Addressing capacity gaps in Child Protection in Emergencies (CPIE)

A Scoping Exercise on Child Protection in Emergencies staff capacity with Career Development Programme options for mid-level CPIE Specialists
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# Acronyms and Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>African Centre for Childhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC</td>
<td>Action for the Rights of the Child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBHA</td>
<td>Consortium for British Humanitarian Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERF</td>
<td>Central Emergency Response Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPC</td>
<td>Child Protection and Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPTS</td>
<td>Child Protection Trainee Scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>Danish Refugee Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECB</td>
<td>Emergency Capacity Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOP</td>
<td>Emergency Operations Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERP</td>
<td>Emergency Response Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLDP</td>
<td>Humanitarian Leadership Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSDP</td>
<td>Humanitarian Skills Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IASC</td>
<td>Inter-Agency Standing Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICRC</td>
<td>International Committee of the Red Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPT</td>
<td>International Peacekeeping and Peace-building Training Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRC</td>
<td>Norwegian Refugee Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLP</td>
<td>Protection Learning Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPSSI</td>
<td>Regional Psychosocial Support Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RedR</td>
<td>Registered Engineers for Disaster Relief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFL</td>
<td>Restoring Family Links</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCUK</td>
<td>Save the Children UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOT</td>
<td>Training of Trainers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United National Children’s Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASH</td>
<td>Water, Sanitation and Hygiene Promotion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive Summary

The aims of the Child Protection Working Group (CPWG), the global Child Protection Sub-Cluster, are to “facilitate a more predictable, accountable and effective child protection response in complex emergencies, disasters and other such situations.”1 Achieving a predictable, accountable and effective response relies heavily on the availability of experienced, technical Child Protection specialists to support with the design and delivery of the interventions. The ability of CPWG members to adequately and consistently meet the staffing needs of humanitarian responses, particularly of mid- and senior-level staff, has been put to the test over the past few years and has been challenged. The purpose of this scoping exercise is to get a better understanding of why this is and develop ideas for how this might be addressed. What are the main gaps in child protection in emergencies staff capacity? What could a career development programme that aims to address these gaps look like?

To research this, 50 Child Protection specialists of mid- and senior level who have worked in emergencies were asked about their experiences and thoughts regarding child protection in emergencies staff capacity through a written questionnaire and interviews. In addition, over 20 other key informants working in human resources, as programme managers and from various academic and training institutes were consulted about their experiences recruiting for child protection in emergency positions, about the capacity building programmes they are managing and what lessons learned they have encountered. Lastly, a review of humanitarian response evaluations and other relevant literature was also carried out and key points captured that relate to child protection in emergencies staff capacity.

The results of these discussions and the brief literature review are captured in the following report in two parts: Part I presents the findings of a scoping exercise carried out and Part II presents three options for Child Protection Career Development Programmes that can be considered to address some of the gaps highlighted.

Part I: Scoping Exercise

Analysis of Child Protection in Emergencies staff capacity

The first section of the scoping exercise explores what the main child protection in emergencies staff capacity gaps are using the Emergency Capacity Building Project’s definition of staff capacity: “the total number of personnel available, their knowledge, skills, and behaviour, and the systems and processes to organize and mobilize them.”2 The analysis is therefore broken down into three different areas: 1) Availability of staff; 2) Staff behaviour, knowledge and skills; 3) Systems and processes to mobilise staff.

1. Availability of staff

A number of mechanisms are used by the different CPWG members to provide additional human resources to emergency responses: internal deployments from other programmes and offices, the use of standby partners or rosters and external recruitment. Even though these options are utilised, however, child protection practitioners highlight the unavailability of staff with certain skills and for certain contexts. The main gaps identified with regards to availability were:

1) There is a lack of mid-level CPIE specialists available at short notice, with specific skills and for positions in non-family duty stations; and

2) There is an overall lack of senior-level CPIE specialists available for emergency responses.

2. Staff behaviour, knowledge and skills

Although much has been undertaken by CPWG members in terms of capacity building on child protection in emergencies in recent years, significant gaps remain in the behaviour, knowledge and skills of child protection specialists. The main gaps identified by key informants, respondents to the questionnaire for this scoping exercise and through the evaluations reviewed, can be grouped broadly into the following categories:

1) Technical areas of specialisation;

---

1 CPWG Terms of Reference. Available at: www.humanitarianreform.org/.../cluster%20approach%20page/clusters%20pages/Protection/CP%20TOR_Final.doc

2) Language skills;
3) Management skills;
4) Social sector and social work expertise;
5) Facilitation skills and skills in community-based work;
6) Country-specific and/or regional expertise;
7) There is no ‘degree’ or professional standard in child protection in emergencies.

3. Systems and processes to mobilise staff

Many of the questionnaire respondents and interviewees emphasised that structural factors are behind the lack of available mid- and senior level staff for emergency responses. The systems and processes currently used to deploy staff do not always match the requirements on the ground. The main gaps identified in the systems and processes to mobilise staff are:

1) The rosters and response teams with mid-level specialists experience difficulty in catering to requests for CPIE specialists within specific skills,
2) There is no roster for senior level CPIE specialists,
3) Organisational deployment procedures are in some instances too cumbersome
4) There is a high reliance on short-term surge support which can negatively impact programming if not managed well,
5) There is a lack of mechanisms supporting national mid-level staff to gain international experience, and
6) Key CPIE positions are not always prioritised and budgeted for adequately in responses, resulting in either a lack of personnel for critical posts or having junior personnel covering more senior level posts, ultimately left to ‘sink or swim’.

Review of existing Capacity Building Programmes

For the second section of the scoping exercise, a review of existing capacity building programmes in child protection as well as in the wider humanitarian sector was undertaken to identify capacity building models, lessons learned and organisations for CPWG members to potentially partner with for the CPIE Career Development Programme.

The Child Protection capacity building programmes and initiatives reviewed were: the REPSSI and University of KwaZulu-Natal’s Certificate run by the African Centre for Childhood (ACC), the Agency Learning Network on the Care and Protection of Children in Crisis-affected countries (CPC Network), the Inter-agency Action for the Rights of the Child (ARC), the Austrian Study Centre for Peace and Conflict Resolutions’ course on Child Protection, Monitoring and Rehabilitation, UNICEF and RedR’s Child Protection Sub-Cluster Coordinator’s Training, Save the Children UK’s Child Protection Trainee Scheme (CPTS), Columbia University’s Global Child Protection Classroom, UNHCR’s Protection Learning Programme (PLP) and a UNICEF CPIE Exchange programme for national staff.

In addition, three capacity building programmes from the wider humanitarian sector were reviewed: Oxfam’s Core Humanitarian Skills Development Programme and the Management Leadership Skills Development Programme, Save the Children UK’s Humanitarian Leadership Skills Development Programme and the WASH Cluster’s Coordination Training and Roster.

A few of the lessons learned identified from these programmes included: Having a clear understanding of the target group and needs is critical in the training design process; Conduct trainings in additional languages where possible; Obstacles for participants to attend trainings in different countries are restrictive visa procedures; Few agencies support participants financially for trainings so for some participants this is an obstacle; Decentralise training where possible to the sub-regional, regional or national level; Include a broad inter-agency component where possible; It is essential to identify a core group of very strong, experienced experts for training content design and technical oversight and also in the delivery and monitoring of the courses; and Training programmes focused on increasing surge capacity should be linked to surge capacity mechanisms so as harness the full potential of those trained.

Part II: Career Development Programme Options

Based on the child protection in emergencies staff capacity gaps identified in the scoping exercise on the one hand, and the lessons learned from capacity building programmes identified on the other, three options for a
Child Protection Career Development Programme (CPCDP) for mid-level Child Protection personnel were developed.

The objectives of all three CPCDP options are the same:
1. To increase the overall volume and diversity of internationally deployable mid-level technical specialists to protect children in emergencies
2. To increase the capacity in terms of skills, knowledge and behaviour of mid-level child protection specialists to design, implement and lead high-quality responses to protect children in emergencies
3. To strengthen systems and processes to mobilise mid-level technical child protection specialists to support humanitarian responses

The three options differ, however, in their duration, location, structure and learning methodology. The options are as follows:

1. **Advanced Child Protection in Emergencies Certificate / Diploma**

   This first option involves the establishment of an accredited Advanced Certificate or Diploma in Child Protection in Emergencies which would include core modules on CPIE as well as areas of specialisation for participants to select from. The Certificate or Diploma would be developed in partnership with an academic institution and would entail an academic component, a distance learning element and a short placement with a CPWG member in a different country to carry out specific tasks in the selected area of CPIE specialisation during which time the participants will be mentored by a more senior CPIE specialist.

2. **Regional Inter-agency Roster of CPIE Specialists**

   Built upon the model of the ICRC’s Restoring Family Links regional trainings and rosters, this second option aims to develop regional capacity for technical areas within CPIE coupled with a system to mobilise mid-level CPIE specialists with country-specific and regional expertise to emergency responses. This option is built around training mid-level practitioners in areas of specialisation through face-to-face facilitated training as well as using situated supported distance learning methodologies. At the end of the training, an assessment process will select a number of specialists to join a regional CPIE roster. The agreement would be for members of these rosters to be available for deployment regionally once a year to support emergency responses for up to a certain amount of time.

3. **Mid- and Senior Child Protection in Emergencies Capacity (CP Cap)**

   This last option mirrors the Protection Capacity (Procap) and Gender Capacity (GenCap) initiatives developed and supported by UN OCHA, DRC and NRC amongst others. The aim of the initiative will be to have up to 3 Senior level and 5 Mid-level CPIE Specialists of different backgrounds, different linguistic skills and different context-specific expertise to be available for deployment to emergencies to provide strategic support, capacity building or carry out other activities for programmes in their areas of specialisation as they will be on one year renewable contracts.
Introduction

The last decade has witnessed an increase in the number, nature and complexity of emergencies. In 2000, for example, UNICEF noted that there were “more than 50 programme countries experiencing some form of crisis and requiring humanitarian and disaster relief assistance”\(^3\). In 2004 the number of emergencies UNICEF responded to increased to 188\(^5\); between 2005 and 2007 the figure rose again to 276 emergencies annually (of which approximately 25% were ongoing or protracted emergencies and 75% ‘new’ emergencies)\(^5\) and during 2009 number of emergencies UNICEF responded to was 232 in 94 countries\(^6\).

Given not only this general increase in the number of emergency responses carried out but also the fact that the number of agencies involved with these responses increasing along with the complexity of the responses, a Humanitarian Response Review (HRR) was carried out in 2005 to assess the humanitarian response capacities of key humanitarian actors. One of the major gaps identified was the “low level of preparedness of the humanitarian organizations, in terms of human resources and sectoral capacities”\(^7\). In the area of human resources, recruitment policies particularly during emergencies were described as “fail[ing] to provide, in a timely fashion, the number and quality of required staff”. Training, in general, was also seen as limited in scope and in time dedicated to it. In terms of sectoral capabilities, protection as a sector was highlighted as requiring special and urgent attention.

The Humanitarian Reform process initiated from the HRR saw the introduction of the cluster system by the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) and with it, areas of responsibility for protection actors including child protection. The aims of the global child protection sub-cluster, the Child Protection Working Group (CPWG), are to “facilitate a more predictable, accountable and effective child protection response in complex emergencies, disasters and other such situations”\(^8\). Being able to achieve a more predictable, accountable and effective response includes strengthening the capacity of those involved with the design, implementation and monitoring of the child protection responses in humanitarian contexts. It also includes working towards ensuring that the right people with the right competencies are available and deployable at the right time.

Over recent years, there have been a number of successful schemes, tailored internship programmes and training courses aimed at increasing the capacity of international child protection specialists. In particular, the interagency Child Protection Trainee Scheme managed by Save the Children has trained 35 child protection specialists since 2005. Additionally, the interagency ‘Introduction to Child Protection in Emergencies’ modular training programme has been received well internationally since its launch in 2007. However, whilst these initiatives have succeeded in increasing the capacity of the international child protection sector, they have primarily focused on staff at entry level and emerging talent, and have not directly addressed mid level technical staff capacity building needs. This realisation comes as the ability of CPWG members, including Save the Children, to adequately and consistently meet the staffing needs of humanitarian responses, particularly of mid- and senior-level staff, over the past few years has been challenged.

In order to develop programmes to meet the needs of mid-level technical Child Protection in Emergencies specialists, a better understanding of what the main gaps are, and what options for such a programme exist, need to be mapped out first. The purpose of this report is to begin just that.

---


\(^5\) UNICEF (2009g), Humanitarian Action Report 2009. p. 10


\(^8\) CPWG Terms of Reference. Available at: www.humanitarianreform.org/../../../cluster%20approach%20page/clusters%20pages/Protection/CP%20TOR_Final.doc
Purpose

1. To research and clarify the need for a Child Protection Career Development Programme aimed at increasing the overall volume of internationally deployable, experienced, mid-level technical specialists to protect children in emergencies
2. To identify what currently exists in terms of child protection capacity building programmes and examine how an additional scheme could respond to identified capacity gaps
3. To put forward three programme design options for a Child Protection Career Development Programme

Methodology

Three sources of information were used primarily in carrying out the scoping exercise: 1, A desk review of relevant literature was carried out; 2, A questionnaire was shared with Child Protection specialists and 3, Key informants were interviewed. The exercise was carried out in 21 days between October and November 2010.

1. Literature Review

The literature reviewed for this scoping exercise consisted of: inter-sectoral as well as child protection specific humanitarian response evaluations; evaluations of child protection capacity building initiatives including ARC and Save the Children’s Child Protection Trainee Scheme (CPTS); materials from different agencies relating to their capacity building programmes including Oxfam, Merlin, African Centre for Childhood and Save the Children UK, and other reports specific to child protection in emergencies including a report on CPIE financing and reviews of child protection sub-cluster coordination mechanisms in various countries. The References section includes a comprehensive list of literature reviewed.

2. Questionnaires

A trial questionnaire was shared with the a few child protection workers and then edited to ensure questions were understood clearly. Questionnaires (see Annex I) were then shared with 85 entry, mid- and senior level CPIE specialists. Of those contacted, 50 child protection specialists responded to the questions, either in writing or through an arranged phone call, most of whom where mid- and senior level practitioners. This comprises a response rate of just under 59%. In addition, those managing rosters for CPIE workers were asked to complete a questionnaire which sought information including the number of specialists on their roster, the number of deployment requests received over the years and the main challenges faced identifying and deploying CPIE workers.

3. Key Informant Interviews

In addition to consulting with the aforementioned group of Child Protection specialists, interviews were conducted with 25 key informants including managers of capacity building programmes both within the child protection sector as well as programmes outside of the sector; members of Human Resource teams in organisations deploying child protection in emergencies personnel, and members of academic institutions and training institutes. For a comprehensive list of those consulted, please see Annex II.

Limitations

A significant limitation of this exercise was the small number of key informants consulted. With a greater number of regional and national inputs the scoping exercise would have been more reflective of the diversity of those working in the child protection sector. The questionnaire shared was only available in English which is another limitation. In addition, non-English language academic and training institutes were not consulted for this exercise. Although an effort was made to identify and contact French speaking institutes it was unfortunately not possible to take forward interviews in the short time available.

---

9 As described in the Inter-agency CPIE competencies: Beginner level means with initial CP work experience; Mid-level has work experience in CP; and Senior level is someone with significant work experience in CP.
Structure of the report

The overall report is divided into two parts, covering the reports three objectives:

Part I covers the scoping exercise that was undertaken to identify gaps in child protection in emergencies staff capacity and review existing capacity building programmes and initiatives, identifying relevant capacity building models and lessons learned to note.

Part II describes three options developed for career development programmes for mid-level child protection in emergencies specialists that could be taken forward by members of the Child Protection Working Group.
Part I: Scoping Exercise

I. Analysis of Child Protection in Emergencies staff capacity

Child protection, a key area of responsibility under the Protection Cluster, endeavours to achieve its goal of delivering rapid and high-quality responses to protect children in emergency situations. As a sector, it relies heavily on staffing for its responses, arguably more so than any other, as the staffing of a response will to a large extent dictate the timeliness and quality of the child protection intervention. This importance staff has in child protection responses is even highlighted under the Central Emergency Response Fund’s (CERF) criteria for life-saving assistance which states that, “since protection staff are directly linked to providing protection to people of concern it is understood that protection submissions may include substantial staffing component and be considered an operational input.”

The ability of the Child Protection sector to adequately and consistently meet the staffing needs of humanitarian responses has been put to the test over the past few years and has been challenged. The purpose of this part of the scoping exercise is to get a better understanding of why this is.

Staff capacity does not, however, only refer to the availability of staff. The Emergency Capacity Building (ECB) Project defines staff capacity as “the total number of personnel available, their knowledge, skills, and behaviour, and the systems and processes to organize and mobilize them.” This tripartite definition of staff capacity will be used for this scoping exercise. The following analysis of child protection in emergencies staff capacity, therefore, focuses on these three areas separately identifying gaps in each, although there are necessarily areas of overlap:

1. Availability of staff
2. Staff competence: skills, behaviour and knowledge
3. Systems to mobilise and organise staff

1. Availability of staff

Who is available for deployment in terms of CPIE staff?

Each CPWG member agency has different personnel it draws upon for deployment to emergencies:

- For Save the Children UK, there is an Emergency Protection Advisor based at the Headquarters and a team of 2 Child Protection Emergency Response Personnel
- UNICEF has three pillars to the rapid response mechanism to provide staffing to emergencies: 1, Internal staff from HQ or the region; 2, Standby partners; 3, External candidates
- International Rescue Committee UK has a Child Protection Technical Advisor at HQ and an Emergency Child and Youth Protection and Development Coordinator for deployment to emergency responses
- Save the Children Alliance have an internal emergency roster for staff deployments including 15 child protection specialists
- Save the Children Sweden have an Emergency Standby Team with 12 child protection specialists that support with emergency deployments
- UNHCR has an Emergency Response Team roster and has pre-existing stand-by arrangements with partner agencies for surge capacity similar to UNICEF

In addition to Emergency response teams and Headquarters staff, country offices and programmes themselves are other important sources for personnel drawn upon during emergency responses. Some organisations have Child Protection in Emergencies specialists within regional and country programmes, whilst others do not. UNICEF Middle East and North Africa (MENA) and Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office (ESARO), for example, have designated Child Protection in Emergencies focal points, but other regions do not yet. For Save the Children there are regional offices in South Africa (for Southern Africa), Senegal (for West Africa), Ethiopia

---

What is the demand for Child Protection in Emergencies specialists?

The demand for human resources to support emergency responses has grown in line with the overall increase in the number of crises globally. This continues to be a challenge, especially since humanitarian crises occur simultaneously in different countries around the globe. In an endeavour to meet this human resource demand, country offices often respond by requesting for additional personnel to support their operations on the ground as mentioned above through rosters or other means. For UNICEF, the number of surge assignment requests received by the Emergency Surge Capacity team this year is almost as high as the past three years together. Figure 1 charts the approximate number of surge assignment requests received from 2007 to 2010.  

Although estimates are not available of what percentage of these requests were for child protection, the number of requests for child protection Standby Partner surge capacity deployments has increased from 23 in 2008 to 31 in 2009 and 41 so far in 2010. Overall the number of standby partner requests for all sectors has gone from 120 in 2008 to 128 deployments in 2009, and 163 deployments so far in 2010 as of November 1. (This means that the percentage of child protection requests amongst the other sectors has fluctuated from 41% to 24% to 25%, but the actual number has increased.)

With regards to the Standby Partner deployments, Figure 3 below gives an overview of the number of deployments from the various agencies with emergency child protection specialists as part of their roster or team to UNICEF.

---

12 The main purpose of SBA is the rapid deployment of pre-identified resources as a temporary gap filling measure to augment the capacity of a country office. (NRC and UNICEF, 2009)

13 These are approximate figures provided by UNICEF Surge Capacity, Emergency Unit, New York.
Figure 3: Child Protection Standby Partner Deployments to UNICEF from 2005-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Save the Children</th>
<th>NRC</th>
<th>SDC</th>
<th>Irish Aid</th>
<th>DRC</th>
<th>CANADEM</th>
<th>PROCAP</th>
<th>RedR</th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>ActionAid</th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>UNV</th>
<th>ICRU</th>
<th>Total by year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Standby Partners also have arrangements with other agencies, however, not just UNICEF. The overall number of deployments per agency is therefore higher that that captured in Figure 3.

- The Danish Refugee Council, for example, had a total of 7 child protection deployments (totalling 32 months) in 2009 and 24 so far this year\(^\text{15}\).
- The Norwegian Refugee Council, under the NORCAP Standby Roster, received requests for 27 CP deployments in 2008, 31 in 2009 and 30 to date in 2010. In 2008 only 63% percent of the 27 requests were answered whereas in 2009 and 2010 almost 80% of the incoming requests have been fulfilled suggesting that overall NORCAP is improving its response to child protection deployment requests.
- The Save the Children Sweden / Norway Emergency Standby Team has responded to 14 deployment requests in 2006, 15 in 2007, 17 in 2008, 24 in 2009 and 12 so far in 2010. The majority of these requests were for UNHCR Community Services.
- Under the Rapid Onset Humanitarian Emergency Experts Fund (RAP-Fund), CANADEM received 66 requests in 2007 and 246 requests from 2008-2009 (this was extended to also include the Haiti earthquake response) for deployments of surge support in different sectors\(^\text{16}\). A separate RAP-Fund was set up for Pakistan which had 44 requests for deployments, including 4 requests for deployments in child protection in a 1 month time span.
- Although UN Volunteers are not traditionally viewed as having an emergency roster, they have in the past deployed UNVs to support UNICEF Emergency programmes and they deploy a high proportion of their UNVs to missions of the Department of Peacekeeping and UNHCR. Currently there are 175 UN Volunteers working as Protection Officers, Child Protection Officer and Community Services Officers worldwide. Of these, 134 are with UNHCR, 24 are with DPKO, 10 with UNICEF, 1 with OCHA and 1 with WHO\(^\text{17}\). This is an increase from 2008 where there were 154 UNVs deployed: 124 to UNHCR, 18 to DPKO missions, 8 to UNICEF, 1 to OCHA and 1 to WFP.

Where are the gaps in meeting the demand for CPIE staff availability?

Overall, members of the CPWG have gone to great lengths to ensure that staff required for emergency child protection responses is available. When asked what their thoughts were about the availability of CPIE staff, one Child Protection Advisor from a CPWG member’s headquarters said, “Overall, I would say it is good and improving. There are a lot of rosters in operation and there is a good flow of information between agencies, sometimes however there are shortages of people in one form or another, for some contexts”. Another survey respondent in Myanmar also painted a positive picture suggesting that, “there was a CP Emergency Response Personnel and a CPTS trainee in place for the initial 6 months. In Cyclone Nargis there did not seem to be difficulties in identifying or recruiting experienced CP staff who could support quality programming”.

---

\(^{14}\) Note that the figures below differ from the totals in Figure 2 since the below count contract extensions as separate deployments and a few of the deployments listed below were not strictly for emergency responses. (Deployments through CANADEM’s IYIP GPS (International Youth Internship Programme), for example, are included below as they go through the formal secondment arrangement.)

\(^{15}\) Statistics on CP deployments prior to 2008 are not available.

\(^{16}\) All of these requests are for deployments to a variety of sectoral responses including child protection, water and sanitation, humanitarian coordination, nutrition, logistics and camp management (to name the six sectors with the highest number of requests).

\(^{17}\) Personal communication with UN Volunteer Recruitment Resources Section
Although a number of mechanisms to enhance the availability of child protection in emergencies personnel exist, however, the unavailability of staff with certain experience and skills has also been highlighted in response evaluations and by child protection practitioners themselves. The main gaps identified are: 1) There is a lack of mid-level specialists available at short notice, with specific skills and for positions in non-family duty stations; and 2) There is an general lack of senior-level CPIE specialists available for emergency responses.

1) Lack of mid-level CPIE specialists at short notice, with specific skills and for non-family duty stations

A high number of questionnaire respondents specifically highlighted the lack of available mid-level specialists for emergency child protection responses as a challenge to the sector. Broadly speaking, questionnaire respondents said the main difficulties regarding their availability was when positions needed to be filled very quickly at short notice, when there are positions with specific skill requirements to be filled (see section below on skills, knowledge and behaviour), and when positions are in non-family duty stations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Statements from questionnaire respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Mid-level CPIE workers are not always free at short notice | - "I found no challenges in finding CVs of highly qualified CPIE specialist in the aftermath of an emergency. The challenge lay in their availability at the time their expertise was needed. As highly qualified specialists, most were already engaged or had already committed to a project in the near future when the need was raised by Country Offices. This also means that the CVs on file were just that, CVs on file, and not tracked on a regular basis for their availability"
- It is "relatively hard to find mid-level staff for deployment as often strong candidates already otherwise engaged, so it seems there are not enough strong qualified/experienced staff"
- "[In Haiti] there was a lack of experienced staff on the ground in the immediate aftermath of the earthquake to lead the response"
- "Strong candidates are often not available with short notice for certain periods due to prior commitments"
- "There have always been difficulties in finding appropriate people to fill the posts quickly"

| Positions in non-family duty stations | - There were “serious difficulties [...] to find a CPIE person for Sudan last year when Save the Children UK and US were expelled from the North and only Save the Children Sweden was left to work inside the country. We requested CPIE staff to come for a longer period to support the Country Office in Khartoum but never managed to get anyone available.”
- “In Gaza we operated without a Child Protection Advisor in the field for more than a month...”
- “After a few years of working in emergency responses, staff tend to want more stable positions where they can balance personal and professional life”
- “In Haiti, it was difficult for UNICEF and Save the Children to recruit experienced CP Specialists. There are several reasons behind this, some of them being the difficult living and working conditions in Haiti, no family duty station...”

Related to availability, what can be said of difficulties encountered by mid-level CPIE staff in their career development? Obstacles raised by those interviewed and the questionnaire respondents were:
- “Burn out is a big problem with mid-level CPIE workers and feeling as though they continue to make the same mistakes, emergency after emergency, and keep having to train the same beginning level workers”
- “Lack of opportunities especially for national staff to gain exposure and experience”
- “Not having a Masters is difficult as it is a prerequisite for some mid-level positions for example in UNICEF”
- “There is a lack of career guidance and direction”
- “Once you reach a certain level you do not want a non-family duty station”
- “Most positions in emergencies are not fixed-term so you loose those people who are looking for more stability in their job contracts”
- “Workers often have only single country or single region (within a country or across countries), and this limits their development”
- “Few scholarships or exchange opportunities exist”
“Often CP staff overall, including CPIE, are more often than not female. Women at mid-level career are often developing their own families and would not fancy being deployed far from home for long periods. These women lose out on many opportunities and get “stuck” in the middle for several years, without much opportunity for professional development, especially if they live in a country which is not “emergency prone”

“The necessity to have both solid experience working with stakeholders at the decision-making level and solid experience working on CP at the community-based level”

“There is an issue of keeping experience people within the workforce somehow if/when they get to the stage of not being able to or wishing to work in emergencies or travel, in order not to lose all that experience and expertise”

The impact not having adequate numbers of experienced mid-level staff available for interventions is highlighted in some CPIE programme evaluations. A review of the Sichuan Earthquake response, for example, highlights that the programme “suffered from neither having an experienced Programme Coordinator [...], nor adequate support from experienced technical staff since their initial engagement during the programme design period.”\(^{18}\) In Haiti, “a result of having so few technical specialists identified and deployed meant that staff on the ground was called upon to do everything - coordination, training, programmatic response development -to the point of almost becoming paralyzed.”\(^{19}\) And lastly, additional evidence for a lack in the availability of mid-level CPIE staff comes from India where the initial response to the tsunami “was reported to have been slow mainly due to the fact there were not enough staff to respond, conduct assessments and implement programmes.”\(^{20}\)

2) General lack of senior-level CPIE specialists

An overall lack of senior-level CPIE specialists available for deployment to emergency responses was also mentioned repeatedly as a big gap in the questionnaires and key informant interviews. Huge difficulties, for example, were cited in identifying senior staff with CPIE experience willing or able to be deployed in the Middle East and North Africa region, in particular for non-family duty stations. This is illustrated by the fact that posts for more senior CPIE specialists have been left vacant frequently for over 6 months. Similar difficulties were noted elsewhere. One questionnaire respondent said that, “in Bangkok, a CPIE P-5 level post was vacant for months. The same was true for the position of Chief, Child Protection in Sudan. Sometimes the problem is finding people for a non-family duty station and sometimes it is just difficult to find someone with that number of years experience.” Respondents also said, “I rarely see senior CPIE staff in the field”; “[It was] hard to find senior CPIE staff for Haiti”; “There are few seasoned and largely experienced staff out there who can be deployed”; and “Availability is an issue for senior CPIE workers”. This is also echoed in the UNICEF Tsunami response evaluation for Banda Aceh, Indonesia which points out that “[e]arly child protection responses in Aceh suffered from a dearth of senior child protection professionals capable of coordinating multi-agency activities and making pragmatic programme decisions.”\(^{21}\)

It is not just for longer term postings, however, that a lack of senior specialists has been identified. Within the emergency response rosters, for example, it is also “worth noting the lack of senior level CPIE candidates [...], coupled with the high demand for CPIE expertise”.\(^{22}\) An external evaluation of DRC’s roster also noted that, in recent years, DRC has “faced a decline in numbers of available senior experts on the roster”.\(^{23}\)

This lack of availability was suggested to exist predominantly for two reasons: firstly, the number of senior specialists working in the child protection sector is relatively low and secondly, of those who are still engaged in the sector, most are not willing or able to be deployed to emergency responses. The latter was said to be due predominantly to family commitments, burn out and other job commitments.

Obstacles in career development for senior level specialists cited by questionnaire respondents included:
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• “Lack of funding or venues for earning advanced degrees or learning about more specialized topics such as assessment, evaluation, field research strategies, concepts and methods”

• “No specific training with minimum qualifications - meaning that the senior workers with 5+ years field experience are attending the same trainings as staff with 1-2 years field experience and thus don’t get challenged enough”

• “Less jobs available”

• “Many professionals who start careers in Protection move on to other sectors or move on into management, and become field, country or regional directors, leaving behind the sectoral expertise. There are very few senior protection posts, at UN and INGO level, and even fewer at local NGOs. The market is small, and the CPIE workers who “survive” the system are often the ones who have accepted to live the emergency lifestyle, moving from one emergency to another, with little time for a stable family life. All this means that senior protection officers are rare, and the possibilities for further growth are almost non-existent.”

• “Since there are only few CPIE senior positions, many diversify out of the sector or to other management positions”

In addition, another obstacle to career development for senior level staff relates to organisational commitment. A questionnaire respondent stated that “many NGO’s do not really have a systematic way of building more sustainable working relationships [with their employees] or creating commitment towards the organisation amongst employees, including CPIE staff.” In Haiti a response evaluation noted that “numerous interviewees felt that over the years, the sector has not been able to retain its international workforce, for which differing explanations have been put forward. There was a sense from many respondents to the earthquake in Haiti that both technical programming and the external perception of CP as a sector have suffered accordingly.”

As a result of this gap, a number of those surveyed suggested that people are often sent to fill roles they are not ready or prepared for. “Because of the lack of availability, people with insufficient experience [are] sent to emergencies to either ‘sink or swim’ and [...] many mistakes [are] made because of that.” One respondent said that she was recruited for a mid-level position, but the only reason it was a mid-level position was because of a “lack of funding (i.e. they couldn’t afford the salary for a senior person), and in reality I received little support and was expected to achieve the same as people in more senior positions in other sectors”. Another respondent noted: “A mid-level staff quickly ‘promotes’ to being a senior level staff without having the years of experience or supervision. [There appears to be] Little regulation of what are the ‘required competencies’. This has been a challenge for both NGOs and INGOs alike. According to the ARC evaluation, “some [UNICEF] staff expressed that they are not always well prepared for [their] role, and do not always have the operational experience to be able to intervene effectively, or to provide credible technical support to partners.”

A problem in having someone more inexperienced take on the responsibilities of a more senior colleague, according to one questionnaire respondent, is that “often, people with limited experience [...] take cookie cutter, short-term approach that imposes outside approaches and ideas and does little to generate community ownership and sustainable processes. More experienced workers typically do a better job of contextualizing their efforts.”

The CPWG evaluation of Haiti also recognised that there was a gap of sufficiently senior staff on the ground at the onset of the response and this had implications. “[More] experienced staff would have recognised the need to initiate simultaneous work on all phases of the separation process [...]” In Haiti a response evaluation noted: “Since there are only few senior level positions at UN and INGO level, and even fewer at local NGOs. The market is small, and the CPIE workers who “survive” the system are often the ones who have accepted to live the emergency lifestyle, moving from one emergency to another, with little time for a stable family life. All this means that senior protection officers are rare, and the possibilities for further growth are almost non-existent.” In addition, “lessons learnt from Haiti show that perceived and actual seniority of a Coordinator can be critical to ensuring good working relations and the requisite authority with the government and other sectors.”
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2. Staff knowledge, skills and behaviour

A set of inter-agency Competencies for Child Protection in Emergencies workers was drafted on behalf of CPWG members this year. This means that there is by no means a common understanding yet between agencies of what skills, knowledge and behaviour are required to carry out different child protection roles. Given that a large number of child protection in emergency workers are seconded or deployed from one organisation to another, as described at the beginning of this section, this has implications which have already been raised.

The Review of Standby Partner Capacity in 2009 found, for example, that the quality of CPIE candidates on the rosters are viewed as variable and described as a “mixed bag” by many Country Offices. This has to do with the fact that, on the one hand there has been no screening or sorting of CPIE candidates on the rosters, and on the other hand that the nature of the Terms of References (TORs) for deployed personnel is changing.

Where previously more general profiles were required for emergency child protection responses, the current TORs require more specific skills sets within child protection. In the Standby Partner Capacity Review, this is described as follows, “[w]hereas traditional deployments focused on general CP field managers [...], today, country offices are in need of a wide range of child protection experts with diverse skill sets. This includes senior level child protection officers to lead the interagency response under the cluster approach, program officers to establish and manage country level 1612 MRM mechanisms and social worker to establish and support case management systems and interagency database mechanisms.”

It is in this light that the NRC has noticed that, “… requests are becoming more and more specialized [in CPIE] and our system of registering people merely as Child Protection officers is not detailed enough. However, we are in the process of becoming more qualitative in that matter and will try to register both levels and specialization in the future, in order to respond quicker and more accurate in terms of competence.”

This call for specialisation reflects a general trend in the child protection sector of growing commitment amongst CPWG members to ensuring predictable, effective and accountable responses. Ensuring the right staff with the right capacity in CPIE are available to support responses is a fundamental part of this.

What are the gaps in terms of knowledge, skills and behaviour?

Although the “availability of trained and experienced personnel is an issue, which cuts across all sectors”, a number of specific gaps in training and experience have been highlighted in the sector’s responses to protect children in emergencies. The main gaps identified by key informants, respondents to the questionnaire for this scoping exercise and through the evaluations reviewed, can be grouped broadly into the following categories:

1) Technical areas of specialisation; 2) Language skills; 3) Management skills; 4) Social sector and social work expertise; 5) Facilitation skills and skills in community-based work; 6) Country-specific and/or regional expertise; and finally a last point which was made repeatedly is that 7) There is no ‘degree’ or professional standard in child protection in emergencies.

1) Technical areas of CPIE Specialisation

In 2007, an inter-agency training needs assessment survey was conducted amongst 116 staff members of CPWG agencies including UNHCR, Save the Children Alliance, Terre des Hommes, ICRC, IRC and UNICEF. The priority areas in CPIE that were identified for training were (in order of priority): sexual and gender-based violence, rapid assessment, child participation and development, psychosocial care, community mobilisation, integrating CP into other sectors, monitoring and reporting on SCR 1612, separated and unaccompanied children, coordination and cluster issues, and children associated with armed forces to name the largest categories.

It is interesting to note that ‘separated and unaccompanied children’ and ‘coordination and cluster issues’ were listed close to last in terms of priorities participants identified for the survey three years ago. Currently, in the aftermath of Haiti, respondents to the questionnaire for this scoping exercise mentioned the lack of experience in working with separated and unaccompanied children as well as cluster coordination to be
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amongst the biggest gaps needing most urgent attention. This was also echoed in a recent evaluation. The “CPIE sector does not have an adequate level of senior staff either in coordination or technical areas.”

Additional gaps in technical expertise in areas of specialisation in child protection in emergencies highlighted through the questionnaire and key informant interviews were: specialists with the right background in psychosocial support for responses, specialists with training and experience in implementing the Monitoring and Reporting Mechanism under the Security Council Resolution 1612 and also specialists on gender-based violence and working with child survivors. A few of these areas are elaborated upon below.

**Separated children**

Amongst the respondents to the questionnaire, the area of CPIE specialisation which was highlighted the most in terms of facing the largest gap was the area of separated children and family tracing and reunification. The experience in Haiti suggests that “it was extremely difficult to recruit specialists in the various technical areas that make up work on unaccompanied and separated children.” A questionnaire respondent who was involved with the Haiti response said, “we had a very difficult time finding staff who had actually started an FTR program which is very different than having been part of an FTR program after it’s already been designed.”

**Interim care**

“Once again, [...] it was extremely difficult to recruit specialists to this field of work [interim care], even leaving language barriers aside, as there are very few people remaining in the sector with experience of managing a complex interim care program.” Seconding this view, a questionnaire respondent said that “it is challenging to identify candidates... In Haiti we struggled to fill the position of ‘Interim Care Specialist’.”

**Coordination**

Given that Child Protection is a Sub-cluster under the Protection Cluster, the increasing need for experienced Child Protection Specialists who can fulfil the role of CP Sub-Cluster Coordinators was highlighted by a number of questionnaire respondents. The difficulty in being able to identify candidates for this role in a number of contexts was raised as a concern. A Manager of an Emergency Standby Roster note that, “those with specialisations are harder to identify than CPIE generalists. There are only a few profiles available [of people] with CP Coordinator or 1612 MRM experience.”

**Gender-based Violence**

Gender-based Violence was another area highlighted as needing more CPIE specialists than are currently available. One key informant said that it was “very hard to identify mid- to senior people for Haiti with GBV experience. I spent hours looking through CVs available. It seemed that for each 30 CVs, only 1 was considerable. If you add language, it is even harder. The person deployed in the end was very strong, but not senior enough and did not speak French.”

**Psychosocial support**

Initiating interventions to protect children from, and respond to, psychosocial distress are growing more and more popular in emergencies amongst various agencies. Given the frequency with which these psychosocial support programmes are delivered, one would assume that there should be no difficulties in identifying CPIE specialists with a psychosocial background. This, however, does not appear to be the case. A questionnaire respondent shared that “it was challenging to find psychosocial support specialists at a senior level during emergency responses in Asia Pacific at the end of 2009”. This was confirmed by a number of other questionnaire respondents and a key informant who mentioned that although it appears at first glance relatively easy to identify candidates with experience of working on psychosocial support programmes for children, experience has shown that their appointments are often a matter of hit and miss since there are many different traditions and approaches in the psychosocial realm.

In addition to different traditions available, there is also the danger of a specialist not applying a contextual lens to their work which is ever so important when working in another cultural context. “The post-tsunami psychosocial needs assessment chronicled post-traumatic stress symptomology at the expense of an
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investigation of family and community supports. [The CPIE Specialists’] assessment lacked sufficient guidance on how to engage extended families or island level committees in social welfare and community care roles.”

2) Language skills

The importance of language skills and the fact that they are lacking amongst child protection in emergencies specialists was put on the agenda again very clearly by the response to the Haiti earthquake. Although the issue of language is not a new one, since the Haiti response called for such a large number of personnel with specific language skills this highlighted a particular weakness of the CPIE community in this regard. The response in Haiti "clearly showed that the sector does not have enough language diversity in its globally-deployable workforce.” This was echoed time and time again by respondents to the questionnaire, but also with regard to other contexts:

- “It is a challenge to find French speaking CPIE specialists.”
- “There is a shortage overall in the Francophone world, and this gap deserves a lot of attention.”
- “[It is] hard to recruit French speakers”
- “[It is] hard to find strong candidates with good French language skills”
- “Some emergency staff lack certain language skills, e.g CPIE staff deployed to a French speaking emergency, who did not speak French. I think this should be avoided, as much as possible.”
- “When we recruited for [a] CP Advisor on the Chile earthquake response, it was extremely challenging to find people with Spanish language skills. In fact, I was deployed there in spite of the fact that my Spanish was basic as opposed to intermediate, which also illustrates the lack of available Spanish speaking staff. I think it’s the same when we need French speakers, Portuguese speakers, Arabic speakers, Swahili speakers, people with local Asian language skills, etc.”

3) Management skills

Another capacity gap identified in CPIE specialists are management skills, both in relation to team management and project management. A questionnaire respondent said, “often people have a Child Protection technical background but limited project management skills (HR skills, budget)”. Another mentioned that, “…we might have a highly skilled CP advisor but lacking of management skills”. This reflects not only the preferred focus on technical content for trainings for CPIE staff but also the fact that many CPIE specialists have gained work experience through a string of short term emergency contracts where professional development options in terms of trainings on team or project management were not available.

“IT is hard to find management staff that have a background in CP as well as management”. “Whether sourced from national staff or international staff it’s difficult to find people with all the requisite skills needed to manage/advise on large complex programmes”.

4) Social sector and social work expertise

There was a strong call from a number of questionnaire respondents to ensure that CPIE specialists either have, or are provided with, opportunities to learn more about social work practices and principles and to enhance their expertise in the social sector. This was judged to be of particular importance when it comes to systems building in child protection. An evaluation pointed out that “[t]he lack of social sector expertise—especially as it relates to social sector and community development specialisation and access to local knowledge—also limited the effectiveness of child protection programming. The absence of a relevant focus and analysis on social and community strengths may, in part, be responsible for the shortcomings of the […] programme’s outcomes.”

CPIE specialists should not only have a background in understanding the basics of child growth and development, but also in understanding concepts related to social institutions and the ‘third’ or social sector. Unfortunately, many practitioners do not have in-depth knowledge or either. A key informant interviewed suggested that “we often rely on hiring people with degrees in international development – which seems to be

a ‘Catch-all’ and doesn’t help”. Another suggested, “what is needed [more than anything else in terms of competencies] are social welfare oriented skills”.

5) Facilitation skills and skills in community-based work

“Many child protection workers are very skilled technically but not in terms of facilitation,” suggested a child protection specialist who completed the questionnaire for the scoping exercise. “In the field, skills of facilitation and the way in which one work are as important as technical competence.” In addition, “there’s a shortage of really skilled workers, particularly for ones who have strong facilitation skills and awareness of cultural and Do No Harm issues and who can work in a manner that generates real community ownership”. This viewpoint is reflected in the interim findings of the Listening Project37, a project which presents a number of qualities identified by aid recipients as important. These are: knowledge and understanding of the local context, language skills, cultural sensitivity. “We need to do a better job of listening to people.”38

6) Country-specific and/or regional expertise

The two issues identified that fall under this particular gap in skills, knowledge and behaviour have to do with a lack of country-specific or regional expertise common to external CPIE specialists that are called upon to support humanitarian responses on the one hand, and a lack of child protection and/or emergencies expertise amongst the country programme or regional child protection teams on the other hand.

Given that the current mechanisms for responding to requests for emergency expertise are built upon sourcing external specialists to support the response – either in terms of own agency staff from headquarters or elsewhere, or standby partner deployments or external recruitments – the level of country-specific or regional expertise the CPIE specialist bring once engaged with the response is usually very limited. The Standby Partner Capacity Review points out that “the need for relevant country level and field experience is highlighted repeatedly by County Offices. However, in reality a large number of roster candidates are determined "fit for deployment" solely in terms of academic and professional qualifications, but with little or no country or field level experience.”39 It is not only difficult to identify short term CPIE specialists with expertise in a particular area or region, however. A Child protection Advisor at Headquarters noted that: “Regional specialists are also difficult to identify in terms of limited contextual knowledge, language and lack of diversity among senior CP staff”.

“CPIE staff need broader experience and more knowledge on the context and the situation they are contributing to in order to produce better quality results. For example, CPIE staff that are deployed in Africa should have prior experience on the context which will most likely be, in most cases, very different from where they come from. [Those deployed] must be ready to cope and adapt to the situation on the ground to work with people at the community level”, a questionnaire respondent said.

This call for country-specific expertise is also heard in child protection response evaluations. In the Maldives, for example, “[t]he extent of local island buy-in and ownership of projects is one of the most important determinants of the long-term viability and sustainability of social welfare and child protection programmes. Hence, it is important to ensure the necessary human resources—with country-specific social sector expertise, community development and gender specialisation—to review and support analysis and programming planning. Social sector expertise is also necessary for strengthening the qualitative aspects of monitoring and evaluation on how to address women’s and children’s rights in a culturally sensitive manner.”40

This example, however, at the same time highlights a lack of general child protection in emergencies expertise in country programmes themselves. “[T]oo few child protection staff have any direct experience or knowledge about working in emergencies, conflict or post-conflict situations; [...] inadequate resources are placed
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towards both staffing and capacity-building for protection and emergency functions”.

In Pakistan after the earthquake in 2005, an evaluation points out that “the difficulty in recruitment of suitable child protection staff posed significant challenges (especially in Bagh).”

In the Maldives, too, during the tsunami response, it was noted that the child protection response “appeared to be in need of support because of its small staff team, inexperience in emergency management, and the absence of strong local NGOs.” This lack of capacity continues to fuel the need for external resources, most for short periods which can also leave the team unsure of how to proceed. In Sri Lanka, “[...] local employees complain[ed] they simply could not absorb the sheer quantity of advice from international [child protection] advisers.”

And in China too, “the complexity of the initial programmes designed by experienced Advisors has not been completely understood by the relatively inexperienced team, or is beyond their capacity to implement.”

The power of building upon country-specific expertise and experiences is captured by an evaluation of the response to a volcano eruption in the Democratic Republic of Congo in 2002 following a previous emergency. “An important factor related to [the response’s] timeliness was success in contacting and recruiting ex SCUK [national] staff members with relevant experience and an understanding of organisational values and approaches. The historical experience of the [...] team with issues of separation and child protection, and the relevance of these skills in terms of the rapid movements of people displaced by the volcano eruption was crucial.”

7) No degree or professional standard in Child protection in emergencies

The Child Protection in Emergencies sector “lacks formal training opportunities unlike, for example, the health sector”. Some of the main reasons cited for the above mentioned skills, knowledge and behaviour gaps are the lack of longer term training and mentoring opportunities available to CPIE specialists. Questionnaire respondents said:

- “Workers typically receive limited training, often in one-off manner. There needs to be ongoing mentoring at field level.”
- “There is a lack of training venues followed by mentored field experience”

The fact that there is no professional standard for child protection in emergencies staff in terms of a certificate or diploma or degree, was raised by a large number of questionnaire respondents. This results in, as one respondent put it, “a lack of an agreement on standards and required backgrounds to work in CPIE” amongst the different agencies and other actors engaged in the sector.

3. Systems and processes to mobilise staff

“At the end of the day, if you want available surge capacity you are going to have to create it because otherwise people go off and get jobs and won’t be available when next needed.” - Questionnaire respondent

A brief overview of the current systems and processes to mobilise staff for child protection in emergencies responses was provided in the above discussion on the Availability of Staff. Just to recap, most organisations have a three tiered approach to mobilising additional staff for an emergency response.

Firstly, there is the mobilisation of agency-own staff from Headquarters or the regions through redeployments or secondments to supporting the relief effort. In addition to Headquarters staff leaving on missions to support responses, most organisations have regional response teams or focal points. UNICEF, for example, has “regional rapid response mechanism in both ESARO and WCARO regions. Regional rapid response mechanisms were supposed to have been rolled out in all regions; but so far only these two have dedicated resources.”
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Secondly, there are deployments from agencies with emergency standby teams or rosters to support other agencies. Surge capacity through rosters is based on pre-existing standby partner arrangements between the agencies and the UN agency which outline the conditions of secondment. In most instances secondments are for 3-6 months and the majority of the costs (except in the case of UNVs) are covered by the seconding agency. One UNICEF Chief of CP consulted suggested that, “it would had been difficult to have the [CPIE specialist] if we did not have the standby support, due to funding constraints.”

Lastly there are external recruitments which might be for full-time positions or shorter term consultancies.

**What are the gaps in terms of systems to mobilise staff?**

Even given these various options, many respondents emphasised that the main obstacles to the deployment of mid- and senior level staff for emergency responses are in fact of a structural nature. The systems and processes currently used to deploy staff are, in many cases, said to do not match the requirements on the ground. The main gaps identified in the systems and processes to mobilise staff are: 1) There is no roster for senior level CPIE specialists, 2) The rosters and response teams with mid-level specialists experience difficulty in catering to requests for CPIE specialists within specific skills, 3) The deployment procedures for organisations are in some instances too cumbersome 4) There is a high reliance on short-term surge support which can negatively impact programming if not managed well, 5) There are a lack of mechanisms supporting national mid-level staff to gain international experience, and 6) Key CPIE positions are not always prioritised and may not be budgeted for adequately in responses resulting in either not having personnel covering critical posts or having more junior personnel having to do a more senior level post left to ‘sink or swim’.

1) **No rosters for senior CPIE specialists**

The fact that there was no roster or reference pool of senior CPIE specialists available to draw upon for emergency responses was highlighted as a big challenge by both questionnaire respondents and key informants. According to a Child Protection Advisor, “Lower levels are easier to source. Senior CPIE specialists are more difficult to identify in part because there is no roster for senior CPIE workers”. Two questionnaire respondents asked why there was not an equivalent of Procap or GenCap for the Child Protection sector?

2) **Rosters with mid-level staff are unable to cater to specific requests for CPIE specialists**

Given the increasing demand for CPIE specialists with experience and knowledge of specific areas of CPIE programming, it would be beneficial for the various rosters and emergency standby teams to reflect these specialist skills. Unfortunately at the moment, as was discussed previously, this is not the case although plans are in place to organise the rosters more systematically around areas of expertise.

3) **Deployment procedures are in some instances too cumbersome**

Lengthy, cumbersome recruitment and deployment procedures were repeatedly highlighted as a gap in the current systems and processes to mobilise staff. One key informant mentioned that for Haiti all the required child protection response staffs for the programme are now in place, but it took seven months for this to happen. A Chief of Child Protection for UNICEF referred to a recent post that was filled through a standby partner deployment as it needed to be filled urgently. “We would have needed much more time if we were to recruit the person on SSA or other contractual basis,” they said. “The ability to immediately get CP specialists in country during emergencies or to support programs is normally delayed,” said a questionnaire respondent.

4) **High reliance on short-term surge support**

In part due to the cumbersome and lengthy recruitment procedures, and in part due to the availability of standby partner staff arrangements to support responses, a high number of child protection deployments for UNICEF are covered by CPIE specialists from one of a number of various rosters and emergency teams. These deployees are generally available for 3-6 months. “Numerous short term missions by different people, however, can be quite detrimental for a programme, not only with CPIE technical specialists but also on the programme management side of things,” highlighted on questionnaire respondent. Not only are short term assignments potentially detrimental to the programmes, but there can also be a sense on the side of those deployed that “emergency response assignments are [generally] short term assignments with no commitments from the organisation afterwards”.

Save the Children, just as most of the other CPWG members with emergency responses in child protection, also makes use of opportunities for short-term surge capacity support to emergency programme where
possible. A questionnaire respondent points out, however, that “CP specialised staff are mostly available for the first 3 months of the emergency, but there’s always a gap afterwards (sometimes it takes up to six months to have a new recruit).” Looking at the longer term gaps, which are in part created by the short term deployments, should be a regular part of healthy self-reflection.

UNICEF acknowledges that “staff capacity [in CPIE] to provide strong leadership and support in Country Offices and some Regional Offices has been relatively undeveloped until recently.”

5) Mechanisms for national mid-level staff CPIE deployments

For national Child Protection specialists, there is a lack of mechanisms or processes in place to facilitate deployments from one office or country to another to provide opportunities for gaining international experience. Part of these mechanisms could simply be the sharing of up-to-date contact lists and details of specialists in the region who would be available to support emergency responses. In the Maldives, for example, the evaluation of the Tsunami response noted that there is “no regional roster of consultants or organisations that could be drawn upon for early deployment of experts to conduct rapid, social protection needs assessments.” In Haiti too, it was noted that “better human resources procedures are needed to temporarily re-assign national staff working in other emergency settings”.

One questionnaire respondent said: “Young, motivated and talented nationally based emergency staff (including CPIE) often do not get opportunities to move on and develop experience in other countries, exactly because they do not have prior international experience. Young national staff then do not see this as a desirable career path and often move on to other sectors where they can grow within their own country. Language barriers also restrain development at this stage.”

6) Key CPIE positions are not always prioritised

One last gap with regards to the systems and processes to mobilise CPIE staff, relates to the fact that the mobilisation process for staff does not just start at the level of identifying available candidates and ensuring they join the team on the ground, but rather much earlier when budgets are drafted for child protection responses. The questionnaire respondents as well as key informants interviewed provided a number of examples where key child protection in emergencies positions were not budgeted for, and hence not filled, usually due to a lack of prioritisation by management.

In Haiti, for example, “unlike in the case of WASH, Education and Nutrition, UNICEF did not recruit a dedicated staff member to coordinate the child protection response under the cluster approach.” This was a great challenge and resulted in a lack of guidance and cluster leadership for the overall response. In addition to the absence of a dedicated cluster coordinator, there was also the absence of an information management officer in Haiti. This “was a key factor in the inability of the cluster to effectively gather and analyse assessment and response data – something which several other clusters and cross cutting issues did relatively well thanks to the appointment of full time national information managers.”

A Head of Child Protection Section underlines that prioritisation is a problem, stating that: “It is always not easy internally to convince the management [...] to have a new staff member. [...] Management understands the need for cluster coordinator for WASH for example but not for CP.” This inability to mobilise dedicated CPIE specialists can have a great effect on a response. “One of the major factors behind UNICEF’s failure to provide strong child protection leadership under the cluster approach can be attributed to the lack of a full time, dedicated child protection coordinator under the cluster system.”

The importance of having dedicated staff in key CPIE positions is highlighted by the Ugandan example. UNICEF Uganda is one of the few UNICEF offices that supported a dedicated and highly experienced coordinator to

54 Unknown (2008), op. cit.
lead the child protection response under the Protection Cluster. In Uganda, the child protection sub-cluster “remains fully visible, [and is not overshadowed by the broader protection agenda]. This can be attributed to [...] the skilled leadership of the sub-cluster Coordinator.”

---

II. Review of existing Capacity Building Programmes

A wealth of learning from capacity building and career development programmes exists. As the second part of this scoping study, this section aims not only to identify and provide a brief overview of different existing initiatives that have relevance to CPIE, but also to capture key points of learning these programmes have generated. The purpose of outlining the programmes here and identifying lessons learned is that this will feed into the development of child protection career development programme options (Part II). Some initiatives are ones that can be learned from and others are ones that can be built upon or partnered with. In what follows, first capacity building programmes in child protection will be explored followed by wider capacity building programmes in other sectors.

1. Capacity Building Programmes / Initiatives in Child Protection

Action for the Rights of the Child (ARC)

Background: The ARC training and capacity building project, which began in 1997, was an initially an initiative of UNHCR and the Save the Children Alliance to create a comprehensive training programme on children’s and adolescent’s issues for staff of UNHCR and implementing partners56. UNICEF and OHCHR then joined the ARC project in 1999, an inter-agency Steering Committee was formed and materials were developed. Between 1999 and 2002 approximately 20 regional training of trainers and workshops were carried out. From 2002-2005 ARC was used more at the national and field levels and the focus was widened to the ‘protection and care of children affected by armed conflict, disaster and forced displacement’. ARC training materials were last revised in 2009 and are currently being translated in Spanish.

The budget for the ARC initiative, which was 75% covered by UNHCR, was: $470,000 in 1997; $860,000 in 1998; Approx. $600,000 for the years 1999, 2000 and 2001; $177,313 in 2002; $169,719 in 2003: and $133,601 in 2004.57

Lessons Learned: An Evaluation of ARC was carried out in 2006. The following are some lessons learned and recommendations:

- ARC’s successes in the field are largely due to a committed group of Regional Advisors – from UNICEF, UNHCR and Save the Children – who have made it their mission to promote this tool and training.
- ARC does not raise the issue of what CP agents should do in cases of child rights violations
- There is the need to strengthen ARC’s ability to translate international standards into terms and concepts local people understand. “They stress the importance of making child rights understandable by connecting them to community customs and values of child protection, rather than depicting them as foreign imports and impositions, which can frequently lead to their rejection.”58
- ARC as a comprehensive package including training on concepts and a TOT together as a one step process has been problematic and should be broken down into two separate steps.
- “[…] ARC has been most effective at the individual level, were generalist staff and those with little prior experience of child protection in emergency […] situations have been introduced to key terms, concepts and good practice to guide their work.”59

African Centre for Childhood (ACC)

Background: In 2008, Regional Psychosocial Support Initiative (REPSSI) and the University of KwaZulu-Natal supported by UNICEF developed a programme to provide distance learning support to volunteers and entry level humanitarian aid and development staff who work with orphans and vulnerable children in ten African countries. The Certificate Programme developed is the called ‘Community-based Work with Children and Youth’ (formerly known as ‘Working with Children, Families and Communities affected by HIV & AIDS, Conflict, Poverty and Displacement in Africa’). The accredited certificate programme ran a pilot year from 2009 to 2010 with 554 students successfully completing it in eight countries: Lesotho, Malawi, Namibia, Swaziland, Tanzania,

57 Ibid. p. 15
58 Ibid. p. 52
59 Ibid. p. 25
Uganda, Zambia and Zimbabwe. Two additional countries, Kenya and Mozambique, joined the programme with the start of the cycle in July 2010.

The programme runs 18 months, is part time and open to those who are working with children and youth from a variety of organisations. It uses a ‘situated supported distance learning’ (SSDL) methodology which involves learners staying situated in their environments, being supported by a trained mentor and peers involved in the same programme and using distance learning materials shared across the region. In terms of structure, there are countries where the programme is delivered through the African Centre of Childhood (ACC) and assessed by the University of KwaZulu-Natal; and there are other ‘transitional’ countries where the programme is being ‘nationalised’. In the case of the latter, the ACC supports identified local institutions to accredit the certificate programme locally and incorporate the programme in their teaching programmes.

In terms of cost, for the Certificate cycle commencing next year the costs have been revised to be approximately $2,500 per student, which covers all costs of the programme for 21 months. (18 month programme plus cost associated with recruitment through to graduation after the programme).

**Lessons learned:** An evaluation of the ACC pilot year was conducted this year\(^60\) which identified the following:
- Selecting the right institution to partner with in different countries is crucial to the success of the programme
- Having a clear understanding of the target group and needs is a critical step in the training design process
- Training materials need to be available in additional languages if they are to be used in non-English speaking countries
- Mentor supervisors have a very important role which needs ongoing support
- A manageable schedule of programme activities is needed that gives enough time to participants to complete modules and that has realistic lead-in times for assignments
- A simple, transparent monitoring strategy can be useful to track the performance of participants in the programme

---

**Agency Learning Network on the Care and Protection of Children in Crisis-Affected Countries**

**Background\(^61\):** The Agency Learning Network on the Care and Protection of Children in Crisis-Affected Countries (the ‘CPC Learning Network’) was established by Columbia University’s Program on Forced Migration and Health at the Mailman School of Public Health and five international organizations, namely the International Rescue Committee, Save the Children, the Women’s Refugee Commission, UNICEF, and ChildFund International, and a number of national organizations including the PULIH Indonesia and the Institute for Development Studies in northern Uganda.

The goal of the CPC Learning Network is to: “strengthen and systematize child care and protection in crisis-affected settings through the collaborative action of humanitarian organizations, local institutions, and academic partners. The CPC Learning Network aims to inform practice and policy through the use of evidence-based findings.”

The CPC Learning Network’s structure includes both Program Learning Groups (PLGs) at the local level and Global Technical Groups to assist and synthesize learning across locations.

Program Learning Groups: consist of approximately 5 to 10 member organizations, including national organizations, field offices of INGOs, and local universities and research institutions catalyze learning on the ground. PLGs. With support from the Secretariat and the Global Technical Groups, PLGs in Uganda, Sri Lanka, Indonesia, and the Occupied Palestinian Territory are developing interagency learning initiatives and honing their learning agendas.

---


\(^61\) Taken from: [http://www.forcedmigration.columbia.edu/research/CPC.html](http://www.forcedmigration.columbia.edu/research/CPC.html)
Global Technical Groups: provide assistance, synthesize learning across locations, and identify proven and promising practice. These entities help to provide necessary technical assistance to the field and disseminate effective program design, evaluation methodologies and lessons learned; and, promote standards, guidelines and practices.

Child Protection, Monitoring and Rehabilitation, IPT Programme

**Background:** The International Peacekeeping and Peace-building Training Programme (IPT) of the Austrian Study Centre for Peace and Conflict Resolution (ASPR) offers a 10-day specialisation course called ‘Child Protection, Monitoring and Rehabilitation’ as part of its programme. The course was designed in 2007 by the ASPR and piloted with direct involvement of the United Nations Operation in Cote d’Ivoire (UNOCI). The overall objective of the specialization course is to prepare experts who would like to become involved in monitoring, advisory, and executive functions related to children in crisis areas. Most of participants to date already have field experience from their home countries and want to qualify for an international mission abroad. The course contents include: basic concepts in child protection, legal framework and international standards, communicating with children, impact of armed conflict on children, child rights monitoring and reporting, and strengthening justice mechanisms amongst other sessions.

On average there have been between 100-120 applications per course, of which a maximum of 25 are selected to participate. The course costs are €725 per week including tuition fee, materials and half-board accommodation. The next course will be held in 2012.

**Lessons learned:**
- Obstacles for many participants to attend the training in Austria are restrictive visa procedures.
- Financial constraints are also obstacles as only a few agencies support participants financially

Child Protection Sub-Cluster Coordinator’s Training

**Background:** The objectives of the CP sub-cluster Coordinator’s training was to build the competencies of current and future Child Protection Coordinators in humanitarian settings through the development and delivery of an inter-agency training programme. To this end ReD UK produced a package of training resources on coordination in CPIE and delivered two sets of 5-day trainings in March and September 2010 to a total of 56 participants from a variety of organisations including UNICEF, UNHCR, Save the Children, Terre des Hommes, DRC, NRC, IRC and Plan.

The costs at global level per workshop for the delivery of the training (e.g. facilitators, printing, preparations etc) was around $20,000 and around $40,000 for the venue, accommodation, etc. for 30 course participants. This amount doesn’t include travel costs (e.g. flights) for participants.

**Lessons learned:**
- The levels of experience varied considerably from highly experienced Cluster Coordinators to those who were new to field work and/or Child Protection. More homogeneity amongst the group in terms of level of experience would ensure that participants get as much as possible out of the training.
- In both workshops, there was an interest in issues relating to coordinating with military actors, working with government counterparts, and burn-out. Sessions could be created and/or existing sessions revised with this interest in mind for future trainings.
- A suggestion was that the training could have been linked to a roster or surge capacity mechanism. Participants who wanted to, for example, could have been assessed to be included on a roster for CP sub-cluster Coordinators as was done for the WASH cluster.

Child Protection Trainee Scheme (CPTS)

**Background:** The Child Protection Trainee Scheme was established by Save the Children UK in 2005 with the objective of enhancing the capacity of the humanitarian system to protection children in emergencies. The

---

62 Course website: [http://www.aspr.ac.at/crisis_missions/ipt/ipt_specialisation_courses.htm#ChildProtection](http://www.aspr.ac.at/crisis_missions/ipt/ipt_specialisation_courses.htm#ChildProtection)
scheme involves 12 months of structured learning including two six month placements in emergency or fragile state settings with a coach and structured workshops at the beginning, middle and end of the cycle. So far 44 trainees have completed the scheme and eight trainees are currently in the last cycle to end in 2011.

The CPTS is a highly competitive scheme providing a rare entry point into the sector, and as such the profile of applicants includes ones with considerable work experience in child protection and related sectors and/or emergencies. Upon completion of the scheme, trainees are generally considered entry- to mid- level specialists depending on the individuals and their backgrounds. Overall, the CPTS scheme cost approximately £1,335,000 over a five year period.

For the first three years of the CPTS, the majority of graduates continued to work in the child protection sector after completing the scheme. In 2009, however, the figure began dropping as the number of graduates who either found work in other humanitarian sectors and in other areas altogether increased. Figure 3 gives an overview of the employment statistics of graduates of the scheme.

**Figure 3**

![Employment of Child Protection Trainee Scheme Graduates](chart)

**Lessons learned**: A recent mid-term evaluation of the CPTS\(^{63}\) provides a number of recommendations for future child protection career development schemes. The recommendations include to:

- Decentralise the scheme and organise trainings at the sub-regional or regional level
- Conduct the training in additional languages, for example French
- Emphasize ‘equivalent work experience’ versus university degrees in the selection process
- Include focus on linking relief, rehabilitation and development (LRRD)
- Broaden the inter-agency component of the scheme
- Develop mechanisms to support trainees professionally after completion of the scheme
- The selection criteria and process for selecting coaches are important to consider carefully
- For placement-based learning, it is important to have a Terms of Reference for the participants
- In addition, another evaluation stated that a point to note was that the “Save the Children UK [...] Child Protection in Emergencies training programme remains without a clearly defined curriculum to guide its trainees”\(^{64}\).

**Global Child Protection Classroom**

**Background**: The Global CP Classroom is an initiative of Columbia University bringing together university students with child protection NGO practitioners in a seven-week course to share learning and experiences. The curriculum and distance-learning technology of the Global CP Classroom enables practitioners and students in the field to develop a practical understanding of effective interventions for preventing and responding to specific child protection concerns, including child-family separations; child recruitment and use

---


\(^{64}\) Thomas, V. (2006), *op. cit.* p. 43
as armed combatants; and sexual violence and abuse. The Global CP Classroom was piloted in 2009 simultaneously at the Mailman School for Public Health in New York and in Gulu, Uganda. Future partnerships are being developed with the Open University in Sri Lanka, the University of Indonesia, and the Columbia University Middle East Research Center in Jordan.

ICRC Restoring Family Links (RFL) Trainings and Roster

**Background:** Restoring family links is a core activity of the ICRC. In 2003, the ICRC launched a global initiative to strengthen the Movement’s ability to restore family links. The Family Links Network, however, faces a series of challenges including insufficient understanding of the work of restoring family links, inadequate sense of responsibility and commitment, and scarce resources. To address this, a 10 year strategy (2008-2018) was developed to map out the actions required to unpin the commitment to improving the RFL work.

The RFL Strategy is built on three objectives: improving capacity and performance; enhancing coordination and intra-Movement cooperation; and strengthening support for RFL. This includes investing in the professional development of staff through delivering trainings including regional trainings and developing training modules and manuals, and also enhancing the effectiveness and functional coordination within the Movement through the development of an international disaster-response mechanism for rapid deployment of RFL specialists including RFL specialists from National Societies on a predefined pool.

Protection Learning Programme (PLP), UNHCR

**Background:** In 2000 UNHCR established the Protection Learning Programme (PLP), which is considered one of UNHCR’s core learning programmes, with the objectives to:

- foster a common understanding amongst all staff members of UNHCR’s protection mandate and international legal standards, in order to promote consistency and cohesiveness in UNHCR’s approach
- enhance staff members’ knowledge, skills and attitudes, according to their functions, to help ensure the effective protection of refugees and others of concern to UNHCR in all operations

Currently there are two cycles of the PLP per year with over 200 participants. The PLP includes a 6-month self-study phase during which participants learn about key protection concepts; a 4.5 day workshop that reviews and consolidates items covered in the self-study units and provides an environment in which participants can interact with others who have different skills and experiences; and a 3-month project phase that enables participants to address a key protection problem in their country of operation.

**Lessons learned:** The PLP was last evaluated in 2005. Recommendations from the evaluation include:

- The PLP was targeted at a mixed audience leaving many participants feeling their needs were not adequately met. Several mid-level protection staff, for example, considered the material to be too basic and had higher expectations of the contents.
- Modularise the training content to allow for flexibility and staff the opportunity to specialise.
- Consider introducing an assessment component to the learning programme which it does not have at present. PLP graduates, course participants, non-completers and trainers/facilitators were asked whether there should be a formal assessment of participants, and a significant number indicated ‘yes’, a few said ‘maybe’ and the remainder ‘no’.
- The training should be available in French and Spanish as well as English.
- The lack of individualised feedback was a main complaint from participants. Timely, individualised feedback and guidance should be provided during the programme.
- After their efforts to complete all the assignments and made the effort to travel so far, some participants were disappointed encountering inexperienced facilitators

---

65 The Central Tracing Agency, the tracing agencies in ICRC delegations, and the National Societies ‘tracing services’

UNICEF CPIE Staff Exchange Mechanism

**Background:** In 2005, UNICEF began to implement a staff exchange programme in emergencies for national child protection staff. The objectives were to provide CP Officers with exposure to different country contexts and increase their understanding of child protection in emergencies work. The initiative twined experienced emergency child protection staff with new/inexperienced staff in countries identified as unstable and/or likely to become so in the near future. Under this initiative, several exchanges were carried out in 2005 and 2006 (?) including a formal exchange between a CP Officer from Sri Lanka to Sudan. Although additional exchanges were planned for 2007-2008, the scheme ended for a variety of (undisclosed) reasons.

**Lesson learned:**

- Managers or supervisors need to have set agreed procedures in place or incentives to ‘release’ staff for exchanges to work well.
- Bureaucracy-heavy processes can hinder the smooth exchange of staff between offices.

2. Capacity Building in the wider Humanitarian Sector

**CBHA Capacity Building Programme**

The Consortium for British Humanitarian Agencies (CBHA)\(^{67}\) have developed a joint capacity building programme strategy, funded by DFID from March 2010 to February 2012. The overall goal of the capacity building programme of the CBHA is to develop capacity within the CBH Agencies and the wider sector to increase the numbers and competencies of potential leaders, and increase the overall humanitarian skills and knowledge base of existing staff working in emergencies.

**Core Humanitarian Skills Programme (CHSP) & Management and Leadership Skills Development Programme (MLSDP)**

**Background:** Under the capacity building programme, there is a component led by Oxfam for building regional and national capacity. This component includes the implementation of two staff development programmes in four areas: Bangladesh, Horn of Africa, Bolivia and Indonesia. One 6-month course is aimed at Core Humanitarian Skill Development, providing professional development to national agency staff focusing on an introduction to the key concepts of humanitarian programming. The second course, of 9 months duration, is the Management and Leadership Skills Development Programme designed for national agency mid- to senior management staff, examining key aspects of management and leadership in emergency situations.

There are 20 participant places per course, requiring a 2-3 hour commitment per week (for self-study, peer coaching/buddying, external coaching, action learning) and involving two short residential events. Crucial to this programme is manager support to participants throughout. A learning event will take place at the close of both programmes in each country – in addition to two learning events for this project will be held in the UK.

An assessment of response capacity will be undertaken in each of these countries prior to running the programme to ensure it is specific to the context and to provide a baseline. Simulations, which have already taken place in Bangladesh, Horn of Africa and Bolivia (Indonesia is scheduled for November 2010) will contribute to these assessments. The best model for learning and cost implications for these programmes is still under development. The overall budget is £750,000 for management costs, carrying out the baseline assessments, delivering the training in the four locations, monitoring and evaluation as well as developing and translating the materials.

The intention of both the Core Skills and the Management & Leadership Skills programmes is that the programme materials are open to the whole sector after February 2012 in English, French and Spanish. The training course and materials can be taken on as a whole, or as segments, to be absorbed into agencies' own capacity building or into other initiatives.

---

67 The CBHA is a consortium of 15 UK based NGOs: ActionAid, Action Against Hunger, CARE International UK, CAFOD, Christian Aid, Concern Worldwide UK, HelpAge International, IRC UK, Islamic Relief Worldwide, Merlin, Oxfam GB, PLAN International UK, Save the Children UK, Tearfund and World Vision UK.
Lessons learned: Although the programme has not yet started, a few learning points relating to the process of developing the programme were identified:

- It is essential to identify a core group of very strong, experienced experts for design and technical oversight and also in the delivery and monitoring of the courses which needs to be adequately budgeted for.
- Significant investments early on in the material development will pay off greatly

Humanitarian Leadership Development Programme - Trainee Scheme (HLDP)

Background: A second component of the aforementioned CBHA capacity building programme is being led by Save the Children UK and focuses on developing new leadership in the humanitarian sector. This component is distinct from Oxfam’s programme above as it is aimed at those who are new to humanitarian work or are new to leadership roles. The HLDP is based around two programme streams: international (with London as the hub) and national/regional (with Nairobi as the hub). These international and national/regional streams will be based on the same operational model but will focus on different geographical areas.

The first cycle is the Head Office Trainee Placement – which runs 6 months from September 2010–February 2011 and September 2011–February 2012 in the Horn of Africa, and from March–August 2011 in the UK. During this time the trainees are housed within a designated agency and complete the Emergency Operations Programme (EOP). The EOP includes a week Emergency Foundation Course (EFC) training and simulation, 5 months distance learning (3 hours a week plus homework and self study), and 12 days of Advance Field Training during the 6th month. Mentors support trainees during this period.

The second 6-month period is a Field based Placement, which will run from March–August 2011 and March–August 2012 in the Horn of Africa, and from September 2011–February 2012 in the UK. The field placement could be with any humanitarian programme anywhere in the world (for the UK cycle) and anywhere in the Horn of Africa region (for Nairobi/Horn of Africa cycle), for any member agency or one of their partners. A coach will be identified for each trainee during this time and will support them and provide guidance in fulfilling their role.

15 trainees will be recruited per programme per annual cycle, so 45 will be recruited in total across both programmes. All trainees will be assessed and accredited throughout the duration of their trainee year. At least 30 coaches will also be recruited, trained and supported throughout the programme lifecycle. After an impact evaluation at the end of the 1st cycle, all learning materials will be consolidated into a handbook to be disseminated widely and to be promoted in other appropriate countries and contexts. The budget available for the Humanitarian Leadership Programme is approximately £600,000.

Lessons learned: Although the HLDP trainee scheme has only just begun, the EOP has been running for a few years and has identified the following learning points:

- The ability to dedicate sufficient time has been raised as a challenge for mentors on the EOP. In the past, some mentors have dropped the mentor role due to this, especially when in emergencies.
- SCUK has a Global Emergency Standby Team (GEST) for which it is mandatory to complete the EFC. Since the EFC is part of the EOP, SCUK candidates who take part in the EOP can apply to join the GEST. The GEST is still only for SCUK staff meaning that for other participants the training is not linked with a surge capacity mechanism.
- For the EOP distance learning component different technical specialists at HQ hold online seminars and it has been a challenge in the past to get the facilitators to do the sessions live due to other work commitments and difficulty scheduling dates that suit all.

WASH Cluster Coordinator Training and Roster

Background: To improve the effectiveness, timeliness and predictability of its responses the WASH Cluster aims to building response capacity by establishing and maintaining standby rosters. Led by RedR, the WASH Cluster carried out a project to set up a roster of competent and trained WASH coordinators, to allow rapid deployment of country level (senior) coordinators and field level coordinators to humanitarian crises. In 2007

68 SCUK initially developed the EOP as an internal capacity building scheme in 2006. The EOP is now in its sixth cycle. The cost for participating in the full EOP costs between £850-1200.
69 Save the Children UK (2010), Project Document – Consortium of British Humanitarian Agencies. London: SCUK.
and 2008, 30 participants were trained. During the trainings, participants were interviewed for the WASH roster set-up by UNICEF and RedR. 24 of the 30 were deemed suitable.\(^7\) The budget for Phase I was $306,600.

For the second phase of the WASH Cluster project, additional potential WASH Cluster Coordinators were identified and another 30 participants took part in the WASH Cluster Coordinators training of which only 3 were not deemed suitable for the roster. A regional WASH Cluster Coordination training was also conducted in Nairobi and a national one in Pakistan. In addition the Cluster Handbook was finalised during this phase of the project. The budget for Phase II was $171,600.\(^7\)

The WASH Cluster project is currently in Phase III which aims to identify and train a further 30 potential WASH Cluster Coordinators. It will also work with UNICEF’s Regional Emergency WES advisers (REWAs) in running 5 courses for national coordination for a variety of actors in priority countries which includes a training of trainers element so the courses can be run by UNICEF REWAs in other countries. Lastly, the project will provide mentoring to 5 coordinators on the roster, giving them the confidence to take on national coordination of large scale rapid onset emergencies. The budget for Phase III is $331,700.\(^7\)

**Lessons learned:**

- The first workshop highlighted challenges in ensuring that course participants were of an appropriate and high enough calibre and that those who should be applying did. To address this, the approach taken was to clarify the application and selection process emphasising that candidates applying are applying for a place on the WASH roster and are then put forward for training. The calibre of the participants of the second training was deemed higher.
- After the trainings held, it is evident that further support needs to be offered to Coordinators once trained in order to make the roster and the capacity it adds to the Global WASH Cluster sustainable.
- Linking the Coordinator’s training with an assessment and interview process for joining the WASH roster worked well to ensure that all the roster members have received the same training, and also that systems to identify and mobilise Coordinators who have been trained are in place.

---


III. Summary of Capacity Gaps identified and Lessons Learned

This last section of the scoping exercise asks how could an additional capacity building or career development scheme respond to the capacity gaps identified? What should it entail? In order to answer this, the main gaps identified in Section I and the learning identified in Section II have been extracted and summarised in the two tables below. In addition, the suggestions made by CP specialists questioned about what they think key components of a career development programme should be, as well as key recommendations from humanitarian response evaluations are included as a third table. Together, this provides an overall framework within which the Child Protection Career Development Programme options can be developed.

1. Gaps identified in staff capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff capacity</th>
<th>Gaps / Problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Availability of staff</td>
<td>• There is a lack of mid-level CPIE specialists available at short notice, with specific skills and for non-family duty stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There is a general lack of senior-level CPIE specialists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency of staff</td>
<td>• Insufficient CPIE specialists with technical areas of specialisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lack of language skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lack of management skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lack of social sector and social work expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lack of facilitation skills and skills in community-based work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lack of country-specific and regional skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There is no ‘degree’ or professional standard in child protection in emergencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems to mobilise staff</td>
<td>• There is no roster for senior level CPIE specialists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The rosters for mid-level specialists are unable to cater to requests for CPIE specialists within specific skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The deployment procedures are in some instances too cumbersome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There is a high reliance on short-term surge support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There is a lack of mechanisms supporting national staff CPIE deployments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Key CPIE positions are not always prioritised and may not be budgeted for in responses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Lessons learned from Capacity Building Programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity building Programmes / Initiatives in Child Protection</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARC</td>
<td>• Training should focus on practical application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Training material developed with the aim of being rolled out in different countries should be contextually adaptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• It is more effective if a training of trainers is seen separately from a training on topics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Centre for Childhood</td>
<td>• Selecting the right institution in different countries to partner with is crucial to the success of the programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Having a clear understanding of the target group and needs is a critical step in the training design process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Training materials need to be available in additional languages if they are to be used in non-English speaking countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• If a training programme includes mentors, they need to be provided with ongoing support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A manageable schedule of programme activities is needed that gives enough time to participants to complete modules and that has realistic lead-in times for assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A simple, transparent monitoring strategy can be useful to track the performance of participants in the programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPT CP Course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Obstacles for many participants to attend the training in Austria are restrictive visa procedures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Financial constraints are also obstacles as only a few agencies support participants financially</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CP Sub-Cluster Coordinator training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Ensure as far as possible a clear target audience for training. Greater homogeneity amongst the group in terms of level of experience allows the training to better achieve its objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interest amongst CP specialists exists for areas that are not always covered in CPIE trainings including civil-military coordination, working with government counterparts, and burn-out. Future trainings for this target group could consider these and additional areas to build in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Trainings related to surge capacity roles could be linked to a roster or surge capacity mechanism to keep track of those trained and to have a list of people to refer to when needed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CP Sub-Cluster Coordinator training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Decentralise training where possible to the sub-regional, regional or national level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conduct trainings in additional languages, for example French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Emphasize ‘equivalent work experience’ versus university degrees in the selection process for participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Include a focus on linking relief, rehabilitation and development (LRRD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Include a broad inter-agency component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop mechanisms to support those who have completed the training professionally afterwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The selection criteria and process for selecting coaches are important to consider carefully</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• For placement-based learning, it is important to have a Terms of Reference for the participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The training programme will benefit from having a clearly defined curriculum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child Protection Trainee Scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Training programmes need to be carefully targeted at the audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organising training content in modules can allow for greater flexibility for participants and allow them to specialise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A learning programme should consider having an assessment component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Offer trainings in additional languages, for example, French and Spanish where possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Timely, individualised feedback for participants is important to ensure which means securing the necessary human resources to do this depending on size of programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ensure training facilitators are sufficiently experienced to be respected as teachers by the group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protection Learning Programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Managers or supervisors need to have set agreed procedures in place or incentives to ‘release’ staff for exchanges to work well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bureaucracy-heavy processes can hinder the smooth exchange of staff between offices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNICEF Exchange</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• It is essential to identify a core group of very strong, experienced experts for training content design and technical oversight and also in the delivery and monitoring of the courses which needs to be adequately budgeted for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Significant investments early on in the material development will pay off greatly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHSP &amp; MLSDP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• For mentors supporting programmes, clear agreements outlining their roles and responsibilities as mentors and the expectations in terms of their time should be signed off by their supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Training programmes focused on increasing surge capacity should be linked to surge capacity mechanisms so as harness the full potential of those trained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• For technical or other specialists playing a key role in the delivery of trainings or support to the programme, clear roles and responsibilities should be agreed upon and signed off</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HLDP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Ensure sufficient consideration is given to ways of target audience for a training is aware it will take place. Application processes may be helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• For an effective roster to be upheld, members require more than a one-off training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Linking a training with an assessment and interview process for joining a roster can help to ensure that all the roster members have received the same training, and also that systems to identify and mobilise those who have been trained are in place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Recommendations from Evaluations and Child Protection Specialists

The below capture recommendations that were both put forward in evaluations of humanitarian responses as well as by child protection in emergencies practitioners themselves about ways in which some of the capacity gaps identified could be addressed:

Evaluations

- Establish an expanded roster of senior professionals to enhance protection responses
- Enhance regional child protection responses. Identify a cadre of child protection professionals in the South Asia region—and globally—with proven experience in emergency response
- UNICEF needs to continue to strengthen the global web roster and standby rosters
- Invest in human resource capacity in Regional Offices with emergency focal points
- As part of an inter-agency initiative, provide skills-based training to protection staff on new methods such as establishing prevalence rates on key child protection concerns, engaging affected populations in identifying what risk and resilience means in a given culture and a given crisis deepening understanding of local concepts and perceptions
- Emergency standby roster workshops could be arranged; regional learning initiatives promoted; and distance training packages developed to ensure the critical skills are promoted in a timely and relevant manner.

CP Questionnaire Respondents

- Develop possibilities for national staff to be rapidly deployed to emergencies in their region
- Develop an inter-agency agreed threshold or set of criteria that specifies when a minimum number of staff need to be deployed to support an emergency. For example, a P-4 level CPIE Specialist and a P-4 Coordinator could be deployed from an established roster to do an initial assessment, set things up etc. The supervisors would of course have to commit, but it could be agreed that it will only happen maximum once a year for each member for a set period of time
- Establish and maintain a rota of experienced CPIE consultants who would be available to support emergency response
- Why not establish a GenCap or PROCAP for the sector?
- Set-up a roster of more senior CPIE staff who are contracted over a longer period of time, for example one year. These can support with trainings or take up other tasks in the time between assignments.
- Develop mentoring and support programmes for national staff
- Develop E-learning courses on CPIE related subjects for mid- and senior level staff
- Build links with social work and other institutions relevant to child protection in various countries
- Provide the opportunity for mid-level workers to specialise in an area through specialised training on technical CPIE areas
- Develop a competency-based capacity building programme, funded through standby rosters, linked to an academic institution that can issue a postgraduate degree on child protection
- Find ways of using experienced people who are unable to travel to support those less experienced who are deployed
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Part II: Career Development Programme Options

In an effort to address the findings of the CPIE capacity scoping exercise, in what follows, three options for career development programmes will be outlined. These share a common Introduction, found below, but differ in their design. A summary of all three options together with an indication of which capacity gaps they aim to address concludes this last section.

Introduction

Why the scheme is necessary

The last few years have witnessed a growing commitment amongst the global humanitarian community to ensuring effective, accountable and predictable humanitarian responses to emergency situations. Child Protection, as a key sector and area of responsibility within the Protection Cluster, has been receiving growing recognition of its importance as part of humanitarian responses including as a deliverer of key life-saving interventions. The growing role of the sector is illustrated by the fact that today 70% of the Clusters in existence worldwide have identified a focal point leading on Child Protection or has a Child Protection sub-cluster. The number of funding requests for child protection programmes submitted to emergency funding mechanisms has also increased from being represented in 23 out of 30 appeals in 2007, to being in all but one in 2008 and present in all CAPS and Flash Appeals in 2009.

Given the increasing profile of, and humanitarian space for, Child Protection in emergency interventions, members of the Child Protection Working Group (CPWG) are tasked with identifying ways of ensuring that the capacity needs of the sector are met. The ability of the child protection sector to adequately and consistently meet the staffing needs of humanitarian responses has been put to the test over the past few years and has been challenged. Particularly the lack of available mid-level technical staff with experience and specific expertise in different areas of child protection in emergencies and the general unavailability of senior-level staff for emergency responses has been highlighted repeatedly. This was confirmed in a recent scoping study undertaken by members of the CPWG to identify gaps in child protection in emergencies staff capacity.

At this critical time, amidst discussions of the professionalization of the humanitarian sector, there is a resounding call for a systematic way of strengthening the capacity of mid-level child protection in emergency workers. This scheme or career development programme would work towards ensuring that there is an increase in the overall volume of well-trained and experienced, mid-level child protection in emergency technical specialists available and able to be mobilised to support emergency responses.

The Humanitarian Response Review carried out in 2005 to assess the response capacity of humanitarian agencies concluded that: “The present approaches to the provision of staff during emergencies are inadequate to the need. There are simply not enough people with the right experience available quickly.” The Child Protection sector endeavours to do all it can to prevent this from continuing to resonate within the sector today, five years later.

Objectives of the scheme

The overarching goal of the Child Protection Career Development Programme (CPCDP) is to enhance the ability of Child Protection sector to deliver predictable, accountable and effective child protection responses to emergency situations in a timely and high-quality manner.

The specific objectives of the Career Development Programme are threefold:

1. To increase the overall volume and diversity of internationally deployable mid-level technical specialists to protect children in emergencies

---
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2. To increase the capacity in terms of skills, knowledge and behaviour of mid-level child protection specialists to design, implement and lead high-quality responses to protect children in emergencies

3. To strengthen systems and processes to mobilise mid-level technical child protection specialists to support humanitarian responses

The profile of participants

Since the career development programme is designed to increase the volume and diversity of available staff, enhance their expertise in child protection in emergencies and ensure that systems are in place to mobilise them, the participants would be:

- mid-level Child protection workers with experience of working in emergency response, and
- mid-level Child protection workers (CP Officers, Specialists and Managers – depending on agency) currently working in or from regions that are emergency-prone or have experienced emergencies
- committed to continuing to work in the sector upon completion of the programme

Beyond this, a more detailed listing of the participant profile would be developed at the inter-agency level based on the Inter-agency CPIE Competencies for option selected.

Although there may be recommendations for specific individuals to partake in the scheme, the selection process for all three options will be on the basis of applications submitted by candidates to the programme.

How will the scheme incorporate upcoming needs analyses

The scheme will be closely linked to the Child Protection Working Group and as such will be aware of, and contributing towards, needs gap analyses in the sector. The scheme will be flexible enough to adapt to the findings of these analyses as it will work on an annual cycle, with ongoing evaluation as part of the process, allowing for adaptations to occur and improvements to be incorporated.
Option 1: Advanced Child Protection in Emergencies Certificate/Diploma

Programme Overview

To overall aim of the Advance Child Protection in Emergencies (CPIE) Certificate / Diploma is to provide mid-level specialists the opportunity to deepen their knowledge and understanding of child protection in emergencies covering various areas of specialisation, methodologies and approaches to the design and implementation and monitoring of responses to protect children. The Advanced Certificate would be accredited competency-based course, providing a necessary element of standardisation into the humanitarian child protection sector.

The formal training element will be developed in partnership with an academic institution who will take the lead on designing and implementing the training as a Certificate or Diploma associated with the institution. The training will consist of a series of seminars developed on a set of core designated modules as well as a set of optional modules on specialised areas in CPIE that participants can select from. The topics for the core modules will be defined by gaps identified through the planned CPWG capacity mapping of the sector and/or a more thorough training needs assessment based on the inter-agency CPIE competencies that can be carried out amongst the target group ahead of time. Based on the responses of those surveyed for the scoping exercise, it is anticipated that the core modules will include, for example, assessment methodologies, facilitation skills and community mobilisation, child development and monitoring and evaluating child protection outcomes. The optional modules on areas of specialisation will be based on the six agreed areas of specialisation in the CPIE competencies. A total of 25 participants will take part in each cycle of the course.

The training materials on the core areas as well as the areas of CPIE specialisation or ‘sub-thematic’ areas will be developed by a group of senior specialists brought together by the institution who are respected by the Child Protection community as knowledgeable and experienced in the different areas of specialisation. Once completed, the different CPWG Task Forces and Inter-agency Working groups (e.g. on separated children, case management etc) can sign off on the individual modules to ensure that the content is agreed by the different agencies involved. These modules will be tailored to mid-level practitioners who already have experience of working in these areas and would appreciate the opportunity for more in-depth and nuanced discussions on the topics and to exchange thoughts on challenges and ways of working with others in a systematic way. The purpose of these training modules is also, however, to open up options for mid-level workers to specialise in a particular area in which they might not have had all too much exposure to date but would like to pursue it.

The Certificate / Diploma is built upon a blended learning approach, consisting of both academic components and hands-on learning. Overall it entails:

- A 7 day intensive residential training at the beginning of the programme including seminars on the core modules and selected areas of specialisation
- Distance / e-learning material to be worked through by the participants during the first 6 month period with short exercises to be completed. To accommodate the distance learning component, where participants will carry out short exercises to put into practice some of the elements covered in the trainings, guidance will be available through the course facilitators as well as between the participant members themselves. In countries and/or regions where a number of participants are covering the materials, study groups can be formed to facilitate learning
- A 10 day intensive residential training will take place in the middle of the programme including aspects on project and team management as well as training on personal safety and security
- A placement tailored to the individual needs of the participant based on their area of specialisation will be organised during the second half of the programme for a 6-8 week period with an NGO or INGO member of the CPWG or a local academic institution. The placements will also be selected based on the availability of a more senior CPIE specialist available to mentor the participant for the designated time in-country. The purpose of the placement is to gain hands on experience in a selected area of specialisation. In some instances, mentors may not be physically available in the countries in question, but will have context-specific expertise and will be able to guide the participants through regular contact via telephone, email etc.
- One 5 day seminar at the end of the programme will pull together the experiences and the learning and provide closure
- There would be an assessment / performance evaluation component at the end
The future vision for the Advanced Certificate or Diploma in Child Protection in Emergencies is for it to be linked to a roster or other mechanisms for identifying experienced, available mid-level technical staff for deployment to emergencies. Existing rosters could be invited to interview candidates at the end of the scheme similar to current practice with, for example, UNV at the end of the IPT Child Protection, Monitoring and Rehabilitation course at the ASPR.

Where?

Similar to the model employed by the HLDP, there will be two streams for this Certificate / Diploma. The academic seminars will take place in Kampala, Nairobi or Jakarta for Stream 1 and New York or London for Stream 2 (Locations to be confirmed based on academic institution selected for partnership).

The placements will be arranged individually. These might be in any given country based on the availability of a CPWG member or partner who can host the participant, the availability of senior specialists who have expertise in the selected area of specialisation and country-specific expertise.

Duration

Overall the Certificate / Diploma will take place over a 10 month period. Stream 2 will begin 2 months after Stream 1 has begun so that both cycles are completed within a year.

Structure and learning methodology of the programme

A Blended learning methodology will apply throughout the programme:
- Seminars with academic and theoretical content and discussion
- Distance learning with short exercises
- Hands-on learning through the shadowing of specialists and carrying out of assignments in different settings

The Certificate /Diploma will have a performance evaluation component taking into account the different components of the course. Based on successful completion of the assessment, the participant will be awarded an Advanced Certificate / Diploma in Child Protection in Emergencies.

Concerns and risks

- The timeframe may be unrealistic to cover so much ground and to have both streams running at once.
- The overall costs for participants may be too high.
- The training venue should be reachable in terms of visa restrictions for participants.
- The training and distance learning modules may take longer than anticipated to develop.
- The course would only be in English initially and would not cater to those who would need it in Spanish or French. This would have to be addressed in subsequent years.
- Placements may not be easy to arrange if organisations do not want to let their staff go.

Cost Estimations

- Training materials: Developing the modules and course materials: 4 months for a team of 10 senior professionals of varying engagement; Printing of the materials; Translating materials
- Personnel: 1 person full-time to oversee Programme; 1-2 persons to provide full-time administration support; Mentors and the senior specialists involved with inputting into the training modules will be offered a consultancy fee for their involvement; Subsistence costs for participants during the 6-8 week placement
- Logistics: Travel for participants to / from training venue (visas, flights, etc); Accommodation for participants during course; Travel for participants to / from placements (flights, etc)

Based on an existing budgets developed for the Emergency Operations Programme and the HLDP Trainee Scheme, very rough estimates can be derived as follows:
- Estimates for the residential trainings are between £25,000–£50,000 each (depending on location)
- The development of materials: estimated £50,000
- Estimates for staff costs for course management team: £92,000 - £160,000
- The distance learning element will cost an estimated £10,000 including relevant staff time
- The placements will cost an estimated £50,000

Total rough estimate for the first year for both streams is £420,000 - £570,000 per cycle, depending on location. The costs will be reduced in following years.
Option 2: Regional Inter-agency Roster of CPIE Specialists

Programme Overview

The Regional Inter-agency Roster of CPIE Specialists is an initiative, mirroring the ICRC’s Restoring Family Links regional roster and training, which focuses on investing in the professional development of child protection staff through delivering regional trainings on child protection in emergencies and enhancing the effectiveness and coordination amongst CPWG members through the development of a regional inter-agency emergency response mechanism for rapid deployment of CPIE specialists.

The Regional Inter-agency Roster of CPIE Specialists will be developed to increase the volume and diversity of deployable mid-level staff, to increase the knowledge and skills of mid-level CPIE staff and to strengthen the systems and processes to mobilise staff. The aim is to have a roster in future with technical specialists from the different areas of CPIE specialisation with country-specific or regional expertise.

In terms of the process for building this roster: Participants in each of the regions will apply to join the Regional Inter-agency Roster for CPIE Specialists. If their application is successful, they will be invited to attend an advanced training on the core CPIE modules for mid-level CPIE workers and 1-2 selected areas of specialisation in their region. The training modules, designed for contextualisation in each context, will be developed at the global level in a process managed by an institute that specialises in facilitating learning together with senior specialists in the different CPIE areas. These modules will be translated and two facilitators, experienced in each of the regions, will be identified to deliver the training and support participants in the different locations. The trainings will be held in the language identified as most appropriate by the regional teams – e.g. Spanish or Portuguese in Latin America. The total number of participants for each training will be 20.

After the initial training, participants will receive a number of assignments to carry out at their place of work. Participants will be encouraged to buddy with other participants from other countries in the region to regularly share updates on assignments and provide each other with support. In locations where participants are able to meet regularly, study groups will be formed to support the participants with carrying out their tasks.

Five months after the first training, participants will convene a second time to go over a second set of modules that build on the first, and receive components of management training. In addition, participants will take part in an assessment process for the Regional Inter-agency Roster of CPIE Specialists. Those who pass the assessment will be invited to join the roster for a one year period in which time they may be called upon for one regional emergency deployment. As part of the initial application process, line managers must provide their consent and support for staff to take part in this initiative.

In the initial pilot year only 1-2 areas of CPIE specialisation will be developed, and only 1-2 regions focused on in order to test the process and materials and improve their design. A future aim is for the regional teams to identify and work closely with local academic institutions, for example those partnering with the CPC Network in Indonesia, Liberia, the Middle East and Uganda, to apply and incorporate the competency-based CPIE specialisation training into their curriculum for future regional trainings.

Where?

This regional initiative will take place in regional hubs, suggestions for these are:

1. Latin America (Panama or Columbia)
2. West Africa (Dakar)
3. East and Southern Africa (Kenya or South Africa)
4. South-east Asia (Thailand or Indonesia)
5. South Asia (India)
6. Middle East (Amman)

The pilot year will focus on 1-2 of these regions.

Duration

The training component of the programme will take place over a 6 month time frame with participants assessed to be on a regional inter-agency roster at the end of the 6 months.
Structure and learning methodology of the programme

The programme will be based on two sets of residential trainings:

1. The first residential training is a 7 day advanced CPIE training focusing on technical aspects of CPIE for mid-level practitioners together with a focus on one to two areas of specialisation for each region (for example, separated and unaccompanied children)
2. The second residential event is 12 days long and made up of three components: additional modules with CPIE content that build on the first training as well as a management and leadership training (possibly based on Oxfam’s MLSDP after the pilot)

In between the residential trainings, the programme has a distance learning component, based on situated supported distance learning (SSDL), which will be overseen by the Programme Manager and an Advisory group. Senior CPIE specialists with knowledge in the different regions will be appointed as mentors to the participants. For each region 3-4 mentors will be identified to support selected participants.

Candidates for the programme will be selected regionally according to an agreed inter-agency selection criteria based on the model of the selection criteria used for Education Cluster and WASH Cluster trainings. All members of the CPWG partaking in this initiative agree to support and release the participants as and when required for the course. The Regional Rosters will be managed (in terms of it being kept up-to-date etc) either by Save the Children or another lead agency identified regionally.

Concerns and risks

- It may be difficult to gain commitment from Managers for the involvement of their staff in this initiative
- CPIE workers may find it challenging to donate time to carrying out assignments whilst working
- In some regions, the participants will be too far apart for SSDL to work in terms of the participants meeting regularly in a facilitated discussion
- The modules may take longer than anticipated to develop as they will have to be translated for the different regions.
- Once set-up, it may be a challenge for the Rosters to be kept up-to-date by the lead agency.

Cost Estimations

Training materials: Developing the modules and course materials: 3 months for 6 senior specialists (with varying engagement)
Translating materials into French, Spanish etc and printing the materials

Personnel: 1 person full-time to oversee Programme in the pilot year (this to be re-evaluated after the first year and once tools are developed)
2 Training Facilitators per region to conduct trainings

Logistics: Travel for participants to / from training venue (visas, flights, etc)
Accommodation for participants during both residential events

Costs for the initiative will include:
- Development of materials and translation into 1-2 languages: an estimated £50,000
- Residential trainings: £15,000 - £25,000 each for two trainings in two locations
- Staff costs for course management team: £92,000 - £160,000
- Consultancy fee for mentors: £600 per month each (depending upon engagement)
- Distance learning element: an estimated £10,000

Total estimated cost for all four locations: £240,000 - £330,000
Option 3: Mid- and Senior Child Protection Standby Capacity (CP Cap)

Programme Overview

The Mid- and Senior Child Protection Standby Capacity initiative mirrors the inter-agency Procap and GenCap initiatives, but instead of being an initiative to primarily augment the capacity of UN agencies to fulfil their mandates, it will be an inter-agency initiative for the members of the CPWG as well as others in the child protection sector. The aims of the initiative will be to respond to priority gaps and needs in emergency child protection response through: 1) the deployment of a core team of up to 5 Senior level and 5 Mid-level Child Protection Specialists on missions to provide expertise in the strategic and operational policy, planning, coordination and implementation of child protection responses; and 2) the building of child protection capacity amongst actors at the global, regional and national level.

The CP Standby Capacity team will be put together of CPIE Specialists with expertise in different regions of the world. At a minimum, the team will consist of 2 members with context-specific expertise from Africa, 2 from Asia, 1 from Latin America and 1 from the Middle East. The linguistic skills of the team will at a minimum include Spanish, French, Portuguese and Arabic. In addition, all team members will be fluent in English.

Establishing this team of Mid- and Senior CPCap Officers will require a number of steps. First, all participants who would like to be on the initiative will take part in an Advanced Child Protection in Emergencies Training Course. The Advanced CPIE Training Course will have a built in assessment and evaluation element catering to the CPCap Initiative. The team members will be selected by an inter-agency panel consisting of CPWG members. The initiative will initially be housed under the CPWG, led by Save the Children although the individual CPCap team members may be financially supported by various CPWG member agencies including Emergency Standby Teams or Rosters. When CPCap Officers are not on mission to support emergency responses, they can involved with supporting various activities on the Global CPWG work plan, providing distance support to CP Sub-Clusters in different countries, and a series of other tasks. The format and range of assignments and deployments will be tailored to the availability and expertise of individual team members.

Where?

The Advance CPIE Training Course will take place in Nairobi or Dakar so that it is easily accessible for participants. The ILO-ITC Center in Turin would be an alternative but visa restrictions in the EU would limit participation. The CPCap team members will be home-based when not on an emergency deployment.

Duration

Members of the CPCap team will have one year renewable contracts.

Structure and learning methodology of the programme

The Advanced CPIE Training Course will be structured around one 10 day residential training and a follow-up 5 day residential training session 6 months later. The CPCap team members will be deployed and engaged in assignments in the interim. In some situations, Senior CPCap members will buddy with more junior team members and offer support and advice to assignments being carried out.

Concerns and risks

- The costs of employing three full-time senior and five mid-level CPIE specialists may be too high.
- Agencies may not want to support a pooled fund of human resources.

Cost Estimations

Training materials: Developing the training modules and materials, printing of the materials
Personnel: 1 Initiative Manager; 1-2 persons for administration support; 8 CPIE Specialists
Logistics: Travel for participants to / from training venues (visas, flights, etc); Accommodation
- Estimates for the residential trainings are between £25,000–£50,000 each (depending on location)
- Development of materials: estimated £50,000
- Estimates for staff costs for course management team: £92,000 - £160,000; for CPIE specialists: £60,000 - £80,000 each

Total rough estimate without salaries £200,000 - £310,000. With salaries: £760,000 - £870,000.
Summary of the main capacity gaps each CPCDP option addresses

The Staff Capacity gaps are listed below along with an indication of which CPCDP Option would address each.
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Annex I: Questionnaire for Child Protection Practitioners

The below are a list of questions shared with the majority of the CP specialists consulted for this exercise. As mentioned in the methodology, however, there were slight variations to some of the questions for those managing emergency standby rosters.

**Questionnaire for Child Protection Staff Capacity Scoping Exercise**

1. What overall has been your experience of the availability and quality of CPIE staff for deployment in emergencies or support to programmes?
   a. Have you experienced any differences regarding the availability of CPIE staff at different levels: beginner (with initial CPIE experience), middle (with CPIE work experience), senior (with significant CPIE work experience)? If so, please describe.
   b. Have you noted any differences regarding the availability of CPIE specialists for different areas of CPIE programming? If so, please describe.

2. What do you think are the main bottlenecks and challenges in terms of having experienced, technical CPIE staff available for deployment to emergencies?

3. What have you experienced to be (or do you think are) obstacles to career development for:
   a. Persons wanting to enter into the CPIE sector to work (with no CPIE work experience)?
   b. Beginner-level CPIE workers (with initial CPIE work experience)?
   c. Mid-level CPIE workers (with CPIE work experience)?
   d. Senior-level CPIE workers (with significant CPIE experience)?

4. What do you think could be done to address some of the points raised in your answer to 3a-d above?

5. In the design of a career development programme for mid-level CPIE staff, what components do you feel should be included or considered?

6. What do you feel should be avoided in the design of the programme?

7. Which training or academic institutions would you suggest exploring potential partnerships with for this capacity building programme?

8. Any other thoughts or suggestions to share?

9. Whom else do you recommend should be contacted for this scoping exercise?
Annex II: List of persons consulted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Katie Bisaro</td>
<td>Save the Children UK, HQ</td>
<td>Programme Manager, CPTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hannah Thompson</td>
<td>Save the Children UK, HQ</td>
<td>Emergency Protection Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Catharine Barnett</td>
<td>CPWG, Geneva</td>
<td>CPWG Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ayda Eke</td>
<td>UNICEF, CPIE section, NY</td>
<td>Capacity Building &amp; Knowledge Mgmt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mendi Marsh</td>
<td>UNICEF, CPIE section, NY</td>
<td>GBV Specialist in Emergencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Amanda Melville</td>
<td>UNICEF, CPIE section, NY</td>
<td>Emergency CP Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Alyson Eynon</td>
<td>Save the Children UK</td>
<td>Emergency Protection Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Shayamol Choudhury</td>
<td>Save the Children UK, HQ</td>
<td>Child Protection ERP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Janis Ridsdel</td>
<td>Save the Children UK, HQ</td>
<td>Child Protection ERP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mike Wessells</td>
<td>Columbia University</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Katharine Williamson</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>CPIE Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Pia Vraalsen</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>CPIE Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Fiona Bukirwa</td>
<td>Save the Children Sweden</td>
<td>Emergency CP Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Sarah Uppard</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>CPIE Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Chiara Tamponi</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>CPIE Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Myriam Marcuello</td>
<td>Save the Children Sweden</td>
<td>Emergency Standby Team Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Kate O’Brien</td>
<td>Save the Children UK, HQ</td>
<td>People Development and Training Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Marleen Korthals Altes</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>CPIE Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Lucy Batchelor</td>
<td>Save the Children USA</td>
<td>Regional Senior Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Sara Lim</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>CPIE Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Victoria Whitaker</td>
<td>Save the Children USA</td>
<td>Child Protection Manager, Armenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Kate Moger</td>
<td>Save the Children UK, DRC</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Laura Boone</td>
<td>IRC UK, London</td>
<td>Child Protection Technical Adviser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Lauri Haines</td>
<td>IRC UK</td>
<td>Project Manager, IA CP IMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Rebecca Chandler</td>
<td>IRC UK</td>
<td>Emergency CYPD Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Tine Jacobsen</td>
<td>Danish Refugee Council</td>
<td>Project Coordinator, Standby Roster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Joanna Wedge</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>CPIE Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Tirana Hassan</td>
<td>Human Rights Watch</td>
<td>Emergencies Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Michele Servadei</td>
<td>UNICEF, Sudan</td>
<td>CP Sub-Cluster Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Moussa Camara</td>
<td>War Child Canada, Haiti</td>
<td>Child Protection Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Mioh Nemoto</td>
<td>UNICEF, OPT</td>
<td>Child Protection Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Laurent Chapuis</td>
<td>UNICEF, RO MENA</td>
<td>Child Protection Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Bridget Steffen</td>
<td>MSF South Africa</td>
<td>Programmes Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Sabine Rakotomalala</td>
<td>Terre des Hommes</td>
<td>Resource Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Sophie Dupont</td>
<td>UNHCR, Geneva</td>
<td>Associate Protection Officer (Children)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Terra MacKinnon</td>
<td>UNHCR, Geneva</td>
<td>Child Protection Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Rashid Chowdhury</td>
<td>Save the Children Sweden</td>
<td>Emergency Standby Team Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Kristin Barstad</td>
<td>ICRC, Geneva</td>
<td>Child Protection Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Ghada Kachachi</td>
<td>UNICEF, Yemen</td>
<td>Chief, Child Protection Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Laurent Chapuis</td>
<td>UNICEF, RO MENA</td>
<td>Child Protection Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Begona Arellano</td>
<td>UNICEF, RO TACRO</td>
<td>Child Protection Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Joanne Doyle</td>
<td>Save the Children UK, HQ</td>
<td>Child Protection Technical Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Clare O’Kane</td>
<td>Save the Children, Myanmar</td>
<td>Child Protection Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Isabelle Marie Guitard</td>
<td>UNICEF, Iraq</td>
<td>Child Protection Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Samuel Obina</td>
<td>IRC, Uganda</td>
<td>Programme Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Denise Stuckenbruck</td>
<td>Save the Children</td>
<td>Programme Manager, CPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Jennifer Morgan</td>
<td>IRC, Haiti</td>
<td>Project Coordinator, FTR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Anneli Lyster</td>
<td>NRC</td>
<td>Adviser, Staff Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Elias Diab</td>
<td>UNICEF, ISCA</td>
<td>Child Protection Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Jackline Amaguru Olanya</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>CPIE Consultant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## List of key informants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>John-Paul Anderson</td>
<td>UNICEF, NY</td>
<td>Surge Capacity Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Julien Temple</td>
<td>UNICEF, Geneva</td>
<td>Manager, Emergency Surge Capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sarah Lilley</td>
<td>Save the Children UK, HQ</td>
<td>Impact Adviser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rachel O’Bien</td>
<td>Save the Children UK, HQ</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Kate O’Brien</td>
<td>Save the Children UK, HQ</td>
<td>People Development and Training Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Diane Keller</td>
<td>Save the Children UK, HQ</td>
<td>Project Manager, EOP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Deborah Haines</td>
<td>Save the Children UK, HQ</td>
<td>Capacity Building, EiE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Emma Mumford</td>
<td>Save the Children UK, HQ</td>
<td>Emergency Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Lisa Bedelian</td>
<td>Save the Children UK, HQ</td>
<td>Emergencies HR Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Paul Coote</td>
<td>Save the Children UK, HQ</td>
<td>Global Mgmt Development Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Perry Seymour</td>
<td>RedR UK</td>
<td>Training and Consultancies Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Caroline Hotham</td>
<td>Oxfam GB, UK</td>
<td>Project Manager, HSDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Catharine Stow</td>
<td>Merlin, UK</td>
<td>Learning and Development Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Adama Basse</td>
<td>UNHCR, Geneva</td>
<td>UNV Focal Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Stefanie Krause</td>
<td>UNHCR, Geneva</td>
<td>Community Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Kevin Gilroy</td>
<td>UN Volunteers, Bonn</td>
<td>Chief, Peace Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Sandra Le Gray</td>
<td>UN Volunteers, Bonn</td>
<td>Recruitment Associate, VRR Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Lindsay Stark</td>
<td>Columbia University</td>
<td>Senior Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Neil Boothby</td>
<td>Columbia University</td>
<td>Director, Forced Migration&amp;Health Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Maureen Murphy</td>
<td>Columbia University</td>
<td>CPC Network Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Fiona Bulman</td>
<td>African Centre for Childhood</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Sarah MacMaster</td>
<td>African Centre for Childhood</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Elias Bierdel</td>
<td>ASPR</td>
<td>Programme Coordinator IPT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex III: Questionnaire responses regarding the career development programme

Components to consider in the design of a career development programme

The Questionnaire respondents suggested the following should be considered in the design of a career development programme (in order of most to least suggested):

- The programme should have a mentoring or shadowing component
- The training and participant team should be diverse
- A practical training component should be included with hands-on experience
- The programme should be inter-agency
- The programme should have an academic or theory component; it could be a part of a distance learning programme
- The training should be available for people speaking different languages
- The programme should ensure a focus on the link between relief and development
- The programme should be designed in a sustainable way with a longer term perspective
- Performance evaluation should be part of the programme
- The programme should be accredited
- Networks and forums for information exchange should be a part
- The training can be designed in modules to allow for participants to select areas of specialisation
- A focus on career planning after the programme should be included
- An e-learning component can be considered
- The training should have a regional component
- Financial compensation for the participants could be considered
- The programme should be flexible in its formats, levels, opportunities, which open room for people who want and can be deployed but cannot commit to being away for months

Topics to include in trainings accompanying a career development programme

The topics that should be included in a programme are: (in order of most to least suggested)

- The individual areas of Child Protection in Emergencies specialisation: CP Sub-Cluster coordination, FTR, child protection assessments, case management, MRM, GBV and working with child survivors, psychosocial support and lastly DDR.
- Team and people management
- Programme management
- National child protection systems and social sector
- Proposal development
- Child development
- Leadership
- Donor requirements and fundraising
- Safety and security
- Conflict resolution
- Language training
- Information and knowledge management
- Community mobilisation ad facilitation skills
- Evaluation and outcome tracking

What should be avoided in the design of a career development programme?

- One-off training courses
- Single-agency course (not inter-agency)
- Too great a focus on theory and not enough on practice
- Relying on western CPIE practitioners only
- Having a singular focus on technical elements
- Little attention to ethics and do no harm
- Simulation exercises