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Abstract

The Capacity Gap Analysis process described & presented in this report was designed to inform the content & structure of the South East & East Asia Child Protection in Emergencies (CPiE) Professional Development Programme currently being developed under Save the Children & the IKEA Foundation’s partnership to Build Stronger Global Humanitarian Capacity.

The Capacity Gap Analysis included the following core activities:

1. A desk review of existing literature on the South East & East Asia sub-region, with a particular focus on issues pertinent to the child protection in emergencies sector. This desk review included documents both internal and external to Save the Children and where relevant they are referenced throughout this report.

2. Key informant interviews with child protection and & child protection in emergencies global & regional experts to discuss child protection gaps and priorities across the South East & East Asia sub-region.

3. An online survey for regional and national child protection and child protection in emergencies practitioners, where individuals were invited to self-asses their existing capacities and highlight child protection priorities for the region.

This report presents a comprehensive breakdown of the findings from the above strands of research. Where possible the percentage of respondents who highlighted particular capacity gaps is indicated and supplementary data has also been included to help situate the findings in the current child protection in emergencies landscape.

The Capacity Gap Analysis findings have been grouped into the following categories:

A. Concepts & Frameworks
B. CPiE Risks & Concerns
C. CPiE Strategies & Approaches
D. Cross-cutting Themes
E. CPiE Programme Management
F. CPiE & Capacity Building
G. CPiE Infrastructure

The Capacity Gaps Analysis also sought to investigate any key format features which the Child Protection in Emergencies Professional Development Programme should be mindful of. It is worth noting that the findings of the South East & East Asia Capacity Gap Analysis tend to corroborate those of the global level CPiE Capacity Building Mapping & Market Analysis conducted by the Child Protection Working Group in 2015, and support the conclusion that the Child Protection in Emergencies Professional Development Programme should take a blended learning approach which enables peer to peer exchanges and combines digital learning, short face-to-face courses and experiential learning.
This report makes no explicit recommendations although the findings presented will provide the Child Protection in Emergencies Professional Development Programme the ability to make informed strategic decisions about the shape & direction on the programme.

It is important to note that the findings in this report do not purport to be absolute, but rather present a snapshot of the current child protection in emergencies sector’s capacities, gaps and priorities in the South East & East Asia sub-region.

It is hoped that this report will contribute to sector-wide capacity building initiatives.

For more information please contact:
Elena Giannini: Elena.Giannini@rb.se
Hannah Uprichard: H.Uprichard@savethechildren.org.uk
Contents

Overall Objective .......................................................................................................................... 5
Background ...................................................................................................................................... 5
Capacity Gap Analysis Methodology .......................................................................................... 7
A. Concepts & Frameworks ............................................................................................................. 10
   Working in Humanitarian Settings and Complex & Adaptable Programming ................................ 10
   Child Protection Minimum Standards in Humanitarian Action .................................................. 10
   Child Safeguarding within CPIE programming ......................................................................... 11
   Linking Child Protection in Emergencies to Child Rights Governance and Child Participation .... 12
B. CPIE Risks & Concerns .............................................................................................................. 14
   Dangers & Injuries ....................................................................................................................... 14
   Violence .................................................................................................................................... 15
      Physical Violence & Other Harmful Practices ......................................................................... 15
      Sexual Violence ....................................................................................................................... 16
   Children Associated with Armed Forces or Armed Groups ...................................................... 17
   Psychosocial Distress and Mental Health Disorders .................................................................... 18
   Harmful Child Labour .............................................................................................................. 19
   Children on the Move ............................................................................................................... 20
   Unaccompanied & Separated Children ..................................................................................... 21
   Justice for Children .................................................................................................................. 22
C. CPIE Strategies & Approaches .................................................................................................. 24
   Systems Building/Strengthening ............................................................................................... 24
   Case Management .................................................................................................................. 25
   Alternative Care ..................................................................................................................... 26
   Child Friendly Spaces .............................................................................................................. 26
D. Cross-cutting Themes ................................................................................................................ 28
   Working with Diversity ........................................................................................................... 28
      Gender & Sexuality .............................................................................................................. 28
   Age Appropriate Programming ............................................................................................. 28
      Targeting the Most Vulnerable (including indigenous people, minorities & children with disabilities) 29
   Mainstreaming and Integration .............................................................................................. 29
   Conflict Sensitive Programming ............................................................................................... 30
   Climate Change, Disaster Risk Reduction & Preparedness ......................................................... 30
   Urbanisation ............................................................................................................................ 31
E. CPIE Programme Management ................................................................................................ 33
   Programme Management & Staff Management ......................................................................... 33
   Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability & Learning in Child Protection Programmes .............. 33
F. CPIE & Capacity Building ......................................................................................................... 35
G. CPIE Infrastructure .................................................................................................................... 37
   Co-ordination of child protection responses in emergencies ..................................................... 37
   Communication & Advocacy .................................................................................................... 38
   Fundraising ............................................................................................................................ 38
H. Key Format Features .................................................................................................................. 40
   Acronyms ............................................................................................................................... 43
   Bibliography ............................................................................................................................ 44

Associated Annexes ...................................................................................................................... 48

CGA Report Annex 1: Initial Scoping Study
CGA Report Annex 2: Key Informant Questionnaire
CGA Report Annex 4: Emerging Topics
Overall Objective

To provide sufficient information to identify the priority Child Protection in Emergency (CPiE) capacity building needs in South East & East Asia.¹ These priority needs will inform decisions on the content and design of the Child Protection in Emergencies Professional Development Programme funded by the IKEA Foundation under the Building a Stronger Global Humanitarian Capacity partnership.

Background

The Child Protection in Emergencies Professional Development Programme aims to increase child protection in emergencies capacity sector-wide, and raise immediate response capability.

Emergencies have a devastating effect on children’s lives. They often result in children being separated from their families and other structures that provide them with safety and security - if child protection mechanisms aren’t put in place immediately children face the risk of abuse, neglect, exploitation and violence.

Increasingly frequent & complex humanitarian crises have meant that the sector has struggled to meet the sheer scale of child protection needs globally. Save the Children and other organisations often find it difficult to identify enough strong and skilled child Protection in emergencies response staff with the level of technical expertise needed to meet the increasing demand.

The Child Protection in Emergencies Professional Development Programme will draw on the successes and lessons from previous initiatives to build capacity² as well as global level research such as The Child Protection in Emergencies Capacity Building Mapping & Market Analysis.

In order to determine the most suitable pilot region for the Child Protection in Emergencies Professional Development Programme, an Initial Scoping Study was conducted across 5 global regions (see Annex 1 for more information) – this study included consultations with both senior management and child protection expertise at Save the Children to better understand CPiE capacity building needs, opportunities, partnerships & demand.

During this process the Asia region emerged as the most appropriate pilot region for the Child Protection in Emergencies Professional Development Programme and following a number of

---

¹ Here, and throughout this report, South East & East Asia refers to: Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Laos, Myanmar, the Philippines, Thailand and Vietnam.

² Including Save the Children’s experience in developing and delivering the Child Protection Trainee Scheme, supporting the development & delivery of the CPiE postgraduate Diploma and its integral involvement in developing and institutionalising the interagency Minimum Standards for Child Protection in Humanitarian Action. The programme will also build on other ongoing sector wide capacity building programs and manuals, such as the Child Protection Working Group CPiE Face-to-Face training, the Child Protection Working Group Training of Trainers and the Action for the Rights of the Child Toolkit.
in-depth consultations with regional stakeholders it was agreed to focus specifically on the South East & East Asia sub-region for the first cycle.

According to the 2015 World Disasters Report there were 317 natural disasters reported worldwide in 2014, 48% of which occurred in Asia. Over 85% of those killed and 86% of those affected globally were also in Asia (IFRC, 2015). The South East & East Asia sub-region is particularly vulnerable to rapid onset natural disasters which have the potential to affect large proportions of the population. Moreover, the growing body of research which explicitly links climate change to the increased frequency & intensity of natural disasters in South East & East Asia3 highlights the urgent importance of building response capability & capacity situated in the region.

For more information see:
- UNISDR Asia and Pacific (2011) At the Crossroads: Climate Change Adaptation and Disaster Risk Reduction in Asia and the Pacific.
- UNICEF (2011) Children’s Vulnerability to Climate Change and Disaster Impacts in East Asia and the Pacific.
Key top-line factors influencing the choice of sub-region include:

- A similar climatic & coastal context across the sub-region, which is vulnerable to rapid onset natural disasters (see above map);
- Feasibility & relative ease for participants to travel to other countries in the sub-region;
- Assumed good level of English knowledge among mid-level child protection practitioners;
- Humanitarian access generally guaranteed throughout the sub-region;
- Several potential partnerships in the sub-region including ASEAN and the Humanitarian Leadership Academy, which could support the scalability and sustainability of the programme in the future;

Whilst the Child Protection in Emergencies Professional Development Programme will be contextualised & piloted in the South East & East Asia, the vision for the programme is to expand to other regions in future cycles.

**Capacity Gap Analysis Methodology**

The Capacity Gaps Analysis (CGA) was designed to inform the Child Protection in Emergencies Professional Development Programme content & structure and seeks to answer the following questions:

1. What main competency areas within CPIE are priorities in the sub-region?
2. What are the main common cross-cutting themes that need to be tackled through CPIE programming within the selected countries/sub-region?
3. What are the main competencies within the CPIE sector that need to be strengthened in the sub-region?
4. What kinds of capacity building programmes/trainings have taken place in the selected sub-region/countries? Are there any recommended format features for capacity building programmes in the region?
5. What resources could be made available to ensure the success of the capacity building programme?

The Capacity Gaps Analysis methodology and associated tools were designed by the Joint Programme Management Team in collaboration with monitoring, evaluation and learning experts within Save the Children. The data collection took place between December 2015 and February 2016.
The following activities were undertaken simultaneously in the targeted South East & East Asia sub-region:

1 - A stakeholder mapping was conducted in order to identify the main child protection actors in the sub-region. Stakeholders were primarily identified from Save the Children Country Offices and Regional Offices, however attempts were also made to identify contacts among prominent national NGOs involved in Child Protection work as well as from International NGOs and UN agencies involved in CPiE programming and capacity building in the region. The Child Protection Working Group Learning & Development Task Force was also engaged to ascertain which members had CPiE programmes in South East & East Asia and identified contacts were included. Identified stakeholders were invited to participate in aspects of activities 2, 3 & 4 below.

2 – A desk review of internal and external documents was conducted. Documents included Save the Children Country Office Strategic Plans, Save the Children global Child Protection & Humanitarian Sector Strategies as well as relevant capacity building research. Wherever possible and available, regional reports external to Save the Children were also included in the review. It is important to note that this desk review does not aim at being a comprehensive research process but rather a quick overview to complement the data gathered through the key informant interviews and survey results.

3 – Key informant interviews were conducted with child protection & child protection in emergencies global & regional experts. Experts were invited to participate both from within Save the Children and from amongst the Child Protection Working Group Learning & Development Task Force. These key informant interviews were aimed at ensuring that global & regional priorities for the targeted sub-region were reflected in the design of the capacity building programme. Interviews were conducted using an interview questionnaire (refer to Annex 2) with 12 global/regional professionals from 6 organisations.

4 – An online survey for regional and national child protection & child protection in emergencies practitioners was conducted. In total, 72 responses were received with 36 being fully completed; a ratio of 50%. Through a filtering process at the beginning of the survey 5 different profiles of respondents were established; respondents had to self-select which profile best described them and this then led to a series of related but distinct questions for each profile. The survey results were then collated into 3 main categories - Regional Stakeholders, National Advisory Stakeholders and In-country Field Based Stakeholders - corresponding to how respondents identified themselves. For a full report on the results of the Capacity Gap Analysis Survey please refer to Annex 3.
The preliminary findings from the desk review, key informant interviews and survey data were pulled together in a document which drew out the emerging CPIE topics and themes which respondents had identified that the Child Protection in Emergencies Professional Development Programme in South East & East Asia should cover. This document was then circulated to the key informant interviewees & survey participants for validation & prioritisation. The collated inputs on this document can be seen in Annex 4. The emerging CPIE topics and themes sorts the preliminary findings into the following categories:

A. Concepts & Frameworks  
B. CPIE Risks & Concerns  
C. CPIE Strategies & Approaches  
D. Cross-cutting Themes  
E. CPIE Programme Management  
F. CPIE & Capacity Building  
G. CPIE Infrastructure

What follows in the next section is the detailed analysis of the desk research, the key informant interviews and the online survey data. The information, collated around the above categories, has been analysed, looking at the below key areas:

- The main Child Protection in Emergencies programming priorities across the sub-region.
- The main competency areas within Child Protection in Emergencies in the sub-region which need to be strengthened.
- Any key format features identified to include and/or avoid.

The following analysis will directly inform the content, design and intended learning outcomes for the Child Protection in Emergencies Professional Development Programme in South East & East Asia.
A. Concepts & Frameworks

Working in Humanitarian Settings and Complex & Adaptable Programming

Complex and adaptable programming recognises that the spheres of humanitarian and development work are intrinsically related and that different forms of aid often have both humanitarian and development components. The distinction between humanitarian work and development work becomes even more blurry when we look at complex protracted emergencies or contexts that fluctuate between the two.

Treating humanitarian and development goals as a single global challenge is the main message of UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon’s report for the world humanitarian summit (United Nations, 2015). However it is important to recognise the challenges that this may pose, for example for staff working in dynamic contexts who have to regularly switch mind-sets in order to respond effectively to emergencies. This change in approach can be particularly challenging in the wake of a sudden-onset emergency.

Understanding and adhering to internationally agreed standards (such as the Sphere Project’s Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards in Humanitarian Response and the Core Humanitarian Standards⁴), rapidly scaling up programming, the humanitarian programming cycle, co-ordination mechanisms, conducting assessments and prioritising response activities (amongst others) all require staff to have specific competencies and confidence. It is also essential to ensure wherever possible that emergency response activities build on existing expertise, systems and processes in order to avoid creating parallel systems, and individuals need to be equipped to work in this way.

Linking child protection in emergencies programming to child protection development work was repeatedly raised by the key informants of the Capacity Gap Analysis (CGA), with 25% explicitly referencing the need to build child protection programming capacity across the spectrum in the sub-region.

Child Protection Minimum Standards in Humanitarian Action

In 2010, the members of the global Child Protection Working Group agreed on the need for child protection standards in humanitarian settings. The Minimum Standards for Child Protection in Humanitarian Action (CPMS) were finalized in September 2012. Over 400 individuals from 30 agencies in over 40 countries, including child protection practitioners, humanitarian actors from other sectors, academics and policy makers, were involved in their development.

⁴ The Core Humanitarian Standard on Quality and Accountability (CHS) sets out Nine Commitments that organisations and individuals involved in humanitarian response can use to improve the quality and effectiveness of the assistance they provide.
The CPMS aims to:

- Establish common principles among those working in child protection.
- Improve the quality of child protection programming.
- Improve accountability within child protection work.
- Provide a synthesis of good practice and learning to date.
- Enable better advocacy and communication on child protection risks, needs and responses.

The CPMS are recognized as companion standards to the Sphere Project’s Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards in Humanitarian Response.

In terms of the CGA findings, 87% of In-Country Field Based survey respondents self-assessed themselves as either familiar or very familiar with the Child Protection Minimum Standards in Humanitarian Action. In addition, 33% of key informants reported that CPMS trainings have been ongoing in several countries in the region and that contextualization efforts are also ongoing. World Vision International in particular reported that they are placing a lot of focus on contextualizing the standards as well as translating them in local languages.

Whilst only 16% of key informant interview respondents placed the CPMS amongst the capacity building gap priorities for the sub-region, given the consensus across the sector and Save the Children’s role as the co-lead on the CPMS Taskforce of the Child Protection Working Group, the Child Protection in Emergencies Professional Development Programme will undoubtedly embrace the CPMS. The Child Protection Minimum Standards should be used daily as a resource for good programming by practitioners working in CPIE.

**Child Safeguarding within CPIE programming**

It is important not to conflate child safeguarding and child protection. Save the Children believe it is the responsibility of all staff to demonstrate the highest standards of behaviour towards children in both their professional and personal lives. They must not abuse the position of trust that comes with being part of an organisation who works with and for children. All staff must do all they can to prevent, report and respond appropriately to child abuse. And, importantly organisations must ensure that any event or activity that involves the participation of children is carefully planned and considered to ensure that it does not place children in harm.

So whilst child safeguarding is not the remit of child protection in emergencies practitioners alone, it is important that CPIE programming is compliant with effective policies and procedures. During the desk review of the CGA it was challenging to find references to “child safeguarding” within CPIE programming, although this may well be because of the different terminologies used by different organizations. In documents where child safeguarding policies were mentioned they often refer only to a code of conduct expected from staff when they sign a contract.
Some Save the Children Country Offices in the sub-region specifically mention working on improving child safeguarding within their programming and it is important to ensure that this takes place in a holistic manner. Only 16% of key informants mentioned the importance of including aspects of child safeguarding in the Child Protection in Emergencies Professional Development Programme, however we can hypothesise that the majority of the key informants prioritised talking about child protection needs and assumed that child protection organizations will tackle child safeguarding concerns within programming appropriately.

However the seeming lack of documentation around this important principle which should be included as the basis of call humanitarian programming highlights the necessity of building an understanding of the role of child protection professionals to meet child safeguarding standards within child protection programming during emergencies.

**Linking Child Protection in Emergencies to Child Rights Governance and Child Participation**

Child Rights Governance is one of five thematic areas prioritized by Save the Children. Child Rights Governance aims to positively influence and determine the decisions and actions of the state and key actors to ensure all children’s rights are fulfilled in all circumstances. In all countries - whether low, middle or high income - it is important to strengthen the voice of children and of child-focused civil society to demand that children are prioritized in policy, planning and resource allocation. Save the Children’s work in this area includes:

- Monitoring and demanding child rights with children
- Good governance delivering child rights
- Public investment in children demanding children rights,

Save the Children in South East & East Asia is involved in ongoing Child Rights Governance work at the local, national and regional level. All Save the Children Country Offices have included child rights governance work in their strategic plans.

Of note in the region, The Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) established a Commission on the Promotion and the Protection of the Rights of Women and Children (ACWC) as a regional human rights institution in 2010.

Whilst only one key informant mentioned the importance of working on children rights in the sub-region, given the many Child Rights Governance initiatives going on in the different countries it would be important for child protection professionals to be able to navigate the policy landscape and make appropriate linkages with child protection in emergencies work. It would be especially important to learn from Child Rights Governance’s work on child participation, as effective child participation is often weak in emergencies.

Humanitarian workers must ensure that girls and boys are given space and time to meaningfully participate at all possible stages of emergency preparedness & response. Boys
and girls of all ages and abilities, and with different perspectives, should be supported to express their views safely, and these views should be regarded with respect and taken seriously. Humanitarian workers must be aware of their own values, beliefs & assumptions about childhood and the roles of the child and family, and avoid imposing these on children. They should enable developmentally appropriate ways of child participation, share power with children in decision making, and be sensitive to how children’s participation can, when done poorly, upset children’s social roles and power relations (CPWG, 2012).
B. CPiE Risks & Concerns

Dangers & Injuries
As the Child Protection Working Group report *A Matter of Life and Death* states ‘we know that in emergencies, children are among those most vulnerable to danger and injury, especially in developing countries’ (CPWGa, 2015).’

Globally the World Health Organization reports that hundreds of thousands of children die each year from injuries or violence, and millions of others suffer the consequences of non-fatal injuries. The 2008 WHO & UNICEF (WHO & UNICEF, 2008) World Report on child injury prevention found the top five causes of child injury deaths to be:

1. Road crashes: They kill 260,000 children a year and injure about 10 million. They are the leading cause of death among 10-19 year olds and a leading cause of child disability.
2. Drowning: It kills more than 175,000 children a year. Every year, up to 3 million children survive a drowning incident. Due to brain damage in some survivors, non-fatal drowning has the highest average lifetime health and economic impact of any injury type.
3. Burns: Fire-related burns kill nearly 96,000 children a year and the death rate is 11 times higher in low- and middle-income countries than in high-income countries.
4. Falls: Nearly 47,000 children fall to their deaths every year, but hundreds of thousands more sustain less serious injuries from a fall.
5. Poisoning: More than 45,000 children die each year from unintended poisoning.

Emergencies undoubtedly expose children to increased risk of physical danger and injury, as their surrounding landscape changes rapidly and new risks are put in the immediate vicinity of children and their communities.

In Asia, recent surveys show that road traffic injuries are one of the five leading causes of disability for children (WHO & UNICEF, 2008) and the Capacity Gap Analysis desk review highlighted that traffic accidents are in fact the number one killer of adolescents in Indonesia.

Save the Children is increasing programming on protecting children from physical harm in the sub-region. Drowning prevention in particular forms an integral part of a number of current debates relevant to the sub-region such as:

- Climate change which often leads to increased instances of flooding
- Mass migrations, including of asylum seekers traveling by boat
- Issues concerning rural development and water and sanitation.

Protecting children from physical harm emerged repeatedly as a priority concern in the online survey of the South East & East Asia Capacity Gap Analysis (CGA) as well as in key informant
interviews, where it was frequently included as a fundamental aspect of protecting children from hazardous work, disaster risk reduction and in keeping children safe.

**Violence**

**Physical Violence & Other Harmful Practices**

Children who suffer physical and other forms of violence may manifest a variety of life-threatening internal and external injuries, as well as face far-reaching psychosocial consequences (CPWGa, 2015).

During emergencies children may face an increase in violence due to escalated stress, displacement, unfamiliar surroundings and communities caused both by the event and the consequences of the emergency. In conflicts, children may also suffer extreme violence such as killing, maiming, torture and abduction. The impact of an emergency can also lead families to resort to harmful strategies as coping mechanisms, such as child marriage and female genital mutilation (CPWGa, 2015).

Globally up to 1.5 million children experience violence annually with domestic violence being the most common form of violence against children (Save the Children, 2016). UNICEF’s 2014 review on Violence against Children in East Asia and the Pacific states: “Meta-analyses show that violence against children is widespread across the region, with 17-35% prevalence rates for both boys and girls in low and lower middle income countries and lower prevalence rates (1-13%) in upper middle and high-income countries. Fairly consistent findings across the region highlight that nearly three out of every four children experience violent discipline” (UNICEF, 2014).

30% of CGA key informants stressed the importance of strengthening child protection mid-level professional capacity to both prevent and respond to violence against children. Save the Children Country Office strategic plans within South East & East Asia highlight that there are many development initiatives going on in the sub-region to tackle child protection concerns around violence, especially on positive discipline work with parents and caregivers. However, given the high prevalence rates indicated above it will be important to continue to strengthen programming and staff capacity on this thematic area and particularly in emergency settings. In addition this focus is in line with Save the Children’s priorities which include:

- Challenging existing social norms around physical and humiliating punishment through awareness-raising campaigns and continue to support children, community members, men and boys as ‘change agents’ in preventing family violence.
- Providing an innovative approach to violence prevention such as the practice of Positive Discipline (Save the Children, 2016).
**Sexual Violence**

The consequences of sexual violence against children are far-reaching and can include injury and death, unwanted pregnancy, the contraction of sexually transmitted infections, physical injuries, mental health issues, distress, and social and economic exclusion (CPWG, 2015).

Evidence suggests that sexual violence occurs in all emergency contexts partly due to reduced protection mechanisms and increased social and economic pressures (CPWG, 2015). In the chaos that can follow an emergency, children are especially at risk because of a number of factors including the lack of rule of law, the lack of information provided to them, their restricted power in decision-making, their level of dependence and the fact that children are more easily exploited and coerced than adults (CPWG, 2012).

Children’s exposure to the risk of sexual violence in an emergency is even greater if the phenomenon already existed. UNICEF’s review on violence against children in East Asia and the Pacific reports that the percentage of children affected by child sexual abuse ranges from 11-22% for girls and 3-6.5% for boys across the region. In the same review, the data highlights the need to be context specific - emerging evidence highlights a growing number of boys being affected by child sexual violence in low income countries, with prevalence estimates slightly higher for males than for females, whereas in upper middle and high income countries prevalence estimates show that sexual abuse is more prevalent for girls (UNICEF, 2014).

ECPAT International’s 2014 East and South East Asia report states that: the commercial sexual exploitation of children (CSEC) has grave implications for the region and the emergence of new global trends provides strong indications that its magnitude is expanding as a result of multiple interconnected factors such as globalisation, unregulated economic growth, inequality and poverty (ECPAT, 2014).

30% of the CGA’s key informants list capacity building on preventing and responding to violence as a priority and 8% list sexual violence specifically. More dramatically the online survey result shows that “Prevention of and response to exploitation and gender-based violence” is a key area for capacity building in the region and it is listed by stakeholders as being one of the main priorities in their context. Some of the capacity gaps highlighted through the desk review were reported to be:

- Understanding on sexual violence including online sexual violence and exploitation
- Capacity to support case workers with cases of sexual violence
- Prevention and response to sexual and gender based violence in emergencies and ensuring its incorporation in child protection emergency preparedness plans.
- Capacity to reduce children’s vulnerability to and effectively respond to sexual and gender based violence.
Content around sexual violence for the Child Protection in Emergencies Professional Development Programme, given the high demand for it, will be developed and adapted in line with the Save the Children’s focus in this area to:

- Strengthen efforts to end sexual violence and challenge gender discrimination and norms perpetuating sexual and gender-based violence against children, including child marriage and FGM/C, working with boys and men
- Advocate for age-appropriate and gender-sensitive, integrated sexual violence preparedness and response services for girls and boys
- Mainstream the prevention of and response to sexual violence against girls and boys and ensure that there are minimum standards in legal, health, child protection, education and social welfare systems
- Strengthen work to address sexual violence in digital media and online by tackling online violence, cyber bullying and grooming (Save the Children, 2016).

**Children Associated with Armed Forces or Armed Groups**

Children recruited into armed groups and forces are often exposed to high levels of violence, abuse, exploitation and injury. Girls and boys may face sexual exploitation and violence, detention for engagement in conflict, threats to life, possible injury and exposure to explosive remnants of war. They are also deprived of education and parental care. Children’s vulnerability is ongoing even after release or escape from armed group or forces, as formerly associated children may lack education or may be rejected by their families and communities, potentially leading to secondary exploitation. Children who escape from armed groups often have long-term psychological problems (CPWa, 2015).

Myanmar, the Philippines, Indonesia and Thailand have active conflicts where instances of children associated with armed forces and groups have been reported. More detailed data on the incidence of children recruitment at the sub-regional level could not be retrieved.

It is worth noting that the prevention of and response to the recruitment and use of children by armed forces or armed groups was identified in the 2015 global level assessment of existing competencies and experience in CPIE as an area where training is most needed (CPWGb, 2015).

With the exception of Myanmar this issue did not emerge strongly in the CGA desk review findings and although key informants did not prioritize this child protection concern for the sub-region they did highlight its relevance for Myanmar and the Philippines. Key informants also stressed the sensitivity of engaging in this type of work in Myanmar.

Through the CGA online survey In Country-Field Based stakeholders indicated that there is low capacity on this area of expertise in the South East & East Asia sub-region, with 75% of respondents self-assessing themselves as either not familiar or having little experience with the topic. However regional and national stakeholders do not indicate that this is as an area of priority for the region.
**Psychosocial Distress and Mental Health Disorders**

Natural disasters and armed conflict cause significant psychological and social suffering to affected populations. The psychological and social impacts of emergencies may be acute in the short term, but they can also undermine the long-term mental health and psychosocial well-being of population (IASC, 2008).

Crises can induce severe and chronic stress, when the stress response system is activated over a prolonged period of time this known as “toxic stress”. Without the presence of protective and caring relationships, toxic stress can have permanent effects on children, meaning that a person is more likely to develop anxiety, depression and a range of other mental emotional and behavioural disorders. Where large groups of children are affected, such as in emergency contexts, this can lead to entire generations experiencing long term mental health, social and economic problems (CPWGa, 2015).

One of the priorities in emergencies is therefore to protect and improve people’s mental health and psychosocial well-being and this is particularly important for children and their caregivers. Mental health and psychosocial support (MHPSS) is a composite term used in IASC guidelines to describe any type of support that aims to protect or promote psychosocial well-being and/or prevent or treat mental disorder (IASC, 2008).

Child protection agencies’ psychosocial support programming may include a variety of activities beyond child friendly spaces, as well as some that child friendly spaces can help deliver. These may include: psychological first aid, positive parenting, life skills for adolescents and awareness raising amongst others. Mental health programming refers specifically to the care for people with mental disorders, including post-traumatic stress disorders, by trained and supervised staff only.

It is worth noting that the prevention of and response to psychosocial distress and mental disorders was identified in the 2015 global level assessment of existing competencies and experience in CPiE as an area where training is most needed (CPWGb, 2015).

Through the CGA key informant interviews and online survey results it was evident that efforts in terms of capacity building in this area are already ongoing in the South East & East Asia region. Psychological First Aid training for example was delivered in several countries in the sub-region last year. Key informants stressed that these trainings while useful may not be sufficient to respond to the needs on the ground and 33% of key informants highlighted mental health and psychosocial programming as an area to focus more efforts on preparing practitioners to deliver on.

---

3 Psychosocial First Aid Training was conducted in China, Indonesia, Myanmar, the Philippines, Thailand and Vietnam Save the Children Country Offices in 2015.
Psychosocial programming in particular remains a core area of child protection in emergencies that needs to become even more robust at responding to beneficiaries’ needs including during preparedness & recovery phases.

Harmful Child Labour
For the purpose of this report the term harmful child labour is defined as work that keeps children from attending school and deprives them of their childhood, their potential and their dignity, and that is harmful to their physical and mental development.

According to the Understanding Children’s Work (UCW) Programme, child labour rates continue to be high in several South East & East Asia countries. The effects of harmful child labour and subsequent education marginalisation can lead to social vulnerability and societal marginalisation. Child labour is also often associated with direct threats to children’s health and well-being. Furthermore, unconditional worst forms of child labour such as sexual exploitation of children are priority concerns in the region. Children subjected to such forms of abuse suffer serious physical, psychological, and emotional damages and can end up being marginalised in all aspects of individual development; social, economic and educational (Understanding Children’s Work, 2015).

Children’s vulnerability to harmful child labour, especially in its worst forms, increases in all emergency contexts. Communities and families face lost livelihoods, educational possibilities are disrupted and children’s protection mechanisms may be eroded by being displaced or separated from caregivers (CPWGa, 2015).

Emergencies can also give rise to new types of harmful work for children as families and children resort to negative coping strategies to fend for their livelihood. Recognising the potentially devastating life-long impact of harmful child labour on children’s development, the child protection sector is and should continue to work to put in place effective prevention and response strategies to fulfil children’s rights in this area.

Significant to note for the South East & East Asia sub-region is that children on the move are often particularly vulnerable to harmful child labour. The UNICEF Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys (MICS), which provides data on the percentage of children currently working in several countries in East Asia and Pacific region, highlights that prevalence ranges from 5.4% of children in Indonesia to 32.4% of children in Lao People’s Democratic Republic (UNICEF, 2012).

In addition to this the majority of Save the Children Country Offices in South East & East Asia (Indonesia, Laos, Cambodia, Thailand, Myanmar and the Philippines) highlights child labour as one of the key child protection concerns to tackle. 25% of key informants also mentioned child labour as one of the child protection programming priorities in the region or as a gap in terms of capacity among CP/CPIE professionals and this is further corroborated by survey data:
62.5% of In-Country Field Based respondents self-assessed themselves to have heard about prevention programming for child labour but having little experience in it
69% of In-Country Field Based self-assessed themselves to have heard about response programming for child labour but having little experience in it

The desk review highlighted the below capacity needs:

- Expertise in child labour for working with companies to improve working conditions / environment
- Differential analysis of livelihood, opportunity and child labour issues for both boys and girls
- To strengthen capacity to address certain forms of harmful work, e.g., child domestic work, urban settings and the informal sector.
- Closer coordination with our FSL colleagues on Cash transfer programming and other social protection initiatives

**Children on the Move**

Save the Children defines children on the move as, those children moving for a variety of reasons, voluntarily or involuntarily, within or between countries, with or without their parents or other primary caregivers, and whose movement might place them at risk (or at an increased risk) of inadequate care, economic or sexual exploitation, abuse, neglect and violence.

Children on the move is an umbrella term that brings together a series of categories of children to highlight their common protection needs, including, for example: children who have been trafficked, children who migrate (eg, to pursue better life opportunities, to look for work or education or to escape exploitative or abusive situations at home, or because of other protection needs) children displaced by conflict and natural disasters and children who live and work in the streets (Inter-Agency Group on Children on the Move, 2013).

Children on the move represent a major and increasing challenge in terms of child rights and child protection and are likely to be increasing priority in the coming decades as a result of increasingly complex conflicts, globalisation, socio-economic shifts and climate change. The movement of people is high on the agenda of protection and child protection agencies globally as an unprecedented number of children and families are pushed to leave their homes either in pursuit of better opportunities or to seek refuge and safety elsewhere.

For many years children on the move have represented a serious child protection concern in the South East & East Asia sub-region. The causes and opportunities for children on the move vary regionally and from country to country. A 2008 Save the Children report found the regional cross-border patterns to be:

- Unskilled labour migration from Cambodia, Lao PDR and Myanmar to Thailand;
- Skilled labour migration from Vietnam to Cambodia and Lao PDR;
• Skilled labour migration from China (Yunnan and Guangxi provinces) to Lao PDR and Myanmar.

But while Cambodia and China are major receiving countries, and Thailand is the largest receiving country, all three are sending countries (Save the Children, 2008).

More complex patterns are followed by children, with unskilled migration of child domestic workers moving from Lao PDR and Vietnam to Cambodia, and children moving from Myanmar and Vietnam into China. Moreover internal migration must also be taken into account and children are migrating internally in every country in the region (Save the Children, 2008).

More recently a great influx of people has been recorded in the Bay of Bengal and Andaman Sea. In 2015, an estimated 32,600 refugees and migrants reportedly used smugglers’ boats in the Bay of Bengal and the Andaman Sea and nearly 170,000 people are estimated to have made the dangerous journey from the Bay of Bengal since 2012 (Inter Press Service News Agency, 2016).

58% of key informants highlighted children on the move, trafficking and family tracing & reunification specifically as priorities in the sub-region and as key capacity gaps among child protection practitioners. The same themes are also prevalent in the literature consulted for the desk review.

Recognising the growing prevalence of children on the move, the very individual and context specific push and pull factors, and the often cross-border nature of working with this group it will be important for practitioners to be prepared to creatively respond to this demographic and their challenges. Among other suggestions key informants also mentioned the need to adapt responses to protracted displacement situations and to also look at undocumented and stateless children as a distinct group. Compounding this issue is the low – medium level of capacity in the sub-region identified by regional and national advisory in the prevention of and response to separation of children from their families.

**Unaccompanied & Separated Children**

As highlighted by the Inter-Agency Guiding Principles on unaccompanied and separated children, during disasters and in conflict situations children may become separated from their families or from the adults that were meant to care for them. They represent one of the most vulnerable categories of children in the aftermath of an emergency and are at extreme risk of abuse and exploitation (ICRC, 2004).

While many children may be reunited with their family in a swift manner the range and complexity of situations in which children can become separated or unaccompanied can vary widely. This typically means that one organization acting alone will not be able to respond to children in this situation in the holistic manner required. A collaborative approach is integral to effectively provide for these children (ICRC, 2014).
Evidence of the sub-region's willingness to move towards a concerted approach in this area is seen in the drafting of set of Regional Guidelines for responding to the needs of unaccompanied and separated children (UNHCR, 2013).

Key informants of the CGA were inconsistent in their prioritisation of this area of focus, with some considering it one of the top 3 priorities for the sub-region whilst others did not include it in the most relevant areas of work at all. As such we can assume its relevance is determined based on the type of disaster child protection in emergencies practitioners are responding to and perhaps that it is considered to be part of the work done with children on the move more broadly.

In-Country National Advisory Stakeholders (44% of respondents) indicated in the online survey that the prevention of and response to the separation of children from their families is an area with a low level of capacity in the region. However it is worth noting that In-Country Field Base Stakeholders self-assessed themselves as to be familiar and have some experience or be very familiar and have a deep knowledge of prevention and response programming to family separation.

**Justice for Children**

The term “Justice for children”, or “children in contact with the law” covers a wide range of ways in which children come into contact with security forces, legal structures and law enforcement agents (CPWGa, 2015). It is an area of child protection that remains poorly covered and underfunded in humanitarian contexts.

A large body of research reflects on how boys and girls held in prisons may be exposed to diverse forms of violence and threats to their wellbeing, including ill treatment, sexual violence, torture, physical violence, abuse and death. Children may also suffer physical and humiliating punishment, bullying and isolation. Dire conditions and harsh regimes are also physically and mentally damaging for children and may amount to cruel, inhumane and degrading treatment. In many prisons and institutions, children are denied medical care, education and other basic rights (CPWGa, 2015).

In an emergency, boys and girls may come into contact with justice systems in various ways and contexts: as victims, witnesses, (alleged) offenders or as part of the justice process. Often a child will come into contact with the law in a combination of these roles. Justice for children is an important child protection issue to be addressed at all stages of an emergency (preparedness, assessment, response and reconstruction) (CPWGd, 2015).

A Child Protection Working Group scoping study (quoted above) explicitly recommends increasing the capacity of child protection actors on justice for children in emergency settings (CPWGd, 2015). This is particularly important contexts like South East & East Asia where
UNICEF’s 2009 Progress for Children Report indicates that the number of children in conflict with the law has increased in nearly all countries (UNICEF, 2009).

Only 8% of the CGA key informants mentioned justice for children as an area of priority for capacity building efforts in the region however informants stressed that this is a new area of intervention for child protection in emergencies, which implies that capacity and experience would by default be weaker. The CGA desk review found little on programming in South East and East Asia around children in contact with the law and in some cases it seemed that work being done on this area in child protection in development contexts may even be being phased out.
C. CPIE Strategies & Approaches

Systems Building/Strengthening

In humanitarian settings, the people, processes, laws, institutions and behaviours that normally protect children – the child protection systems – may have become weakened or ineffective. An emergency response may provide an opportunity to develop and strengthen national or community-based systems (CPWG, 2012).

There are several advantages to building and strengthening child protection systems in emergency situations. These include: achieving greater and more sustainable impacts for children, preventing protection problems from occurring, thus reducing overall caseloads and their complexity and severity and enabling agencies to maximise the efficient use of resources (Save the Children, 2010).

No two emergency situations are the same and different types of emergencies present different challenges and opportunities to work on building/strengthening child protection systems. Emergencies can exacerbate strains and expose weaknesses in child protection systems, but at the same time, an emergency response can provide opportunities for improvement.

The Inter-Agency Steering Committee, a subcommittee of the East Asia and Pacific Child Protection Working Group, conducted a review of mappings and assessments of the child protection system in 14 countries in East Asia and the Pacific (ECPAT, 2014). While more focused on development contexts rather than humanitarian settings, key findings from this review highlighted the following:

- The child protection systems in the 14 countries have been influenced by a range of diverse but powerful ‘drivers’.
- Many child protection systems in these countries continue to bear the influence of short-term project- or issue-based approaches and often reflect donor priorities rather than responding primarily to the real needs of children and families.
- The notion of international standards appears to have been guided by ‘ideal’ Western models or approaches, with little acknowledgment that there are a variety of ways that these can be interpreted and applied.
- There appears to be growing awareness of and demand for child protection systems that work in harmony with specific cultural contexts.
- The lack of human capacity and sufficient financial resources remains a primary challenge for the effective functioning of child protection systems across the region.
- Child protection systems in the 14 countries are generally not functioning in an integrated and holistic way. Many of the mapping reports show that the approach to promoting child welfare and protection has tended to be ad hoc (ECPAT, 2014).
66% of the Capacity Gap Analysis key informants very firmly pointed out that systems building/strengthening, and working with governments more generally, is a major priority both in terms of child protection work in the sub-region and as a capacity building need among practitioners.

All Save the Children Country Office strategic documents consulted in the desk review incorporate work on formal and informal child protection systems building/strengthening.

Interestingly, formal and informal systems building work is not reported as a capacity gap by online survey participants, with 85% of In-Country Field Based survey respondents self-assessing themselves to have some experience or to have a deep knowledge of this area.

**Case Management**

Case management systems are used in a variety of human-service fields, including health, social work & justice. Case management is the process of helping individual children and families through direct social-work-type support and managing information well (CPWG, 2012). Case management can be provided in both emergency and development settings to address a range of issues, including child protection concerns (CPWG, 2014).

Case management practice is a necessary aspect of child protection work and cuts across much of the child protection work carried out by Save the Children including the identification, documentation, tracing and reunification of children; the reintegration of children formerly associated with armed forces and groups; the reintegration of children in unnecessary or detrimental institutional care; children on the move; children involved with harmful labour or taken out of exploitative settings; supporting children in contact with the law; and the collaboration with national governments on building child protection systems (Save the Children, 2011).

It is worth noting that case management strategies and approaches were identified in the 2015 global level assessment of existing competencies and experience in CPiE as one of the areas which practitioners are most interested in receiving training (CPWGb, 2015).

Strengthening case management approaches was one of the most consistently identified needs in the CGA, with the desk review indicating that all 8 countries targeted had flagged it as an area of focus either as a stand-alone piece of work or part of the child protection systems strengthening approach.

50% of key informants identified case management as a priority area for implementation and/or as a capacity gap in the region. On the other hand 87% of In-Country Field based stakeholders responding to the online survey self-assessed themselves to be either familiar or very familiar with the case management approach.
It is difficult to reconcile this discrepancy among the results of the desk research and key informant interviews and those of the survey, however this is a critical area of programming for child protection and one where distinct skill sets, extreme sensitivity and strict adherence to process are required.

**Alternative Care**
Alternative care is the care provided for children by caregivers who are not their biological parents. It may be formal or informal in nature and can assume the form of: kinship care; foster care; other forms of family-based or family-like care placements; residential care; or supervised independent living arrangements for children (CPWG, 2013). Children are at risk of being separated from their primary caregivers during emergencies, either as a direct result of the emergency or as a result of its consequences. Children separated from their parents/caregivers or families are at increased risk of violence, abuse, exploitation and neglect. Growing up in a safe family environment is essential for children to accomplish the various developmental goals associated with healthy child development. In many countries in South East & East Asia, residential care remains one of the primary responses to child abandonment, neglect and abuse and separation. Residential or institutional care should always be a last resort and only considered when family-based care arrangements are not possible or family-based care is not in the best interests of the child, and then only for as short a time-frame as possible (UN General Assembly, 2010).

43% of key informants in the CGA highlighted the need for further capacity building in this area of programming and also suggested that alternative care programming should be looked at jointly with case management and system strengthening approaches.

**Child Friendly Spaces**
The term Child Friendly Space is used to mean safe spaces where communities create nurturing environments in which children can access free and structured play, recreation, leisure and learning activities (CPWG, 2012).

Child Friendly Spaces are used by humanitarian agencies to protect and provide psychosocial support to children in emergencies. Child Friendly Spaces provide young people with a safe place to play, participate in activities, and learn about their rights and the services available to them. They allow child protection professionals to identify cases that need additional support. Child Friendly Spaces also help children to return to healthy routines and experience a sense of normalcy again.

The most comprehensive work done on evaluating the effectiveness of the Child Friendly Spaces approach is a 3 year research piece conducted by Columbia University and World Vision.
International in cooperation with UNICEF and Save the Children. The findings of this research suggest that across a broad range of contexts Child Friendly Spaces provide a good foundation for positive impact on children’s lives, when they are qualitative in nature. The report states, however, that whilst impacts can be substantial, they are often small and organisations need to work to ensure that Child Friendly Spaces are more than simply physical structures.

It needs to be further acknowledged that Child Friendly Spaces are not a panacea for every emergency in any setting. For Child Friendly Spaces programming to be effective it must be contextualised and age-and-gender-appropriate. Organisations and practitioners need to understand what characterises more effective interventions and different approaches to programme design accordingly (WorldVision, 2015).

25% of CGA key informants (WorldVision, 2015) specifically mentioned the need for additional training on Child Friendly Spaces for practitioners, to quote one informant: “Child Friendly Spaces need to be set up properly and not just poles and a tent to make children play.”

In the desk review Save the Children’s Country Offices in the Philippines and Indonesia specifically highlighted an intention to focus on staff capacity building around Child Friendly Spaces programming not only internally but also for partner NGOs and government counterparts, indicating its importance in the sub-region.

Key recommendations & challenges highlighted in the Evaluation of Child Friendly Spaces research in order for Child Friendly Spaces to really be effective include:

- Developing more engaging interventions suited to older children, understanding their differing capacities and challenges
- Promoting gender equity and positive outcomes for all
- Evolving strategies that are more effective in urban settings
- Quality of service provision matters, with programming meeting higher standards having a greater impact
- Improving outreach into communities

---

6 It is worth noting that the online survey respondents were not asked to self-assess their capacity in CFS programming.
D. Cross-cutting Themes

Working with Diversity

Gender & Sexuality
All the countries covered through this Capacity Gaps Analysis (CGA) exhibit quite low Gender Inequality Index rankings. Humanitarian crises can affect women, men, girls and boys in radically different ways; changing social and cultural structures in both positive and negative ways. If Child Protection interventions are not planned using a gender lens, the needs of the most at risk may not be met.

Gender sensitive programming resonated as one of the most relevant cross cutting themes in the sub-region throughout the documents consulted for the desk review. Save the Children Country Offices in South East & East Asia explicitly reference capacity building needs in this area including:

- Developing internal capacity in terms of organizational understanding and mainstreaming of diversity and equality
- Increasing internal capacities in gender approaches, understanding discrimination and inclusion, and facilitating different forms of child participation and building cooperation with key stakeholders
- Understanding gender sensitive and gender responsive child protection programming
- Improving internal and external awareness and competency in addressing sexual diversity and gender equality issues

Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) individuals also face systematic discrimination and marginalisation. Only a few documents consulted during the CGA desk review made specific reference to LGBT protection mainstreaming. We can however infer that the need for capacity building in this area is encompassed in the identified need for more organisational capacity in mainstreaming diversity and equality.

Age Appropriate Programming
In an emergency child protection interventions need to respond to the protection needs of babies and young children as well as to children in puberty and adolescence. Older children may have different expectations placed upon them: for example, having greater legal entitlements, being expected to work or marry, amongst others. Childhood diversity should therefore be taken in consideration when designing and planning child protection programmes.

---

7 Relevant Global Inequality Index rankings as per UNDP 2014: Cambodia = 143, China = 90, Indonesia = 110, Laos = 141, Myanmar = 148, the Philippines = 115, Thailand = 93 & Vietnam = 116
in emergencies. We also need to remember that age does not always correspond to an exact development stage.

The CGA findings did not reveal much data on this topic. The documents consulted in the desk review did highlight that efforts are being made to programme appropriately for adolescents, however we did not find much information on varied programming targeting specific stages of child development. Knowledge on child developmental stages and the implications this has for child protection in emergencies programming are fundamental and they form the basis of effective child protection work.

Targeting the Most Vulnerable (including indigenous people, minorities & children with disabilities)
Inclusive humanitarian action should ensure the right to survival, development and wellbeing for all persons affected by natural disasters or conflicts, especially people living in situations of vulnerability, irrespective of age, sex, disability, ethnic and social origin (UNICEF, n.d.).

The inclusion of children with disabilities and children from minority and indigenous groups in programming was expressly mentioned in several documents consulted through the desk review, emerging as an important cross-cutting theme for child protection in emergencies.

Key informants and survey participants were not explicitly consulted on cross-cutting themes although in some instances these emerged in conversations and comments. Inclusion and inequality were reported as major challenges according to findings of the UNOCHA 2013 Regional Humanitarian Policy Forum for Asia and the Pacific (UNOCHA, 2013).

Ensuring that practitioners know how to conduct appropriate targeting, especially in the face of an emergency’s competing priorities, is essential for ensuring that child protection interventions really do reach the most vulnerable children.

Mainstreaming and Integration
All sectors of a humanitarian response are critical in providing an adequate and holistic response for children who live in emergency settings. So whilst child protection in emergencies is a distinct sector, mainstreaming child protection or ensuring that child protection considerations inform all aspects of humanitarian action, can help to maximise the child protection impact of the work that all humanitarians do (CPWG, 2012).

Cross-thematic integration is on the other hand essential in overcoming some of the shortfalls the child protection sector may encounter during an emergency response in terms of funds as well as help in providing a holistic package of services for children.
The CGA desk review found little information in regional literature on child protection mainstreaming but cross-thematic integration was mentioned as a need in order to improve services for children affected by emergencies.

Conversely 25% of key informants highlighted mainstreaming as a priority area to focus capacity building efforts, however only 8% spoke more broadly about integration issues.

Through the online survey the majority of In-Country Field Based stakeholders reported to have some experience or a deep knowledge about mainstreaming child protection within other clusters when asked to self-assess themselves on coordination matters. Respondents were however not consulted on their knowledge about cross-thematic integration.

**Conflict Sensitive Programming**

Conflict sensitive programming/responding in a conflict situation was highlighted in the CGA by only a couple of key informants and online survey participants. It also did not come out strongly as a priority in the desk review, only appearing in a few Save the Children Country Office Strategic Plans.

Whilst conflict sensitive programming does not at first appear to be one of the priority capacity building concerns, it was highlighted by key informants to be an especially sensitive topic in the sub-region, in Myanmar for example programming in conflict affected areas is highly politically sensitive and requires in-depth specific expertise and contextual knowledge.

We can therefore infer that whilst conflict situations are not the major trend for emergencies in the region, conflict sensitive programming may be needed to work appropriately within contexts with varied complex relationships and power dynamics.

**Climate Change, Disaster Risk Reduction & Preparedness**

South East & East Asia is particularly vulnerable to the impacts of climate change with its extensive, heavily populated coastlines, large agricultural sectors and large sections of the population living under $2 or even $1 a day (ADB, 2009).

Climate change has already had a noticeable impact on the region, as evidenced by the increasing mean temperature, changing precipitation patterns, rising sea level, and increasing frequency and growing intensity of extreme weather events (UNHABITAT, 2014).

South East Asia is projected to suffer more from climate change in the years to come, with the impact likely to be worse than the global average (ADB, 2009). Climate related disasters can lead to the sudden, large-scale movement of people as they move to the nearest safe haven.

Globally in 2008 alone, over 46 million people were displaced by sudden-onset disasters, of which 20 million were affected by climate-related disasters (IOM, 2010). Save the Children
emphasises the importance of child-centred disaster risk reduction activities and this perspective is reflected in the majority of South East & East Asia Country Office Strategic Plans consulted in the desk review.

The evidence and trend analyses suggests that being able to effectively link disaster risk reduction & emergency preparedness work to child protection programming will be an indispensable competency for child protection professionals in Asia in the coming years.

Child protection interventions are implemented to respond to emergencies of different kinds but these programmes can also use the emergency as an entry point to help build more resilient communities better able to adapt to changing climates in the future, something that Child Protection practitioners in Asia should strive to do.

**Urbanisation**

Rapid, inequitable and unplanned urban growth in developing countries has led to the emergence of highly vulnerable urban communities, particularly those living in informal settlements. According to the latest (2012) statistics from UN-Habitat, there are an estimated 850 million urban dwellers in slums and slum-like conditions globally, with over 500 million of those being in Asia-Pacific cities (UNHABITAT, 2014).

The urban poor often do not own the land they occupy or have the formal legal identity needed to possess housing registrations and building permits. Environmental health, especially for women and children, can significantly impact their livelihoods and well-being. Limited or weak social networks can make recovering from risks and shocks, both natural and man-made, a challenge (UNHABITAT, 2014).

Poor city residents in Asia-Pacific tend to live in the most vulnerable locations, such as the low-lying coastal areas, which are particularly vulnerable to storm surges. In addition to this according to the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UN DESA) 66% of the world’s population is projected to be urban by 2050 and 90% of this increase is expected to be concentrated in Asia and Africa (UNDESA, 2014).

Disaster response in an urban environment presents a wide variety of challenges. Humanitarian organisations often have more experience of disaster response in rural settings, and local authorities and community organisations may have little experience of planning and executing large-scale activities in response and recovery (ALNAP, 2012).

An urban disaster is unique in that it occurs in a dense and highly complex (physical and nonphysical) environment that has adapted, formally and informally, to absorb large populations and a range of economic activities (ALNAP, 2012). Child protection practitioners in
South East & East Asia therefore need to be able to adapt to this particular context and also link robustly to disaster risk reduction efforts in order to build more resilient cities.

Urbanisation emerged strongly as a cross-cutting theme in the desk review of the CGA and it will be important to leverage regional knowledge of creating effective child protection interventions and urban programming to build capacity in this area.
E. CPIE Programme Management

Programme Management & Staff Management

Child Protection Minimum Standard 4: Programme Cycle Management, specifically highlights the importance of child-protection oriented programming. CPMS Programme Cycle Management Guidance has also been developed by the CPWG expanding on Standard 4 and drawing principles and key actions related to programme management that can be found throughout the 26 standards (CPWGc, 2015). Specialised competencies and skills in programme and staff management are essential for mid-level child protection in emergencies professionals to ensure the success and quality of child protection programming.

Enhancing the programme management skills as well as the performance management skills of staff, especially around the areas of staff retention and development, is highlighted as a key strategic need in terms of capacity building by the majority of the Save the Children strategic documents consulted during the desk review.

It is also worth noting that ‘management: organizational and team managerial skills and know-how’ was identified in the 2015 global level assessment of existing competencies and experience in CPIE as an area which practitioners are most interested in receiving training (CPWGb, 2015).

Even though key informants were not consulted directly on operational competencies capacity building needs, 16% highlighted the importance of enhancing child protection–programme management skills specifically, even more reported the importance of working on a variety of topics related to management more generally, including:

- Confidence building,
- Communication skills,
- Intercultural communication skills,
- Reflective practice,
- Effective supervision,
- Self-care and stress management.

Building the capacity of child protection practitioners in terms of programme & staff management will be linked explicitly to aspects of monitoring, evaluation, accountability & learning as well as to the tenets of good capacity building itself, in order to ensure practitioners are able to build effective programmes and strong child protection teams of the future.

Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability & Learning in Child Protection Programmes

Monitoring tracks progress in reaching programme objectives in order to compare the intentions of a specific programme with its results assessing programme quality, outputs,
outcomes and where possible, programme impact. Monitoring can highlight activities or delivery approaches that may need to be adjusted. Organisation’s programme monitoring, if effective, may also enable them to contribute positively to sector-wide child protection situation monitoring or response monitoring (CPWGc, 2015).

Evaluations should provide information that is both credible and useful, enabling the incorporation of lessons learned into the decision-making process of both organisations and donors.

Accountability to children and communities involves giving them a voice and opportunity to influence relevant decisions affecting whether and how organisations work with the people they seek to assist.

Learning refers to the systematic incorporation of lessons, recommendations and observations into programme design, including the findings that emerge from accountability mechanisms (Save the Children, 2015).

Monitoring, evaluation, accountability and learning (MEAL) are important aspects of programme implementation. The majority of Save the Children strategic plans consulted during the desk review highlight that within the South East & East Asia sub-region there is a focus on improving MEAL systems across different programming sectors and with partners.

It is worth noting that ‘monitoring, evaluation, and policy development’ was identified in the 2015 global level assessment of existing competencies and experience in CPE as an area which practitioners are most interested in receiving training (CPWGb, 2015).

Key informants of the Capacity Gap Analysis (CGA) did not highlight MEAL in child protection programmes as a gap or priority however this is likely due to the fact that the interview questions were framed around child protection technical areas rather than operational matters.

50% of In-Country Field based survey respondents assessed themselves as either not to be familiar or to have little experience in designing and implementing effective monitoring and evaluation systems for child protection programmes. The desk review repeatedly highlighted the need to strengthen aspects of MEAL systems, including:

- Strengthen monitoring, evaluation and accountability mechanisms and capacity across all sectors
- Enhance programme data management systems
- Improve M&E capability and practices of all programme staff, including field staff
- Develop and administer tools for better knowledge management.
The increasing frequency, intensity & complexity of emergencies means that the humanitarian system and the child protection sector especially, is stretched to its limits with insufficient capacity to effectively respond to emergencies.

Children who are affected by emergencies deserve consistent, high quality, contextually appropriate responses delivered by capable staff. In contexts which shift between development & humanitarian, and in which high staff turnover is endemic (due to high attrition rates, emotionally and physically demanding work and because many roles and jobs are funded by short term grants and projects (CPWGb, 2015)) there is a need to ensure staff are able to disseminate learning and contribute to the capacity building of peers and partners in the sector.

Furthermore despite a growth in the number of initiatives, capacity building support remains scarce exactly where it is needed most. There is a wide network of people who are involved in child protection work - a less formal protective system: crisis survivors (children, extended family), adults and professionals most frequently in contact with children (teachers, social workers, health care workers); as well as those who comprise a more formal, professional child protection in emergencies workforce: members of community based organizations, national NGO staff, national staff with international NGOs and multilateral agencies. For these professionals, paraprofessionals and families, access to capacity building in child protection practices remains limited (CPWGb, 2015).

Save the Children has over 10 years’ experience in humanitarian capacity building and believes that good learning programmes are ones which are contextualised, practitioner-led, blended, experiential and reflective. These types of programmes are effective, but demanding of resources which mean they can often be limited in reach.

Despite capacity building's potentially transformative impact, we know that in a system stretched to breaking point, it can be difficult for organisations to prioritise resources for such programmes when faced with difficult choices about how best to address need.

Therefore in an increasingly competitive funding environment, and considering the sheer scale of need, it is important to consider innovative ways to sustain the outcomes and maximise the impact of capacity building initiatives.

A key function of any CPIE practitioner’s role is capacity building – be it working with colleagues, partners, care-givers, communities or governments. For CPIE staff to be effective in this role and we need them to understand that good capacity building is more than just the transfer of knowledge – it is about fostering a productive learning environments, enabling peer-to-peer exchanges and encouraging reflective practices.

See also Save the Children’s Humanitarian Technical Capacity Building Framework
These are distinct skills which we must equip CPiE staff with if we want to consider the wider reaching impact of learning programmes. We need to invest in staff as CPiE capacity “multipliers”, if we are to truly build capacity at scale.

The issue of capacity building came up repeatedly in the Capacity Gap Analysis (CGA) key informant interview with 41% directly referencing how important capacity building is during an emergency and that the sector needs to consider the cascade model of training – where participants are expected to disseminate learning beyond the time-frame of the programme.

Whilst the CGA online survey did not focus extensively on capacity building as a distinct skill-set for CPiE practitioners in detail, In-Country Field Based stakeholders self-assessed themselves on their experience in training and mentoring others on child protection as follows:

- 12.5% were not familiar with this
- 12.5% have heard of this but have little experience in it
- 44% are familiar with this and have some experience
- 31% are very familiar with this and have a deep knowledge of this area
G. CPiE Infrastructure

Co-ordination of child protection responses in emergencies

Co-ordination is central to addressing child protection issues in emergencies. As stated in Standard 1 of the Child Protection Minimum Standard, coordination helps to make sure that child protection responses are prioritised, efficient, predictable and effective.

In most contexts the government has the main responsibility for coordinating child protection activities and may lead or co-lead the coordination mechanism. In situations in which this is not possible, it is the responsibility of child protection actors – members of the child protection coordination mechanisms – to liaise with government actors in a coordinated manner, as much as is possible and appropriate (CPWGc, 2015). Effective coordination helps to avoid duplication or partial responses and assists different actors involved in a child protection response to agree on objectives and a division of efforts. It can also foster an inter-agency or multi-sectoral response that strengthens the national or community-based child protection system in the long run. A lack of coordination can on the other hand result in harmful programming (CPWG, 2012).

25% of the CGA key informants mentioned co-ordination as a fundamental competency required by mid-level child protection professionals and that there was significant need to build co-ordination skills in the sub-region. In the online survey the co-ordination of child protection responses in emergencies is listed by regional and national stakeholders as one of the areas with low to medium levels of capacity in the region, it is also flagged as an area of focus which is highly relevant in sub-the region.

Echoing these findings:

- 63% of In-Country Field Based survey respondents reported not being familiar or to having little experience in understanding the role and mandate of political, peacekeeping and peace building missions in child protection and humanitarian reform – a key aspect co-ordination in emergencies
- 44% of In-Country Field Based survey respondents rated themselves as having heard about assessments but having little experience in them.

Both the desk review and key informant interviews raised the necessity of practitioners understanding the importance of co-ordination mechanisms beyond the cluster system and being able to collaborate and co-operate at the regional level.
Communication & Advocacy
The success of child protection programmes and strategies is very dependent on an effective communication style/strategy. Building the capacity of child protection practitioners so that they are capable of effective communication is fundamental for ensuring the success of:

- CPIE Programme messaging for communities and beneficiaries
- Fundraising efforts
- Effective coordination with other stakeholders
- Impactful integration and mainstreaming efforts
- Organisational representation in working groups/cluster system
- Developing media strategies
- Successful advocacy initiatives

Many practitioners need to be able to: adapt communications to their audience, CPWG coordinators for example need to organize meetings efficiently as well as build trust by keeping in touch with stakeholders (CPWG, 2010).

As mentioned above, linked to an effective communication style is the success of any advocacy strategy. As per UNICEF’s definition:

“Advocacy is a core process for addressing inequity and disparities. Advocacy addresses inequity by bringing the issue of child disparities to the forefront of the agenda for decision makers, by building awareness, visibility and public momentum behind the issue, and by improving access, cost and quality of programmes and services for disadvantaged children and women.” (UNICEF, 2010).

The CGA did not reveal much direct data on this more operational aspect of managing child protection interventions. However In-Country Field Based survey respondents did self-assess themselves as the following:

- 75% rated themselves as either familiar or very familiar with advocating to raise the profile of child protection concerns
- 44% rated themselves as either familiar or very familiar in liaising and advocating with donors
- 50% rated themselves as either familiar or very familiar in building partnerships and consensus within Child Protection interagency forums on strategic priorities.

Fundraising
Fundraising for child protection in emergencies programmes continues to be difficult, especially in the first days of an emergency response when other interventions can be seen as more urgent. Despite the Inter-Agency Standing Committee’s statement on The Centrality of Protection in Humanitarian Action and the growing body of evidence and research to the contrary, to many, child protection is still not considered a lifesaving intervention.
A Child Protection Working Group report commissioned by Save the Children in 2010 stated: “...humanitarian funding of child protection between 2007 and 2009 has been inconsistent, despite significant requests and requirements made for child protection programmatic work. In addition, the analysis shows that the child protection sector is underfunded relative to the majority of other sectors and relative to the protection sector in which it is located” (CPWG, 2010).

Levels of spending for the prevention and response of violence against children in emergencies remain very low, both by governments and donors. They typically receive approximately one third of the total amount requested. Despite an overall growth in humanitarian funding, CERF funding for child protection fell from US$ 6.5 million in 2007 to US$ 3.2 million in 2008, and then fell again to US$ 2.9 million in 2009 (CPWG, 2015). Building the capacity of child protection staff to support fundraising for the sector is therefore integral.

25% of key informants in the CGA emphasised low funding as a key challenge not only for continuing and improving CPIE programme activities but also for retaining qualified staff and providing a career pathway, especially because many roles and jobs are funded by short term grants and projects.

56% of In-Country Field Based survey respondents reported to have no experience or little experience in liaising and advocating with donors. To overcome some these challenges the global Gender Based Violence (GBV) and Child Protection Working Group (CPWG) areas of responsibilities (AoRs) have developed a handbook to provide practical guidance to child protection and GBV coordination groups and their members with the aim of helping them access more humanitarian funding. The CPWG has also recently launched advocacy tool A Matter of Life and Death to support practitioners with demonstrating the life-saving impact of Child Protection work when communicating with donors.

In an increasingly competitive funding environment, and considering the sheer scale of need, CPIE practitioners need to become better equipped at fundraising for the sector. It is furthermore important to note that there seems to be an increasing corporate presence offering new opportunities for fundraising in South East and East Asia and this may be an opportunity for child protection in emergencies programming.
H. Key Format Features

Save the Children is committed to capacity building and has worked in building humanitarian response capability for the past 10 years. We take a blended learning approach (see below) to talent development and believe in reflective, practitioner led learning.

The CPiE Capacity Building Mapping & Market Analysis conducted globally in 2015 highlighted that in-person short courses are high in demand – with that format being identified by individuals as the most likely form of CPiE capacity building they would make use of in next five years, followed by online trainings. The CPiE Capacity Building Mapping & Market Analysis also revealed that short in-service trainings are by far the most sought after type of training opportunity (51% of those surveyed ranked this as their highest priority need) (CPWGb, 2015).

More detailed observations on training demand and format highlighted that CPiE training delivered through humanitarian agencies is the most broadly-attractive type of training opportunity for individuals, and is especially appealing to those who express less inclination toward an accredited program or degree (CPWGb, 2015).

In terms of format features the findings of the South East & East Asia Capacity Gap Analysis (CGA) tend to corroborate those of the global level CPiE Capacity Building Mapping & Market Analysis, and support the conclusion that the best option in terms of format for the CPiE Professional Development Programme would be a blended learning approach which enables
peer to peer exchange and uses a mixture of instructor led digital learning and short face-to-face courses.

CGA key informants also stressed the importance of setting appropriate entry criteria to ensure the Child Protection in Emergencies Professional Development Programme targets & reaches the right candidates, in order for it be an impactful capacity building programme. Suggested criteria included:

- Appropriate academic background to be verified during the application process;
- Incorporate the recognition of prior learning and professional experience, especially in lieu of academic credentials;
- Include an assessment of motivation during the application process;
- Include a language assessment as part of the application process;
- Completion of online personal safety and security training prior to acceptance on the programme

It is important to note that key informants also suggested potentially incorporating a process for line-management sign-off during the application process, allowing for senior-level endorsement of participation. And in some cases, even letting organisations nominate the most suitable candidates for the programme.

Senior management buy-in is integral to the success of the programme and one of the main challenges highlighted as a potential barrier is the issue of “backfilling” programme participants’ current jobs whilst on placements or attending training.

Taking into account budgetary constraints, there is broad agreement that a face-to-face component of the training would be indispensable and it should be delivered capitalising wherever possible on the expertise available in the region. It should also foster and enable peer-to-peer learning opportunities.

Several key informants mentioned unreliable internet connections in the Philippines and Myanmar as a potential challenge for digital learning methodologies; however despite this the overall attitude of respondents was very receptive to exploring new technologies and media. Any successful capacity programme in the sub-region would need to include a variety of quality assured learning interventions that can be adapted depending on the need and accessibility.

Technical supervision and mentoring of programme participants were also highlighted repeatedly as important components of any impactful CPiE capacity building programme. Mentoring in particular, was highlighted as being necessary for a significant duration of time in order individuals to benefit from the process an approach which echoes Save the Children’s in this area.

The lack of exposure to other contexts was also consistently highlighted as one of the main career barriers for national mid-level CPiE practitioners, preventing them from accessing international/regional roles or more proactive roles in responding to emergencies in their own
country. For this reason, CGA key informants proposed a variety of suggestions for individuals to gain emergency exposure including:

- Short-term placements
- Staff exchanges
- Job shadowing
- Study visits

Discussions with key informants of the Capacity Gap Analysis also highlighted the necessity of using a competency approach and a competency based assessments in the CPIE Professional Development Programme. The programme should also be built with assessments which include a pass/fail mechanism and the creation of an alumni group upon successful completion.

Lastly, given the wide spectrum of child protection in emergency programming, it is important for the Child Protection in Emergencies Professional Development Programme to enable participants the opportunities to specialise in specific thematic areas which could be defined through individual learning plans.
### Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACWC</td>
<td>Commission on the Promotion and the Protection of the Rights of Women and Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AORs</td>
<td>Areas of Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASEAN</td>
<td>Association of Southeast Asian Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERF</td>
<td>Central Emergency Response Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGA</td>
<td>Capacity Gap Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>Child Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPIE</td>
<td>Child Protection in Emergencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPMS</td>
<td>Minimum Standards for Child Protection in Humanitarian Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPWG</td>
<td>Child Protection Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSEC</td>
<td>Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGM/C</td>
<td>Female Genital Mutilation/Cutting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSL</td>
<td>Food, Security and Livelihoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBV</td>
<td>Gender Based Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IASC</td>
<td>Inter-Agency Standing Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBT</td>
<td>Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAL</td>
<td>Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHPSS</td>
<td>Mental Health and Psychosocial Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICS</td>
<td>Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDP</td>
<td>Professional Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEEA</td>
<td>South East &amp; East Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCW</td>
<td>Understanding Children's Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN DESA</td>
<td>United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations' Children Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNOCHA</td>
<td>United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>World Health Organisation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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