectors and in many countries across Asia, Africa and Central America.

- Challenges: cluster members’ perceptions often links to capacity constraints.
- General consensus of those asked: benefits of co-leadership far outweigh the challenges.

**Plan International outlined why NGO Co-leadership**

- Advantages: strengthening connections in field, increased participation, accountability, and internal benefits for the organization – visibility and capacity (refer ppt).
- Need to ensure balance of co-leadership and “top-heavy” structure that affects programming.

**Child Protection and Education outline the many challenges of coordination in DRC**

Multi-faceted needs of children due to conflict and increasing human rights violations highlight the urgent needs to collaborate between Education and CP coordination groups.

- Co-leadership in DRC is going through a call for nominations and an application and selection process. Co-leadership is key in DRC due to the sheer size and geographical location of the country, the nature and complexity of the conflict, and the scope of violence and human rights violations communities face.

**Q&A/Comments in plenary:**

- **Q. Given the sheer number of clusters and sub-clusters in DRC, is it a dilution of Cluster roles and responsibilities or a decentralization of coordination?**
  - A. It is not a dilution but instead decentralization because the clusters at provincial and sub-provincial level have their own autonomy, despite the capacity, needs and scale of response in all provinces. Autonomy and ownership is very important given this particular context.
- **In Sudan, turnover of staff is so high within the government, NGOs and UN. A real benefit in Sudan has been a consistency and continuity in knowing who is whom due to co-leadership.**

- **Q. How are these roles and responsibilities covered or shared?**
  - A. Examples needed of MoUs/ToRs from other countries would be helpful. It can help to outline the responsibilities of co-leads and even members.
  - At country level, any NGO can step up to support and play a co-leadership role. It should be decided at country level where the Global level can provide guidance to analyse the accountability issue.

**Group Work discussion around the following issues:**

1. **What does it take to co-lead? (e.g. what resources, capacity)**
   - Three things: Agencies must be able to identify someone to play the role of Cluster Coordinator (CC) and it is important to give them the capacity to be able to fulfil this role. Their job description must have roles and responsibilities clearly outlined. Co-leads must have access to resources and good communication channels with the lead at country level but also with other cluster counterparts and especially with the global clusters.
   - There must be a strong commitment of high management at HQ/Global and country levels by both organizations where there is co-leadership. This will help resource mobilization as well as creating conducive environment for capacity building (CB). Commitment from leadership of organizations to provide not just technical capacity but be able to play a leadership also. CC training – presence of country reps, HCTs should
attend. A regular meeting with the Country Director is important, and their role highlighting cluster priorities at the HCT.

- Funding is capital. Capacity is needed; example of Zimbabwe. If local organisations are coordinating, assessing capacities must be done to take on these roles and responsibilities, while at the same time considering at transition.

2. *When is co-leadership a good idea? (e.g. pros and cons)*

- In the transition process, how do you integrate these issues – especially for national NGOs?
- Especially in an emergency, it is a good idea; but even after an emergency, why not continue it?
- Greater civil society voice and allows greater partnership to work together especially during an emergency.

3. *What are the implications of and for governments in NGO co-leadership?*

- NGO Co-leadership is key where there is politicization of aid, sensitive issues, and a need to maintain a humanitarian imperative with government’s partnership.
- Building capacity of government is the most important. Not building capacity of a person, but of the institution/system itself.

4. *What can you/your agency do to support/lead co-leadership?*

- Save the Children at a global level and at the GEC has demonstrated a strong commitment to support local NGOs to take on the co-leadership role.

**Theme 05: Training and capacity-building**

**Natalie McCauley, Anne Laure Rambaud & Arianna Sloat**

This session looked at the synergies and lessons learned across the two sectors as well as looking at the bigger picture of who is the target population and what are we trying to achieve and that capacity building goes beyond training alone.

**Update from Education**

- INEE - EC Eie Training Package (New module under development on conflict sensitive education; French translation)
- INEE mainstreaming training / workshops
- 3 whiteboard videos to be developed in 2014
- e-learning module (a bit dated, but hope to update it)
- Support to CB at the tertiary level
- INEE Minimum Standards (MS) contextualization since it leads to policy change and grappling with key concepts locally; institutionalization of the MS and checklist
- INEE toolkit [www.ineesite.org/toolkit](http://www.ineesite.org/toolkit)
- INEE hardcopy resources

**Update from Child Protection (CP)**

- Developing new IA (CPiE F2F in line with the CPMS - potentially e-learning course; CPRA, UASC, Coordination for CPiE in line with IASC 6 Functions of Coordination, Case management, Child Friendly Spaces with the PSS)
- Global and regional resource pool under development with specific emphasis on language diversity
- Country and regional level support of 16+ countries through: adapting and developing new training packages for country and regional level training; capacity assessments in partnership with national working groups, ensuring an evidence-based approach to the CB components in their strategies; good to use with donors.
• Post-graduate diploma in CPIE with UKZN
• E-learning and webinars: on-going with some delays due to IT support available
• Contextualisation workshops with CPMS Task Force.

Q&A:
• Q. How do we measure impact of trainings?
  It’s a huge challenge to measure. We do need to be clear about learning outcomes. Consistency of approach in measurement across all training packages; IM person is looking at measurement possibilities for the new packages.
• Q. Use of on-line products?
  INEE has Google analytics; e-course is not being used extensively. CP uses Dropboxes that can be monitored and updated as needed; the e-course and webinars are also not used extensively with some feedback from the field saying that they are not so accessible because of the access to internet. Suggestions made on phone apps and varying ways of circulating recorded webinars, e.g. MP3.
• Q. What about mentoring?
  CPWG is looking at how to include this more formally as it does happen already with the RRT and the CPWG focal points who coach and mentor daily with countries around the world. CP is also looking at developing a training session on coaching and mentoring for in-country managers. INEE has Focal Points in an ad hoc manner that can be coaches, tasked with following-up key points from training. A mentoring system is quite complex to set up; suggestions that this is needed at the field level.
• Q. Are we expanding the CPIE pool overall?
  CP is developing Regional and Global resource pools of trainers to assist in the development of capacity in key areas. There is a need to consider specialization combined with the practical field skills to deliver on the ground. INEE has had conversations with academics to provide a bridge to practical opportunities to practice. Child Protection in Crisis Network (CPC) has discovered that 10 or more academic bodies are developing Masters in CP (though not necessarily with emergencies). There is a need to build linkages with our colleagues who are not in emergencies, especially around Minimum Standards and Emergency Preparedness. CPC will conduct a global mapping exercise to identify the existing CP curriculums (entry, mid and senior levels) and gaps.
• Q. Is distance education being used widely?
  The International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP-UNESCO) has a course and is interested in hearing about others; it requires day/week over 10 weeks. Distance education is relatively easy to scale up and cheaper than flying people together. UNICEF commented that through their internal CP capacity mapping, they realised that there was a gap in CP staff with emergency experience. Based on these findings, the CP section is working with HR colleagues to identify capacity building opportunities for UNICEF staff and partners. UNICEF is also in the process of developing a global Child Protection web roster (includes external and internal candidates).

Synergies
There are synergies between sectors within child rights agencies. War Child Holland gave an example that they no longer have stand-alone education programming, but run it with other efforts.

Theme 06: Monitoring and Reporting Mechanisms
Saudamini Siegrist & Stijn Wouters

This was a mainly informational session which led to some discussion and little time was left to discuss action points. The Monitoring and Reporting Mechanism (MRM), its successes and current status was presented, as well
as the set of MRM tools developed by UNICEF, OSRSG, CAAC and DPKO to support the implementation and NGO engagement. To increase NGOs' engagement, Watchlist is currently developing an MRM resource pack specifically designed to inform NGO involvement in the MRM, which will be made accessible to all on their website.

In 1996, the Graca Machel Study¹ on the impact of armed conflict on children was submitted to the General Assembly and to the Security Council. The study called for UN system-wide enhanced engagement on behalf of conflict-affected children. The same year, UNICEF launched its 10-point anti-war agenda, aimed at preventing and responding to the worst atrocities faced by children in times of armed conflict.² In 1999, the Security Council (SC) adopted Resolution 1261, the first to address specifically the children and armed conflict agenda, thereby establishing the link between the involvement of children in armed conflict and the Council’s Peace and Security agenda. Subsequently, the Security Council has progressively operationalized the children and armed conflict agenda through the adoption of nine thematic resolutions.³ Furthermore, the Secretary-General has submitted twelve Global Annual Reports to the Security Council on Children and Armed Conflict, providing information on children in situations of armed conflict, in particular with regard to grave violations committed against children.

SC Resolution 1612, adopted in July 2005, calls for the immediate operationalization of a mechanism to monitor and report on six categories of grave violations against children in conflict affected countries, and endorses the framework for the MRM set out in the Secretary-General’s Fifth Report to the Security Council on Children and Armed Conflict of 2004 (SG/2005/72). Resolution 1612 also creates the Security Council Working Group on CAAC, which represents a significant global milestone as the first instance in which the Security Council created a sub-working group on a thematic human rights issue linked to the Council’s Peace and Security agenda.

When the MRM was established by Security Council Resolution 1612, the mechanism was triggered when a party to armed conflict was listed in the Secretary-General annual report on CAAC’s annexes for the recruitment and use of children by at least one armed force or armed group in a country situation. That trigger mechanism was later expanded to include listing for the violations of killing and maiming and/or sexual violence (SCR 1882 in 2009) and attacks against schools and hospitals (SCR 1998-2011). The new trigger on attacks on schools and hospitals is a good opportunity to bring together the CPIE and EIE communities. In International Humanitarian Law (IHL), hospitals are better protected than schools. It is thus important to find ways to enhance the protection of schools through the MRM. The Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack, formed in 2010, has recently produced interesting publications including a Study on Field Based Programmatic Measures to Protect Education from Attack, which is a currently proliferating in the world. Malala is an excellent advocate, and at the moment the issue gets an enormous amount of visibility. The Chief Prosecutor at the ICC, Queen Rania, Gordon Brown the special advisor to the UN Secretary-General on Education are other advocates.

The MRM is a groundbreaking opportunity to use our work at field level with children, teachers, principals to strengthen our collective work on monitoring and reporting, and to use this as an entry point to expand both programming and accountability work for children more globally.

UNICEF no longer fundraises for MRM, rather they fundraise for CAAC. In other words, they are using the MRM to leverage funding and programming on the child protection issues highlighted by the MRM. Also, in situations where the MRM is not formally mandated, the mechanism can still be used informally, e.g. oPt.

Palestine: In oPt the protection cluster, Child Protection sub cluster and Education cluster did a joint assessment on access to education, and started monitoring attacks on education and impeded education. The Education Cluster worked together with the MRM group to ensure that MRM information was used to inform programming responses. Mobile schools in trucks and measures to monitor and secure schools are programming initiatives that came out of this piece of work. CP colleagues trained the volunteers (Israeli and Palestinian) to help to monitor and ensure safety in schools, so that they were also able to contribute to the MRM. Out of this came Education under Occupation, a report on the protective presence project. In Gaza, there was an SMS project to support MRM work.

Sudan: The president has been indicted by the ICC and because of the sensitivity, the UN agencies and the INGOs are less quick to engage in the MRM and we have been thinking through what the different levels of engagement could be to enable some partnerships in the implementation of the MRM. There is a regional reporting mechanism for the LRA, where the lead responsibility is out of Uganda.

A series of four UN tools to support MRM implementation (on which the Watchlist resource pack partly draws) will shortly be available on a joint OSRS-CAAC-UNICEF-DPKO website: the MRM Guidelines, the MRM Best Practices Study, the MRM Field Manual and the MRM Training Toolkit, and a whole range of forthcoming publications will tackle the issue of attacks on education and further move the agenda forward.

**Theme 07: Information Management tools for coordination**

Jean Mege, Landon Newby & Gavin Wood

**Presentation: “I think therefore IM” by Gavin Woods:**
Gavin Woods explained the importance of IM for cluster and inter-cluster coordination. IM is present at all stages of the Humanitarian Programme Cycle (HPC), to measure the response throughout the whole process.

Good IM starts in preparedness, but after the onset of an emergency good IM discussion needs to happen during the strategic planning phase:

- Ensure that measurable outputs are identified and logically linked right through and up to the strategic level.
- Ensure plans integrate across sectors.
- Use the indicators registry, developed collectively by global clusters (available at https://ir.humanitarianresponse.info), as a starting point in those joint planning discussion.
- Agree how evidence should be presented and reported to inform decisions.
- Ensure tools are adapted to start collecting information from Day 1 (start small, plan for expansion). It is important to be realistic and to understand what external and internal factors are influencing your IM environment.

**Presentation: “Being a Tool – IM from data collection to graphic visualization” by Jean Mège & Landon Newby:**
When you don’t know which data to collect, you need to answer the following questions:

- What do you need to know to inform decision?
- What level of details is feasible / realistic?
- What level of details is useful (for analysis purpose)?
- What is our framework for data collection? Education and Child Protection use their respective Minimum Standards?

Types of information you will collect depend whether you have to inform the needs (secondary data, assessments, on-going situation monitoring), the response and/or coordination (contact list, meeting minutes, 3/4/5Ws). Information on needs and response can be aggregated into situation reports and dashboards. 3/4/5Ws is one of
the most important IM tools; it helps collecting data on the operational presence and once analysed, the data collected provide information on gaps, overlaps, performance.

Landon Newby and Jean Mège provided excel training on key features to prove you don’t need to be an excel expert, and that user-friendly tools exist:

- Format of database
- Hiding/unhiding
- Freezing panes
- Protecting/unprotecting
- Dropdown lists
- Offset validation
- Vlookup
- Filter
- Pivot Table

Additional information on excel training is available on the Education Cluster box.com folder, Communities of Practices (CoP) on Yammer and Youtube playlist.

Often partners don’t provide information. Sending a spread sheet by e-mail has proven over the years not to work. There is a need to train them and to inform the cluster partners of the value added when they inform about their activities. Maintaining contact with the partners is very important, allowing them to build their capacity and relationships at the same time. One participant flagged that partners also want to know about the outcomes (not only the outputs), so it needs to be measured, for example, through an impact assessment. Access to the 3W matrix is defined according to the context, but for some countries it’s available on the cluster website.

Jean Mège and Landon Newby showed participants how to turn data into shareable information: contact list, filtered 3W database, assessment report and snapshot, graphs and maps. Finally, Jean and Landon presented where to turn for help (see ppt). OCHA provides IM trainings in-country.
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Theme 08: DRR and Resilience
Janis Ridsdel, Benoit d’ Ansembourg & Anna Barrett

The session covered definitions, presentation from South Sudan and Bangladesh on building resilience, and relationship between CP and Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR).

- **The Resilience Approach** (see ppt)
  Resilience is nothing new – we need to find concrete, realistic, sustainable entry points of integrating Conflict and Disaster Risk Reduction (C/DRR) into our work and sector plans. DRR is about the context and systems or process that prevents and responds to disturbance, shocks (natural hazards) considering the capacity to deal with them. Climate change is no longer about mitigation but rather on adaptation. “Resilience” looks at multiple kinds of shocks – natural hazards, social, economic and ecological shocks. Capacity considers capacity, adaptation and transformation. There are challenges sensitising MoEs and other actors who have their own priorities. New concepts keep emerging, and resilience is a good way to streamline all these concepts – C/DRR, climate change adaptation, peacebuilding and Educational and Protection Responses.

- **EIE Building Resilience in South Sudan: Small solutions to big problems** (see ppt)
  Although it focused on the Education Cluster, it also applies to CP mechanisms. EiE is inherently resilience-building at different levels – individuals, community as well as national levels. Resilience includes protecting and nurturing a child’s cognitive abilities. Can EiE discourage resilience? It can – turnover of MoE, NGO, UN agency and INGO staff discourages ownership within community and programming, and can encourage reliance on short-term “patches” for chronic problems. A key recommendation is to start small and practical when building a resilience framework.

- **Let’s Go Out of the Box Building Resilience in EC Bangladesh** (see ppt)
  At the initial stage, the government of Bangladesh was completely against the cluster approach and nowadays it would not do without it. To some extent, leveraging the existence of an approved Coordination Forum like the EC during peace time and emergencies contributed in shifting their opinion.

- **DRR and CP** (see ppt)
  Analysis of risks and looking at specific measures that will mitigate risks is key to integrating DRR and CP. DRR connects CPIE with development Child Protection programmes by focusing attention not only on what protection risks children may face in emergencies, but also on the root causes of these risks. Targeted, risk-informed systems-strengthening supporting risk analysis for DRR and CP and trying to combine the indicators from DRR and CP to ensure practical RA and a targeted response.

  How can the two sectors work jointly?: develop mapping tools between CP/ED on community vulnerabilities, coping mechanisms, capacities etc. using a gender and inclusive lens; target community networks and parent teacher associations (PTAs); combine Education and CP messages into Communication for Development (C4D).

Theme 09: UASC
Mathilde Bienvenue, Megan Rock, Monika Sandvik-Nylund, Katharine Williamson & Alan Kikuchi White

An overview of the Inter-Agency Working Group (IAWG) on UASC that exist since 18 years was given. The following products were presented:
Finalised in 2013

New UASC IA registration forms and guidance note:

The two existing interagency registration forms have been updated. One of them is a rapid registration form, (“Registration form”) when time is urgent while the other, an extended form (“Extended registration form”), provides more detail. They were presented and tested to an interagency workshop of practitioners in Dakar in May 2013 and revised accordingly. It needs wide uptake now, and Guidance notes include minimum standards on consent, data protection, etc. There is no logo so that individual organizations or alliances of agencies in a setting could add theirs. They are available in Word and PDF, and Arabic, French and Spanish translations will be available by end of the year. They will be available through Dropbox and the www.cpwg.net. All members of the group are committed to using it. ICRC will promote its use internally but delegations can make their own decisions in the field. The prepositioning of the tool with fragile governments in 2014 will be discussed.

ACE toolkit:

It will be translated into French next year. The Alternative Care in Emergencies (ACE) Toolkit is designed to facilitate interagency planning and implementation of alternative care and related services for children separated from or unable to live with their families during and after an emergency. The Toolkit was developed to provide practical interagency guidance based on previous learning that can be quickly adapted in an emergency. http://resourcecentre.savethechildren.se/library/interagency-working-group-unaccompanied-and-separated-children-2013-alternative-care

Moving forward

Implementing the Guidelines for the Alternative Care of Children:

The handbook provides some documented, evaluated promising practices where Chapter 1 presents the guidelines and the structure, Chapter 11 introduces alternative care in emergencies, and Chapter 12 explores allies, advocacy and influencing governments. There is a strong focus on prevention. It is available in French, English and Russian, and more is underway. All of these resources, plus some video introductions, are available on the website. http://www.alternativecareguidelines.org/MovingForward/tabid/2798/language/en-GB/Default.aspx

Near completion/ in progress

Rapid FTR app:

It is a “faster paper” tool for FTR. The five driving concerns were: data security; usability with multiple mobile technologies; easy to set up and use; uses standard inter-agency (IA) registration forms; and links with case management systems. It will be updated to reflect the IA registration forms in the coming months. It is available on Android, Blackberry and off-line server. It is being piloted in Uganda and more recently since mid-2013 in South Sudan.

UASC field handbook and training materials:

After the disasters in Haiti and Pakistan, the handbook was commissioned to be user-friendly and up-to-date operationally. Its development took into account other normative tools, such as ACE, CPMS, UN Guidelines for the alternative care of children / Moving Forward, and IA Guiding Principles. It is divided into understanding and preparing for emergency response, immediate priorities in emergency responses, and programs for UASC in detail. It is a guide that is to be contextualized. There is an accompanying training package of ten modules that are stand-alone or integrated. It was piloted in May 2013 in Dakar, will be reviewed one final time by the group, and will be released in Spring 2014 and translated. It will be promoted as the key inter-agency handbook and training materials; you are encouraged to mix and match with other internal materials.

Q&A and updates:

• Q. The role of the government?
The Ugandan government endorsed its use, and it is being used with DRC refugees and children leaving LRA. It does involve a lot of training.

- **Q. How does it affect social workers’ approach with children?**
  They say that it is fast to use and that the children are really interested in the device but is a shift for the existing staff. Agency can monitor how well their staff is doing in the registration process.

- **Q. How will this be supported?**
  It is not just a downloaded app, but also some costs for training, database maintenance, manager, phones themselves, etc.

- **Q. Can a child be double-registered?**
  Yes, if they provide different information, but there are checks in place that show that a similar or same person’s details have been entered. There is a concern of the risk of registering children who don’t quite fit the categories.

- **Q. Is there a gap around reintegration guidance?**
  There is a need to ensure different perspectives there come together on that phase. It will be important to build awareness and strategy for use of the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) complaints mechanism that is coming.

Save the Children is looking at how to combine the new tools (including case management) for an effective roll-out. They will be building capacity on UASC in 8-10 countries.

ICRC raised the issue of whether and how far to harmonise with the debates and learning on “children on the move/migration.”

**Theme 10: Child Protection Systems in Emergencies**

*Mark Canavera & Pia Vraalsen* 🇬🇧

A PowerPoint presentation provided a brief introduction to what we know about CP systems in emergencies to date at a theoretical level as well as through research that was carried out last year by the CPC Network.

In recent years, there has been a gradual shift in thinking from working on Child Protection issues in independent silos to understanding them as inter-connected. Even though this shift has taken place, however, the translation of this into practical action has been more challenging. The question about implementation of this remains central: How can we work on protecting children with different needs through a system as opposed to only addressing specific risks in silos? Agencies certainly refer more to systems building now when they describe their work, but there is still a long way to go before we have internalized this and have a good understanding of what indeed this actually means. This is especially important for emergency workers as there is a proposition that emergencies can create opportunities for strengthening or reviewing child protection systems in a given context.

A discussion ensued about work on CP systems in camp environments in emergencies. It was argued that camps provide a unique environment where the CP systems that are built do not necessarily need to connect to the systems outside of the camp. There are examples, however, of where this has been challenged though. In Dadaab refugee camp in Kenya, for example, a mapping of the local CP system was undertaken going beyond the camp. Other countries could draw learning from this exercise. Similar work is underway in Rwanda.

**Participants explored the following questions:**

1. **What assumptions do international actors bring about the national child protection systems that they are entering?**
• Emergency settings vary – states function or not (i.e. in fragile states we assume the states are not functioning well), and community structures and capacities vary as well.
• Capacity versus capacity plus: How do we begin thinking about emergency capacity building as “added” capacity as a normal approach?
• CP systems are weak, if at all existent.
• CP systems are transferrable across contexts.
• The state is central to any CP system, and that is a good thing.
• CP systems are good.
• Systems should be about the protection of individual rights.
• Simplistic understanding of “community.”
• Informal versus the formal.
• People like community systems.
• This is an underlying / universal sense of reciprocity between the individual and the state.
• Systems building will be harder in emergencies.
• “We know better than national actors.”
• We assume that terms have universal meanings – i.e. child, community, system.
• Coordination and communication between government and UN agencies is not strong.

2. In instances where systems are believed to be weak/capacity low, how can agencies establish a dual process (providing the immediate assistance required WHILE using a systemic approach to ensure improved capacity, ownership and sustainability)?
• Coordination groups should develop their response plans based on national action plans.
• Before emergencies occur, encourage emergency preparedness planning.
• Instead of seeing the dual purpose (development and humanitarian) of some agencies as a problem, see it as an opportunity or asset.
• Increase the connectedness between the development and humanitarian branches of agencies.
• Add capacity plus outcome measures to the response plans.
• Have a grounded and ongoing understanding of the context as soon as possible, not as an afterthought.
• Engage with local and national actors as soon as possible; go beyond the “usual suspects.”
• Identify strategic areas for investment.
• Map the basic services available.
• Make direct links between DRR and CP systems strengthening more.
• Increase linkage with development actors and donors.
• See the language of resilience as an opportunity to bring in the dual approach.

Theme 11: MHPSS
Margriet Blaauw & Rachel McKinney 

Main points of discussion
The session started with a simulation of an earthquake; the group was broken up into teachers and children. This was to introduce Psychological First Aid. A presentation was then given on the IASC MHPSS Reference Group, its products, successes and challenges.

The four layers of the pyramid were presented which generated the following comments:
• Overall: MHPSS goes beyond CFSs. The different layers need to be defined and clarified within countries.
Annual Meeting Education Cluster and Child Protection Working Group

- 1st layer: IRC briefly presented the Healing Schools toolkit, which is a tool that can be used by teachers inside classrooms. The Safe Learning Spaces are much used in the Philippines.
- 2nd layer: There is growing evidence for depressed mothers that play groups have a strong impact. There is the need to think more how to define and measure these interventions.
- 3rd layer: There is still much confusion around this layer. In proposals, this may include everything from “centre d’écoute” in a village to “individual psychological support.” The IASC guidelines must be contextualized for countries.

The emerging framework for post-2015 puts importance on the measuring “learning outcomes.” Very little is on Child Protection or psychosocial support. Much advocacy needs to be done to ensure that Child Protection and/or psychosocial support is considered in the “learning outcome” indicators since it is currently absent.

Children should be seen more holistically. Donors are also funding towards more integrated programming (even within specific sector proposals), even if they have to “check the box” that a program is within one sector.

Many agencies are involved from a distance in referral and psychosocial support.
- Q. How can technical oversight be provided to these people/groups (e.g. teachers and people working on information management or monitoring)?
  More and more psychologists are training “lay people” (e.g. community staff or camp managers) on counselling (for example Cognitive Behaviour Therapy).
- Q. What is the role of the clusters in linking referral systems under Protection/CP & Education sectors to ensure children’s services are linked?
  The Child Protection Working Group (CPWG) has set up research on “hard to measure issues.” Much care needs to be taken on bringing together qualitative and quantitative research data. In terms of ethics the point was made that collecting data on MHPSS is questionable in emergency settings, and we still need to collect the evidence on what works and what does not. Randomized Control Trial is not the only research method that can be used; alternative methods should be explored (i.e. comparative studies). There is growing interest in a “waiting list” approach to research by staggering program implementation and introduce interventions at different phases.

Eye Movement Desensitization Reprogramming (EMDR) is a new area of programming that is coming up. This is a “quick fix” solution that is quite controversial – some practitioners believe that it does not take into account the person holistically. If there is no follow up/referral system in place it can be more detrimental. It is being presented at the IASC MHPSS Reference Group (RG) meeting and discussed in much detail.

**Theme 12: Adolescents & Youth falling between the cracks**
Lotte Claessens, Rachael Reilly & Barbara Zeus

The session started with a reminder of definitions of who are adolescents and youth (A&Y): adolescents are 10 to 19 years old; youth 15 to 24 years old; young people are 10 to 24 years old. Over 1.8 billion people worldwide are 10 to 24 years old. In crisis-context, A&Y are disproportionately affected. They face forced recruitment, trafficking, sexual violence, and inadequate assistance, limited access to post-primary education or skills training opportunities, few livelihood and wage-earning options. Yet they show great resilience, so why do they continue to fall through the cracks?
Presentation: “Protecting Returnee through Education in Burundi” by Barbara Zeus:
Barbara Zeus briefly presented Refugee Education Trust (RET) which aims to bridge the gaps between humanitarian and development assistance. RET project for A&Y in Burundi aimed to protect returnee through education. Dropping out of school is one of the challenges for education and difficulties faced by young returnees (for more details, see ppt). RET response focused on peaceful and sustainable reintegration of young returnees into mainstream secondary education (see ppt for detailed challenges and activities). In general, out-of-school returnee youth found it harder to reintegrate to the point that they recommended to their peers not to repatriate. Those in school had more solid plans for their own future and easily envision staying in their home country and helping rebuild it.

To take advantage of young people’s potential, A&Y must be included in the post-2015 agenda through: flexible and holistic planning to answer variety of needs as young people have different needs; real youth inclusion; enhancing and supporting youth leadership at all levels; results-oriented and evidence-based programming; increased funding; and more effective coordination and cross-sectoral action.

Presentation: “Because I am a Girl: in Double Jeopardy – Adolescent Girls in Disasters” by Lotte Claessens:
The Plan International report highlights key findings and recommendations. There is an increase in the number of disasters, thus increasing the number of affected people. Girls face double challenges: being young and being female. The burden of disasters adds more risks to their lives already rooted in discrimination and inequalities where services to boys are in general prioritized. The report illustrates that adolescents girl have specific needs in education, protection but also health. Adolescent girls greatly value education, protection from GBV and participation but still they are particularly invisible and the least funded sector. And if it is funded, education response and programmes target mainly young children, while gender-sensitive programmes target mainly adult women. The main recommendations from the report are: consulting adolescents’ girls in all stages of preparedness plan and in programme planning; collecting age disaggregated data; training and mobilizing female aid workers in emergency response; and including funding for GBV in emergency response. These elements were highlighted through an example of Plan’s response in Pakistan (floods) where the presence of female facilitators was a key factor for success.

Presentation on Youth and Livelihoods by Rachael Reilly:
Women’s Refugee Commission (WRC) project on economic programming for urban refugee youth (in Panama City, Cairo and Nairobi) aimed to bridge the gap between learning and earning. Youth are too often ignored in humanitarian programming and the fall between gap of adults and children. WRC has been focusing on livelihoods since 2006, on improving economic programming in humanitarian settings with targeted focus on gender and livelihoods to mitigate risks of GBV. WRC has also been focusing on urban refugees since 2011 because more than half of the world’s refugees and displaced persons live in urban areas, but there is too little attention paid to economic programming for them. (Guiding principles and main findings of the WRC project can be found in ppt.)

There is strong need for advocacy for A&Y which are: within our own organization and build cross-sectoral alliances (don’t work in silos); with host government for increased rights for refugees; with donors: to prioritize youth programming in all sectors; and with UN agencies -- some agencies are ahead, but in terms of refugees there are gaps for youth programming.

The main gaps identified on A&Y are the following:
- Need for disaggregated data: there is already improvement but need to do more. Mobile data collection could help with that.
- Definition – commonality across agencies: need to have the same definition for youth across organisations.
- Emergency Needs Assessment: Clusters should include more systematically A&Y in their needs assessment.
- No tools for secondary education.
• Only assessment of needs of A&Y and not of capacities.
• Adolescents programming for boys – focus on girls, but not at the expense of boys.
• Targeting/lack of awareness of youth programming models. NGOs sometimes do have programmes but at a small scale, so we need to scale up.
• Training and skills on youth programming (e.g. livelihoods): need for training for humanitarian staff on youth.
• Evidence gap -- good practices: lack of evidence-based data on success of livelihood programmes.
• Perceptions including negative ones, especially regarding adolescent boys. There is a blurred boundary – are adolescents, children or adults? There is a need to recognize that adolescents have capacities.
• Lack of government involvement.
• Inclusion of psychosocial support / emotional safety net as part of vulnerability assessment in view of economic programming.
• Lack of legal framework for youth and adolescents.

The Future of Humanitarian Action
Antonio Donini (Tufts University)

Main points of discussion
Main trends:
• The amount of humanitarian assistance is up in the last decade ($17 billion), but the principle of humanitarianism is more under threat.
• Crises are lasting longer and many are being left in limbo without sufficient resolution. It is clear that we are not good at resolving crisis. The military see the humanitarian community as irrelevant or a (minor) obstacle.
• While it is difficult to measure, the level of violence against humanitarian workers has increased in real terms. That has resulted in us being behind bigger and bigger walls.
• Increase in natural disasters, though some is down to better records.

Main areas to watch:
• Our historical model of humanitarian compassionate, charity; Western humanitarian orthodoxy / oligopoly and its discontents.
• Sovereignty, nationalism and the future of Humanitarian Action. This can be seen as a good thing when it is about rules and enforcement, however this poses a threat to the protective aspects of HA.
• Humanitarianism and power. There is an emergence of new model of states (such as China, India). Will governments increasingly be able to manipulate the humanitarian discourse?

What is next?
Politicization and manipulation of aid and humanitarian dialogue are here to stay. The huge growth in the industry is making it less agile and leadership is weak. Humanitarian growth has meant that it has levels of power: standards are rules of the game and “You can only join the club, if you play our way.” So that leaves a number of actors outside the humanitarian arena. There is a disconnect between the humanitarian narrative and the reality of humanitarian power. Can this be made more equal and modest? We remain very top-down.

Q&A:
• Q. If we accept that humanitarian principles developed in Europe at the same time that capitalism was expanding into other parts of the world, what are the long term implications? We need to understand the codes behind our actions and reveal and analyse them and decide what to do.
• Q. Is it system failure or a chance to re-boot?
  Humanitarianism viewed from Turkey or China looks very different. So is the current universalist
humanitarianism the best form, or is there room for poly-versal humanitarianisms?
• Q. How do you see the universality of IHL & International Human Rights Law (IHRL) in light of what you have
  presented?
  Historically, the development of laws has followed the evolution of societies. The perception of HR has changed
over the years. The world of Solferino is very different from the world of drones.
• Q. What is your idea about IASC setting up a Humanitarianism Task team?
  It has become more difficult to dissent and the lowest common denominator tends to prevail.
• Q. Would a strengths-based approach change things?
• Q. What are your thoughts on professionalization of humanitarian workers?
  The jury is still out on professionalization. He provided an example from MSF where the average age of field
worker has increased by 10 years. Generalists have street-smarts and learn by doing; they had great agency to
take decisions.
• Q. Reality of power (Machiavelli in Afghanistan)?
  The international intervention has re-empowered the warlords, who are the business elite. They will not be
able to deal with the other political elements and the massive youth blip coming.
• Q. Do humanitarians really understand and apply accountability?
  Consider the UN’s refusal to engage on the issue of technical mistakes that led to a cholera outbreak in Haiti.
• Q. Could you comment on citizen agency as a dynamic at play?
  Information now travels so fast in all directions. The court of public opinion is an important factor in
government decisions and it is shaped by different forces. The UN humanitarian wing has lost its independence;
it is much more embedded with the UN political wing. There was logic in keeping a firewall between the two.
Integrated missions make it very difficult to counter the received wisdom from HQ.
• Q. Is there more professionalism but less humanity in our work?
• Q. In Mali, should the clusters be involved beyond the emergency?
  Humanitarian system focuses on immediate needs alone. Is there another model? Why? When should the
development people be present? They are very reluctant to operate within a crisis. Humanitarians should focus
on primary and urgent needs; their agenda should not expand further as it often creates problems on the
ground.
• Q. Non-state actors (NSA) can have more acceptance, speed and resources than the (international)
humanitarian community. Can you comment on these scenarios?
  Developing the humanitarian discourse is part of the NSA maturation. It used to be that opposition groups had
political, military and development arms.

Theme 13: Family Interventions and ECD
Laura Boone & Charlotte Balfour-Poole

The sessions was framed by IRC through a broad overview around the critical role immediate caregivers play in the
protection and development of children (in providing a safe home, prioritizing survival and development needs
of children, and helping children mitigate the effects of harm) and research showing that children are likely to thrive
when they grow up in an environment that is safe and nurturing. There is a well-established evidence base around
the effectiveness of parenting skills intervention on reducing risk factors for child maltreatment, but this is mostly
coming from high income countries and is much less implemented and tested in low and middle-income countries
(LMIC) and humanitarian settings. And as such, there being a need to work with immediate caregivers to establish
an evidence-base on effective parenting programs in humanitarian settings. Some progress has been made towards this, and there is an opportunity for Child Protection and Education to work together on this.

A brief presentation was given by Mary Moran (child development specialist) on toxic stress. Evidence demonstrates that young children experiencing acute stress, such as many in emergency situations, will have long lasting impacts on cognitive development. One thing that mitigates this is a stable responsive caregiver. If parents are feeling insecure or unsafe, then children feel unsafe. In food insecure settings for example, research demonstrates that depressed mothers in comparison to non-depressed mother have children who are underweight or experience stunting.

Examples on ECD and parenting skills programs were given by WVI:

- Parenting program from Laos for children suffering from high levels of malnutrition. Using a mother-to-mother model, a 12-day intervention based on positive deviance and parenting support.
- Adolescent mothers program in Mexico providing peer support through time and targeted counseling in centers (not a family based intervention). The aim was to increase parenting skills and decrease the level of violence in the home.
- Conditional cash transfer program (from the state) in Colombia for children working in the mines. The families that attended the parenting programs received remittances. While the programming had some benefits for health outcomes, it was focusing mostly on the family environment without considering the broader contextual problems which were having an impact on the children.

Discussion:

- It would be useful to get a better understanding of which programs worked in development settings and that can be replicated in emergency settings.
- Programs that work best are integrated services that deal with parents and children together (e.g. relationships, feeding and stimulation).
- Long term support is essential in order to influence long-term behaviour of adults.
- Programs should not stigmatize parents/children but should be inclusive.
- Important to bring together Child Protection and education as this subject is about the child well-being and the intrinsic link between parent and child.
- Parenting programs often neglect the background to parenting problems. Often economic and other external stressors are not addressed.
- Parenting programs have to focus not only on the children but also on parents as people with their own right.
- The use of resilience framework is key and requires strengthening local assets and practices in addition to the prevention interventions.
- Through Early Childhood Development (ECD), it is important to strengthen the social system of the child that he/she can use throughout his/her life throughout different events.
- Programs where children have strong agency over the decisions affecting them (along with their family) have a strong impact.
- Strengthening social workforces is an intervention that has long term impacts.
- Parenting programs show a reduction in harsh disciplining (physical and emotional) and can be included in health or nutrition programs.
- Money is not enough! Research showed that a household economic strengthening intervention did contribute, for example, to higher spending on children but did not for example change disciplining practices. We cannot assume that an economic strengthening program will have an impact on child abuse, neglect and violence.
Kerstin Tebbe gave some background information on Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE) global consultations. INEE has global consultations every 4-5 years. Members get together to take stock on where we are going and what has been happening. In parallel, INEE is also checking on the network: does INEE have a role to play, is INEE still relevant and what will it look like in the coming years (strategic planning)? Previous consultations were held in 2000 in Geneva (launch of INEE), 2004 in Cape Town (launch of the INEE Minimum Standards), and in 2009 in Istanbul where discussion focused on conflict sensitive education. Today there are 10,000 members in the network.

The goal of the discussion was to get some feedback on the process for 2013-2014. Global consultations will start in the coming weeks with an online survey, and with regional consultation in 2014. INEE also would like members-driven consultations within countries and hopefully member will organise consultation within their own organisation. INEE will also use the consultations to develop its next strategic plan (2015-2017). The current plan was global-level focus, while the next one will be network-wide based.

The presentation was followed by an open discussion where participants asked questions or flagged issues. INEE has limited funds and capacity for now, so there has been a shift from a secretariat-driven to members-driven events. INEE Secretariat will support members in organizing regional or institutional events, by providing resources, templates. The final consultation will likely be in Manila, but it will be a smaller scale event due to funding constraints. INEE will work through various steps to allow a broad consultation and get qualitative data to be able to draft a strategic plan. The template is a tool for INEE to collect information, but it’s also a tool for individual members to reflect on their work and on what is important for their country and their organization. INEE hopes this process will feed into the work of the Education Cluster as the global Education Cluster will also develop its new strategic planning. INEE and the global Education Cluster still have to see where they come together, and the global Education Cluster will have to make sure country clusters feed into the consultation.

Participants broke into two groups:

1. How INEE can engage with the Education Cluster (as working with cluster coordinators would be beneficial), and how can the cluster engage in the process?

Participants raised one major concern: there are already lots of similar exercises, and people don’t know why to engage. They suggested creating an online platform so that clusters see in real time what’s coming in from other countries. INEE should seek the endorsement from cluster lead agency to engage clusters. INEE should also think about some feedback mechanisms to country clusters who contributed. INEE should enable country clusters to engage at sub-cluster level by providing guidance as a 20-minute discussion with sub-cluster members will provide lots of data for INEE. All participants were concerned by the lack of capacity and HR resources within the INEE secretariat and suggest asking cluster coordinators to consolidate feedback from their country to make it more manageable for INEE.

2. How to provide feedback on the template?

Discussion focused on how to roll-out the template. Pre-consultation online survey (online and paper form) will be useful but INEE needs to know beforehand how much data to analyse. It also needs to be clear on what’s in it for the Education Cluster. Participants also discussed quantitative versus qualitative data and flagged the need to pilot the template. They stressed the link with advocacy, with targeted message to governments, agencies and teachers.

Finally participants discussed the format of the consultation: formal, non-formal or mixed event? If consultations are mostly informal events, this can be done through the global meet-ups.
Three presentations about different aspects were done by keynote speakers.

**CFSs & CBMs**
Common themes arose from pre-meeting discussions: challenges on overlapping terminology; unclear definition leading to unclear roles and responsibilities for actors on the ground. Grey area on who does what and what does Community-Based Mechanism (CBM) mean. There are also challenges of effective coordination and collaboration between actors. Issue of effective transitioning and phasing out questions on how “community-based” are programs. A study was conducted in Rwanda and Uganda on how agencies engage with communities which considered four basic approaches, roles and responsibilities of agencies and communities and key learning points. The key finding (Rwanda) – linking education and CP, is get children back in school!

**Child Friendly Spaces (CFS) Training Module**
Modules divided in three main areas: principles and theoretical background on CFS; project planning and practical examples throughout programme cycle; tools on how to support and supervise staff, samples of JDs etc. Feedback on pilot test will be sent out in November. Participants were invited to review and provide feedback and then come up with linkages with CP & Education to be able to work together to implement the training module and send examples of good practice on activity scheduling, including integrating education directly to UNICEF. It was suggested that CP should convene a meeting to bring together different clusters, especially the Education Cluster to discuss CFS more broadly, including integrated programming.

**Child-Centered Services (CCS) model**
The “service hub” would provide access to various services, not just the geographical space but integrated programming – CP, Education, Nutrition, Health etc. With this model, there are tools – defining document for training and advocacy, guidance note on model approach and a joint proposal template that both education and CP can use.

- Example of Pakistan’s earthquake: more integrated CFSs, not only for children but breast-feeding mothers.
- Challenges: argument of inclusion of women, adolescent boys, roles and responsibilities of partners (e.g. different salaries), duplication (e.g. having a CFS next to a school tent), need to be strategic, think of funding and how best to coordinate on formal and non-formal education. Space itself is a challenge, e.g. during floods.
- The existence of many different counterparts, even within the cluster system and within own organizations – different stakeholders and different funding allocations might make an integrated approach very difficult to operationalize. Need to think pragmatically on how to find a solution for this.

**Discussion:**
- The CFSs must be able to adapt to what services is most needed. Practical challenge, how can CP actors work with MoTs to enable education in CFSs?
- Different quality and skills are required for teachers/animators/social workers. Need to think about different people doing different tasks and skills.
- Different space arrangements, e.g. classrooms, sports/recreational activities. How can we put this together in limited spaces?
- Practical obstacles: How our funding is structured? How our ministry counterparts are structured? We need to consider innovating to combat these issues with donors and government.
- Improved planning of spaces and cross-effectiveness of spaces.
• CFSs need to take a step back and question appropriateness of CFSs, how often they are frequently applied, and consider if this is an appropriate response in certain settings. Maybe there is a need to look at alternative solutions.
• Technical expertise from various different sectors, clusters, government is needed.
• Recommendation: one coordinator to facilitate the integration of the spaces.

Theme 16: Worst Forms of Child Labour
Alyson Enyon, Janis Ridsdel, Naoko Kamioka & Mirella Shuteriqi

Background information on the issue was provided which led to the development of the global CP Minimum Standards. The Task Force was formed to look at what was known about Worst Forms of Child Labour in Emergencies (WFCLiE) and commissioned a global review as its starting point.

The review found significant gaps in practice, knowledge and learning (particularly hazardous labour), as well as evidence. Immediate prevention has not been followed up and organizations that work on WFCL are not usually active in the initial stages of response; the systems-building work needs to connect better with WFCL. There have been weak inter-sectoral responses. Advocacy, tools and training are inconsistent across the sector. Emergency preparedness and early response mechanisms were seen by respondents as particularly weak. The study identified seven gaps between the MS and its implementation (i.e. monitoring and reporting mechanism; in-depth study): funding; developing advocacy and awareness-raising tools; improving capacity; existing WFCL programs are not flexible enough to adapt (need long term programmes); strong leadership and coordination because it cuts across so many areas (within CP and beyond); emergency preparedness; and using WFCL as a vulnerability indicator. The review will be finalized by the end of November and available through www.cpwg.net. Many actors within the humanitarian system need simple guidance on how to improve their interventions.

The next presentation explored the close correlation between WFCL and children’s education involvement and success both in and outside of emergencies, and how children and communities place a strong emphasis on education even in crisis. It was noted that WFCL has not till now been raised directly as an issue within the Education Cluster; its two groups on protection and adolescents and youth are nevertheless relevant. A few possible actions could include sensitization of key actors (within the education system and beyond), life skills training, and alternative education programs.

Discussion:
• What is debt-bondage?
• Evidence of children using sexual exploitation to pay for schooling expenses? Not much evidence base from a humanitarian context other than in West Africa.
• Are adolescents more affected than children?
• How can education and child protection work together to advance this topic?
• How can we better ensure better identification and referral of children in WFCL?
Meeting Outcomes and Wrap Up
Ellen van Kalmthout & Catherine Barnett

An overview of key points of each of the sessions was presented together with the unedited list of action points. The revised version of the action points will be included in the final report. There were lots of ideas, reflections, recommendations on which we will need further to work with all actors together under the umbrella of the Global CPWG and Education Cluster. While we tend to talk about the lack of evidence, nevertheless many evidences were presented during the various sessions as well as the Market Place, but it is also a matter of better presenting the data and evidence that are available. This meeting allowed everyone to clearly visualize that there are lots of synergies and entry points for improved collaboration across sectors.

Closing remarks

Dermot Carty, Deputy Director of EMOPS, UNICEF
Just under two years ago, the Clusters moved to EMOPS office in Geneva, and this meeting is a reflection of the growing recognition that we address it as a connected impact. It’s not easy to reach out to all, but it provides such meaningful discussion. Let us learn from this meeting about how we can reinforce each other in our work and intentions. We are trying to put affected people back at the centre, and the procedures are servicing the purpose. The Transformative Agenda will require humanitarian actors to work more closely together.

Louise Aubin, Global Protection Cluster Coordinator, UNHCR
The Transformative Agenda is about the rapid delivery of services for which we can measure its impact. Based on available statistics, the high point for Protection funding is in year two of a crisis -- which translates into a year of missed schooling, a year of high risks to vulnerable children. Recreational services can be lifesaving, but we need to measure the impact of our interventions. The partnership between Education and CP has much to learn and do together. Together, we can evaluate and articulate what we mean by protective programming. Education and CP are the business of everyone but not everyone’s expertise. Education has some terrific tools and analysis, which need to be made available more widely. More actors need to work together like this, as well as with development colleagues.

Thank you to the organizing committee, those who organized parallel sessions and Market Place stalls, the cross-cutting focal points and all the participants!
### APPENDIX

**Appendix I: Recommendations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve country based advocacy on CP and Edu for 1) better outcomes and 2) additional funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3 emergencies: Follow-up regarding coordination and discussion across UNICEF, UNHCR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encourage research on the role of gender and its impact on ES programming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage research on cash transfers and other ES programs and its impact on CP and Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build capacity for implementing ES programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus advocacy on solutions rather than the problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop guidance on areas of intersection (e.g. protecting education/schools are not safe) for common advocacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a bank of evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider a massive collective fund-raising effort at global level, show foot print, ask for a larger humanitarian pot of funding rather than a larger allocation of the existing pot!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organize joint meetings CPWG Advocacy Group and the Strategic Advisory Group of the Education Cluster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create budget template for Needs Assessment, and guidance on how to do budget allocation and contextualize it to the country situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get pre-approval from agencies so people (pool of assessment team) can be released quickly to do the assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Join Education Cluster online Communities of Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Look at a regional platform to share lessons learned on Worst forms of child labour (WFCL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collect tools and resources on working with refugees in urban settings and distribute them to colleagues working on crisis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore the option of a Community of Practice on EiE. Request a regional facilitator to lead this discussion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure there is a rigorous Non Formal Education program that is standardized (INEE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advocate to our country staff and make two cluster coordinators talk to each other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global cluster coordinators to do a joint child protection and education advocacy on the emergency on CAR (e.g.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session: IM Tools for Emergencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look and use indicators registry (available on HR.info as of November 1st)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree at country level do frequent/periodic (quarterly) standardized reports</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support OCHA in its country-level IM training</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session: Capacity Building</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Map current professional induction programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look at the possibilities of mentoring, shadowing, peer exchange and coaching programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combine training on soft skills used across both sectors and other consistent programs eg: Coordination Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map tertiary programs in CP and how CPIE can be included linking to Graduate Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate CPIE and EiE into each sectors training packages especially where linkages exist eg: PSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that Capacity Building focal points participate regularly to other sector trainings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session: DRR And Resilience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop a joint CP and Education contingency planning on broad analysis of risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a list of global indicators on what we mean on DRR and resilience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocate and push for the concept of safe schools to be regarded as an entry point for DRR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a joint CP and Edu Risk Analysis tool</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session: Psychosocial Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop guidance on how to work with children at different stages of an emergency response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide clear guidance on possible points of collaboration between CP and Edu through MHPSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop guidance on strong psychosocial programming for children + indicators (what type of programming works where)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session: Adolescents and Youth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compile good practice / lessons learned across sectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build cross-sectoral evidence base on what works/what doesn’t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop joint Edu and CP proposals on adolescents and youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify youth focal point in CPWG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapping existing advocacy networks/initiatives on youth and adolescents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruit dedicated staff to work on adolescents and youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To donors and govt, make strong argument and show benefits of investing in youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Youth Envoy should work on youth in humanitarian emergencies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Session: CFS and Community-based Mechanisms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborate with shelter about guidelines for spaces infrastructure</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocate with donors to fund joint meeting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting about revised CFS training in January 2014, incl. donors</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share CFS training package with all involved clusters</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop guidance on genuine community based models and CFS as part of that (incl. for out-of-school children)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include assessment of community/children’s perceptions of CFS within CFS research project (or other research)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure joint planning and budget and one coordinator from day 1 particularly in refugee contexts</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Session: Working with Parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase research needed and sharing of research and programs (link to Evaluation Challeng Fund)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a good narrative on the importance of this area of work and advocate with donors</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a community of practice around this area if sufficient interest</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use existing programs as entry points for parenting programs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Session: Worst Forms of Child Labour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop a good narrative on the importance of this area of work and advocate with donors</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop simple messages with and for communities and children</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider undertaking joint assessments on Worst Forms of Child Labour</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate research and lessons learned – which approaches work?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop guidance based on learning from the approaches taken from education and child protection development actors</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surname</td>
<td>First Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OALTONEN</td>
<td>Pasi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AASE</td>
<td>Gunn-Mariann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABOUDAN</td>
<td>Farida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABRAMS</td>
<td>Marlene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABUSHORA</td>
<td>Naila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADAM</td>
<td>Wigdan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDREW</td>
<td>Susan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARNOT</td>
<td>Tyler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATIS</td>
<td>Evans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZNAR BADAN</td>
<td>Rocio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BADAOUI</td>
<td>Anissa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALFOUR-POOLE</td>
<td>Charlotte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARNETT</td>
<td>Katy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARRETT</td>
<td>Anna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIENVENU</td>
<td>Mathilde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOONE</td>
<td>Laura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROOKS</td>
<td>Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUN</td>
<td>Delphine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURNS</td>
<td>Lauren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANAVERA</td>
<td>Mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAFFIN</td>
<td>Joshua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAMPEIX</td>
<td>Margot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAESSENS</td>
<td>Lotte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPLAND</td>
<td>Michael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORNISH</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSSOR</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURT</td>
<td>Brigitte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D’ANSEMBOURG</td>
<td>Benoît</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECADET</td>
<td>Leen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVINE</td>
<td>Simon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVOY</td>
<td>Shanna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIOP</td>
<td>Diarra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUNN</td>
<td>Joanne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDOUARD</td>
<td>Solene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMERSON</td>
<td>Natasha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPTING</td>
<td>Nicole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EYNON</td>
<td>Alyson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAR</td>
<td>Jesus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FASSEAX</td>
<td>Leila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FISCHER</td>
<td>Hanna Tina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GALE</td>
<td>Christine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIBBONS</td>
<td>Michael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILL</td>
<td>Julie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAIPLIK</td>
<td>Brenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HANSEN</td>
<td>Snjezana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HANSSON</td>
<td>Malin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEMBERG</td>
<td>Jouni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HORN ALBUJA</td>
<td>Melissa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOSETH</td>
<td>Anne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYLL-LARSEN</td>
<td>Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JACOB</td>
<td>Kamran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEPSEN</td>
<td>Elaine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KACHUKA BYAMUNGU</td>
<td>Jacques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAMIOKA</td>
<td>Naoko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KARUGABA</td>
<td>Joania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEIS</td>
<td>Joa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHAN</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIKUCHI-WHITE</td>
<td>Alan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAENKOLM</td>
<td>Anne-Sophie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAMAZIERE</td>
<td>Aurelie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAPHAM</td>
<td>Kate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEGER</td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEMAISTRE</td>
<td>Laetitia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOMPO</td>
<td>Boubakar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACLEOD</td>
<td>Heather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAIGA</td>
<td>Bonaventure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAIGNANT Sandra</td>
<td>Sandra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANDARA Serena</td>
<td>Serena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCUELLO Myriam</td>
<td>Geneva Call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATAMBO Patience</td>
<td>Save the Children / Zimbabwe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCCAULEY Natalie</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCKINNEY Rachel</td>
<td>Save the Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCLAURIN Lyndsay</td>
<td>UNICEF / Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEGE Jean</td>
<td>UNICEF / Rapid Response Team (RRT) - Global CPWG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEYERS Cliff</td>
<td>UNICEF EAPRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINNICK Emilie</td>
<td>UNHCR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORAN Mary</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUKABETA Moses</td>
<td>Save the Children / Zimbabwe/ Cluster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWEBE Frieda</td>
<td>World Vision / Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEMOTO Mioh</td>
<td>UNICEF EAPRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWBY Landon</td>
<td>Save the Children / Rapid Response Team (RRT) - Education Cluster Unit (ECU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOAKA Clement</td>
<td>Ministry of Education (MoE) CAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIRENCRUM I Denis</td>
<td>UNHCR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORGAARD Grith</td>
<td>UNHCR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYANGOYA Hellen</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBDAM Esther</td>
<td>War Child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLSSON Asa</td>
<td>Save the Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’SULLIVAN Niamh</td>
<td>EU Permanent Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTTOLINI Diego</td>
<td>Cesvi / Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAGE Gilles-Philippe</td>
<td>Watchlist on Children and Armed Conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASTI Silvia</td>
<td>UNICEF / Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PELTOLA Minna</td>
<td>Finn Church Aid (FCA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENSON Jonathan</td>
<td>War Child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEUSCHEL Minja</td>
<td>Save the Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIERSON Kara</td>
<td>Save the Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POULLARD Axel</td>
<td>French Embassy / Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUEIRAZZA Anita</td>
<td>War Child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAKOTOMALALA Sabine</td>
<td>UNICEF / Global CPWG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAMBAUD Anne-Laure</td>
<td>UNICEF WCARO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REILLY Rachael</td>
<td>Women’s Refugee Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIDSDEEL Janis</td>
<td>Plan International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>First Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCK</td>
<td>Megan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROGEMOND</td>
<td>Dalia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SABOT-SCHMID</td>
<td>Lisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANDVIK-NYLUND</td>
<td>Monika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTINI</td>
<td>Alberta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHMIDT</td>
<td>Caroline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHMITZ GUINOTE</td>
<td>Filipa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIGLITANO</td>
<td>Katherine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SESAY</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHUGG</td>
<td>Sophie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIEGRIST</td>
<td>Saudamini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGSGAARD</td>
<td>Morten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLOT</td>
<td>Arianna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMITH</td>
<td>Wendy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOLETI</td>
<td>Lucia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPARKES</td>
<td>James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRACY-BURBRIDGE</td>
<td>Bethan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TALBOT</td>
<td>Christopher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEBBE</td>
<td>Kerstin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVEITE</td>
<td>Ingvill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULLAH</td>
<td>Ehsan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAAS</td>
<td>Ketil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VALLANDINGHAM</td>
<td>Teija</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAN KALMTHOUT</td>
<td>Ellen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VILLENEUVE</td>
<td>Helene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOJTA</td>
<td>Marisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VRAALSEN</td>
<td>Pia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEDGE</td>
<td>Joanna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIJESINGHE</td>
<td>Rhishani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAMSON</td>
<td>Katharine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIRTH</td>
<td>Vanessa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WISNIEWSKI</td>
<td>Susan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOUTERS</td>
<td>Stijn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YAMANO</td>
<td>Makiba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEUS</td>
<td>Barbara</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix III: Resource Persons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUBIN</td>
<td>Louise</td>
<td>UNHCR / Protection Cluster</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aubin@unhcr.org">aubin@unhcr.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARTY</td>
<td>Dermot</td>
<td>UNICEF / EMOPS</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dcarty@unicef.org">dcarty@unicef.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHATAIGNER</td>
<td>Patrice</td>
<td>ACAPS</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pc@acaps.org">pc@acaps.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROISIER</td>
<td>Alice</td>
<td>WHO</td>
<td><a href="mailto:croisiera@who.int">croisiera@who.int</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONINI</td>
<td>Antonio</td>
<td>Feinstein / Tufts</td>
<td><a href="mailto:antonio.donini@tufts.edu">antonio.donini@tufts.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEWIS</td>
<td>Gwyn</td>
<td>UNICEF / Inter Cluster</td>
<td><a href="mailto:glewis@unicef.org">glewis@unicef.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCCLUSKEY</td>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>OCHA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mccluskey@un.org">mccluskey@un.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NADIG</td>
<td>Aninia</td>
<td>Sphere Project</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aninia.nadig@sphereproject.org">aninia.nadig@sphereproject.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOBLECOURT</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>CartONG / NOMAD</td>
<td><a href="mailto:m_noblecourt@cartong.org">m_noblecourt@cartong.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAPADAKIS</td>
<td>Olivier</td>
<td>iMMAP / NOMAD</td>
<td><a href="mailto:opapadakis@immap.org">opapadakis@immap.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAVIER</td>
<td>Guilhem</td>
<td>ICRC</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gravier@icrc.org">gravier@icrc.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALAGNAC</td>
<td>Aliocha</td>
<td>UNICEF / Inter Cluster</td>
<td><a href="mailto:asalagnac@unicef.org">asalagnac@unicef.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAN DOORN</td>
<td>Hetty</td>
<td>Avenir Analytics</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hetty@aveniranalytics.com">hetty@aveniranalytics.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIEGLOSZ</td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>OCHA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wieglosz@un.org">wieglosz@un.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOOD</td>
<td>Gavin</td>
<td>UNICEF / Inter Cluster</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gwood@unicef.org">gwood@unicef.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Meeting Objectives:
- Strengthen links and collaboration between Child Protection and Education;
- Facilitate dialogue and learning amongst field based coordinators and practitioners, international organisations, academics, and donors on emerging issues, and identify areas for further learning;
- Update on progress and developments in the sector and share new tools
- Review progress against respective work plans.

### Appendix IV: Meeting Schedule

**CHILD PROTECTION WORKING GROUP & GLOBAL EDUCATION CLUSTER JOINT MEETING**

**Geneva, 29-31 October 2013**

| Ecumenical Centre |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Tuesday 29th</strong></th>
<th><strong>Day 1 – Introduction and starting the conversation about collaboration</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>08:30 - 09:00</strong></td>
<td>Registration &amp; Welcome Coffee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **09:00 - 10:00** | Welcome and opening  
Welcome, participant introductions, meeting objectives, agenda, admin announcements |
| **10:00 - 11:00** | Global updates: How we operate at the global and field level, update on both work plans |
| **11:30 - 12:30** | Panel on changing humanitarian landscape: Transformative agenda, Standards, Post 2015  
Heather MacLeod (WVI), Jean McCluskey (OCHA), Aninia Nadig (Sphere), Guilhem Ravier (ICRC) |
| **13:30 - 15:30** | Market Place: New initiatives/tools/ideas/projects/innovations/research, new members, country clusters |
| **16:00 - 17:00** | Achieving CP/ Education outcomes through economic strengthening – Josh Chaffin (Women’s Refugee Commission)  
Evaluation of UNICEF as Cluster Lead Agency – Hetty van Doorn (Avenir Analytics) |
| **17:00 - 17:30** | Plenary/Conclusion of the Day |

| **Wednesday 30th** | **Day 2 – Exploring themes of common interest to Education and Child Protection  
Linked to Coordination and Collaboration** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>08.45 - 09.00</strong></td>
<td>Welcome and agenda for the day: Instructions on organising parallel sessions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **09:00 - 10:30** | **Parallel Sessions**  
Theme 01: Advocacy and funding  
Theme 02: Government Co-leadership and transitioning Clusters  
Theme 03: Needs assessment |
| **11:00 - 11:30** | Reconvene in plenary for presentations and discussion |
| **11:30 - 12:30** | Major emergencies and themes |
| **13:00 - 13:45** | Lunch |
| **13:45 - 15:30** | **Parallel Sessions**  
Theme 04: NGO Co-Leadership |
Annual Meeting Education Cluster and Child Protection Working Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08:45</td>
<td>Welcome and agenda for the day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:00</td>
<td>Instructions on organising parallel sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:00</td>
<td><strong>Parallel Sessions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:00</td>
<td>Theme 08: DRR and resilience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:00</td>
<td>Theme 09: Unaccompanied and separated children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:00</td>
<td>Theme 10: Child Protection systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:00</td>
<td>Theme 11: Psychosocial support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:00</td>
<td>Theme 12: Youth/adolescents falling between the cracks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>Coffee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>Reconvene in plenary for presentations and discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td><strong>Future of humanitarian action:</strong> presentation and plenary discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>with Antonio Donini, Feinstein International Centre, Tufts University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:30</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:30</td>
<td>Instructions on organising parallel sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:45</td>
<td><strong>Parallel Sessions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:45</td>
<td>Theme 13: Working with parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:45</td>
<td>Theme 14: INEE Global Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:45</td>
<td>Theme 15: CFSs and community based mechanisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:45</td>
<td>Theme 16: Worst forms of child labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00</td>
<td>Coffee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00</td>
<td>Reconvene in plenary for presentations and discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:30</td>
<td><strong>Action Points and Next Steps Meeting Outcomes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:00</td>
<td>Closing: Dermot Carty, UNICEF EMOPS, Louis Aubin, Global Protection Cluster</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix IV: Satisfaction Survey Results

21 respondents

Were links and collaboration strengthened between Child Protection and Education?

- Excellent: 9%
- Good: 24%
- Reasonable: 67%
- Needs Improvement: 0%

Sample comment: The meeting provided a great opportunity to establish links and for each sector to find out what the other is doing. A suggestion would be to establish a “reality check” for the many suggestions for future collaboration to encourage a focus on only those which are likely to come to fruition. This might take the form of an end-of-day review akin to the Eyes and Ears exercise.

Was the mid-term review of the respective work plans ensured?

- Excellent: 10%
- Good: 33%
- Reasonable: 43%
- Needs Improvement: 33%

Sample comment: Time was too limited.

Was there a facilitation of dialogue and learning amongst field-based coordinators and practitioners, international organisations, academics and donors on emerging issues while identifying areas for further learning?

- Excellent: 5%
- Good: 14%
- Reasonable: 33%
- Needs Improvement: 48%

Sample comment: The technical side sessions were quite short, not leaving adequate time for technical dialogue. It would have been beneficial if more time was given to the technical side sessions and less time in plenary for example. Similarly, in articulating recommendations and areas for further learning, the process was quite rushed and it would have been useful to have had more time in these sessions to really identify priority areas (rather than in some cases long lists of recommendations).

Was the quality and amount of materials covered adequate for the meeting?

- Excellent: 5%
- Good: 14%
- Reasonable: 29%
- Needs Improvement: 52%

Sample comments: The marketplace was a fabulous idea. // Would have been good to have copies of new materials being launched (CPRA Toolkit, ACE toolkit, etc.) during the meeting.

Was each topic covered adequately?

- Excellent: 5%
- Good: 9%
- Reasonable: 43%
- Needs Improvement: 43%

Sample comment: I sometimes wished there were fewer topics, covered in greater detail.
Sample comment: I needed to miss some preferred sessions due to conflicting times. Last year at the CP Annual Meeting, a number of sessions were run twice which allowed extra opportunities to participate.

How well did the logistics and admin support the running of the workshop?

Sample comments: Yes! However, a future joint meeting with the CPWG would need to have a very clear objective and expected outcomes, beyond developing synergies. Not for the entire cluster, but country or issue specific. For example, a CP-Education joint meeting in relation to emergency response for Syrian refugee children will be very useful.

Suggestions for improvement:

- I felt that a session to determine the concrete next steps was missing. Otherwise, it was very well organized.
- Maybe create a simple format for each session to force each group to come up with concrete steps for cooperation between CP and Education.
- More clarity on what we wanted to get out of the meeting other than networking. Some of the action points outside of work plans -- for example, who will take these forward? It was a good meeting to chat to people in similar situations.
- The review of the work plans was not fully done.
- The size of the meeting seemed relatively unmanageable. By the end of the meeting, many people still hadn’t met each other, etc. I appreciated the organizers’ efforts to limit the size, but it had a very different feel from previous meetings. Something of the “linkage facilitation” between organizations and individuals was lost.
- It was difficult to cover each sector in detail, especially where Education Cluster is primarily looking at coordination and related issues, not substance. Perhaps in the future we could just have a one day overlap with another sector.