

**THE ALLIANCE
FOR CHILD PROTECTION
IN HUMANITARIAN ACTION**



2018–2020
WORK PLAN

ENDORSED ON 9 MARCH 2018

Core Members of the Alliance

1. ChildFund International
2. CPC Learning Network
3. Danish Refugee Council
4. International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent National Societies (IFRC)
5. Hurras Network
6. International Organization for Migration
7. International Rescue Committee
8. Islamic Relief Worldwide
9. Plan International
10. Save the Children
11. Terre des hommes
12. UNHCR
13. UNICEF
14. War Child Holland
15. War Child UK
16. World Vision International
17. *Observer status:* Child Protection Area of Responsibility

General Members of the Alliance

18. International Labour Office
19. Global Partnership to End Violence against Children
20. Action contre la Faim
21. Children of One World
22. EFADA
23. CAN Pakistan
24. VIVA
25. Cambodia ACTS
26. Swatantrata Abhiyan Nepal
27. Partnership Network for Prevention VAC
28. Hope Spring Haven
29. Lutheran World Foundation
30. New hope New winners
31. Catholic Relief Services
32. Advocacy for Child Relief
33. Bioforce Institute
34. Humanity and Inclusion (Handicap International)
35. Bangladesh Model Youth Parliament
36. King's College
37. BIFERD
38. Child Fund Philippines
39. Parent- Child Intervention Center
40. Street Child
41. SEDHURO
42. AJEDI-Ka
43. Elimu Mwangaza
44. Nirengi Association
45. Africa Child Policy Forum
46. Hope Aid
47. Action Chrétienne pour la Paix et le Développement (ACPD)
48. Child Frontiers
49. Child Helpline
50. Child Soldiers International
51. CESVI
52. Everychild
53. Family for Every Child
54. Geneva Call
55. Goal
56. Heartland Alliance
57. HelpAge
58. International Bureau for Children's Rights (IBCR)
59. International Institute for Child Rights and Development (IICRD)
60. Keeping Children Safe Coalition
61. Mercy Corps
62. Mindleaps
63. Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC)
64. Refuge Point
65. ReTrak
66. RedR
67. SOS Children's Villages International
68. University of KwaZulu Natal
69. UNRWA
70. War Child Canada
71. Watchlist on Children and Armed Conflict
72. Women's Refugee Commission
73. World Health Organization
74. *Observer status:* International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC)

Associate Members and other Contributors

Global Affairs Canada
Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergency
Elevate Children Funders Group
European Community Directorate General for Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection (DG ECHO)
Swiss Agency for Cooperation and Development

UK Government Department for International Development (DFID)
United Nations Department for Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO)
United States Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration (BPRM)
USAID Displaced Children and Orphans' Fund (DCOF)
USAID Office for Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA)

Contents

- Introduction..... 1
- The Alliance 1
- Vision, mission, function and structure 1
- WorkPlan..... 3
 - Secretariat 3
 - Alliance Secretariat 3
 - Working Groups 4
 - Working Group 1. Minimum standards for child protection in humanitarian action (CPMS)..... 4
 - Working Group 2 Advocacy Working Group (AWG) 5
 - Working Group 3: Learning and Development Working Group (L&D WG) 6
 - Working Group 4: Assessment, Evidence and Measurement Working Group (AME WG)..... 7
- Task Forces 9
 - Task Force 1: Case Management Task Force 9
 - Task Force 2: Cash Transfer and Child Protection Task Force 10
 - Task Force 3: Community-Based Child Protection in Emergencies Task Force 11
 - Task Force 4: Child Labour Task Force 13
 - Task force 5: Family Strengthening Task Force 15
 - Task Force 6: Unaccompanied and Separated Children Inter-Agency Work Group..... 16

Introduction

This work plan sets out the interagency standard setting and normative work of the Alliance for Child Protection in Humanitarian Action (Alliance), which aims to strengthen quality and effectiveness of child protection programs in humanitarian settings. This document should be read in conjunction with the [2018-2020 Strategic Plan of the Alliance](#). Members of the Alliance listed on the cover page of this document collaborated to produce this work plan. Donors that have contributed funding to implement the work set out in this document include SIDA (Sweden), and OFDA and BPRM (United States of America). An excel document with the more complete and detailed work plan is also available.

This work plan will be reviewed and updated on an annual basis. Further updates will be available on the [Alliance website](#).

The Alliance

The work that is currently being undertaken by the Alliance was previously carried out under the UNICEF-led Child Protection Working Group (CPWG). The CPWG was created in 2007 as part of the Protection Cluster and performed two main functions. Over nearly a decade, the CPWG developed an important body of inter-agency technical work. This included the development and launch of the Minimum Standards for Child Protection in Humanitarian Action in 2012, which provided important guidance to practitioners for helping children affected by emergencies.ⁱ In November 2016, the CPWG transitioned to the Alliance for Child Protection in Humanitarian Action and the Child Protection Area of Responsibility (CP AoR). The Alliance carries forward the standard setting and technical support function while. The current structure allows the Alliance to better integrate considerations related to child protection in non-cluster settings into its various work streams, while maintaining a strong connection to the cluster system through the CP AoR. Moreover, the Alliance is well placed to collaborate with relevant development partners to bridge the humanitarian/development divide.

Vision, mission, function and structure

The Alliance envisions a world in which children are protected from abuse, neglect, exploitation and violence in humanitarian settings.

Its mission is to support the efforts of humanitarian actors to achieve high-quality and effective child protection interventions in humanitarian contexts, in both refugee and non-refugee settings. As a global network of operational agencies, academic institutions, policymakers, donors and practitioners, the Alliance facilitates inter-agency technical collaboration on child protection in all humanitarian contexts. It sets standards and produces technical guidance for use by the various stakeholders. The United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) currently co-leads the Alliance with Save the Children.ⁱⁱ

The Alliance for Child Protection in Humanitarian Action facilitates inter-agency collaboration on normative work, including standard-setting and development of technical guidance. It also provides its members with technical support and guidance where needed. The Alliance's work falls into five categories:

- **Standard setting and guidance development:** The Alliance develops standards for child protection in emergencies (CPIE) and generates technical guidelines and associated

materials for use by humanitarian actors. It also promotes the integration of humanitarian standards and norms into practice, and encourages efforts to learn from their use and improve upon them. The Alliance is the custodian of the Minimum Standards for Child Protection in Humanitarian Action, which is considered a companion to the Sphere standards.

- **Capacity building, learning and development:** The Alliance develops technical capacity for child protection by identifying, expanding and strengthening the CPiE workforce; mapping capacity gaps; defining priorities and strategic direction in terms of capacity development; and providing learning opportunities, both face-to-face and remote.
- **Evidence and knowledge generation:** The Alliance invests in generating, processing and making robust evidence available on the effectiveness of programmes and strategies in protecting children in humanitarian settings.
- **Advocacy:** The Alliance engages in advocacy for child protection and its beneficiaries. This includes ensuring child protection needs are reflected in the global humanitarian architecture and associated processes.
- **Convening:** The Alliance convenes humanitarian child protection actors working at local, national, regional and global levels to promote knowledge-sharing and technical collaboration.

Working groups, task forces and technical focal points implement the Alliance workplan. They are led by members of the Alliance and supported by Alliance coordinators. Working groups are permanent work streams, while task forces are expected to serve a specific technical function and dissolve once the task is completed. Technical Focal Points are individuals, within member agencies of the Alliance, who have agreed to act as an inter-agency resource on a given technical area of child protection, where no working group or task force exists

The Alliance for Child Protection in Humanitarian Action is composed of four working groups and six task forces:ⁱⁱⁱ

Working groups within the Alliance:

- Child Protection Minimum Standards Working Group (CPMS WG), co-led by Save the Children and Terre des hommes
- Assessment, Measurement and Evidence Working Group (AME WG), co-led by Save the Children and the CPC-Network
- Learning and Development Working Group (L&D WG), co-led by Terre des hommes, UNICEF, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and the Child Protection Area of Responsibility
- Advocacy Working Group (AWG), co-led by World Vision and ChildFund Alliance.

Task forces within the Alliance:

- Unaccompanied and Separated Children, led by the International Organization for Migration (IOM) (rotating leadership)
- Case Management, co-led by the International Rescue Committee (IRC) and UNICEF
- Community-based Child Protection, co-led by Plan International, UNICEF and World Vision
- Cash Transfer and Child Protection, co-led by the CPC-Network, World Vision and the IRC
- Family Strengthening, co-led by War Child Holland, the IRC and Save the Children
- Child Labour, co-led by the International Labour Organization (ILO) and Plan International.

Work-Plan

Secretariat

| Alliance Secretariat | | |
|---|--|--|
| Outcome: Evidence-based, high quality standards and technical products are available and accessible to child protection actors in humanitarian setting, especially local actors. | | |
| Lead agency(ies): | Save the Children and UNICEF | Total Budget 2018-2020: \$1,692,000 Budget 2018: \$564,000 Total received 2018: \$252,000 Funding gap 2018: \$312,000 |
| Contributing members: | The Alliance Steering Committee members: ChildFund International, CPC Learning Network, Danish Refugee Council, International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent National Societies (IFRC), Hurras Network, International Organization for Migration, International Rescue Committee, Islamic Relief, Plan International, Save the Children, Terre des hommes, UNHCR, UNICEF, War Child Holland, War Child UK, World Vision International and CP AoR | |
| Objectives | Activities | |
| Objective 1: Working Groups and Task Forces of the Alliance are well coordinated and on track with their activities | 1.1: Facilitate linkages with external networks and actors relevant to technical areas of WG and TF | |
| | 1.2: Support WGs and TFs in fundraising for their activities | |
| | 1.3: Coordinate across WGs and TFs including through quarterly meetings | |
| | 1.4: Provide strategic and quality guidance to the work of the WGs and TFs, including review of work plans and aligning activities with the Alliance Strategic Plan and endorsement of final products | |
| Objective 2: The Alliance maintains a strategic focus while remaining relevant to the needs of the sector | 2.1: Develop and implement a 3-year strategy for the Alliance | |
| | 2.2: Organize quarterly meetings with the Steering Committee | |
| | 2.3: Analyze evidence from the field to ensure relevance of the work of the Alliance | |
| Objective 3: Ensure that knowledge and technical material is more available and accessible | 3.1: Develop and enhance Alliance online presence to support information sharing and community of practice | |
| | 3.2: Support WGs and TFs in developing and carrying out Knowledge Management strategy | |
| | 3.3: Organize Annual Meeting for the sector | |
| Objective 4: The Alliance strengthens its approach to Integration and Localization | 4.1: Engage with other Sectors to develop mechanisms that foster Integration (INEE) | |
| | 4.2: Actively support the expansion and inclusion of membership with particular focus on local actors | |
| | 4.3: Advocate for and facilitate the generation and use of evidence in standard setting and technical guidance | |
| Objective 5: Alliance is well represented at global regional and national level | 5.1: Take part in relevant events | |
| | 5.2: keep key actors abreast of Alliance activities and development | |

| Working Group 1. Minimum standards for child protection in humanitarian action (CPMS) | | |
|--|--|--|
| Outcome: Humanitarian agencies meet agreed standards of quality programming | | |
| Lead agency(ies): | Save the Children and Terre des hommes | Total Budget 2018-2020: \$1,649,639 Budget 2018: \$618,301 Total received 2018: \$424,622 Funding gap 2018: \$193,679 |
| Contributing members: | Viva, BIFERD (DRC), SOS Children’s Village, Terre des hommes, UNICEF, Islamic Relief, KCS Coalition, War Child Holland, World Vision International, Plan International, Geneva Call, Danish Refugee Council, CP AoR ICRC, International Rescue Committee, Child Soldiers International, DPKO, ChildFund, Columbia University, UNHCR, War Child UK, Save the Children, IOM, ILO, CPC Learning Network, Goal. IFRC, Global Partnership to End VaC, WHO | |
| Objectives | Activities | |
| Objective 1: A 2nd edition of the CPMS is available that reflects updated knowledge and evidence within the sector. | 1.1: Prepare the revision / identify participants & process / Agree 2nd edition structure and major content updates. | |
| | 1.2: Revise drafts through revision teams. | |
| | 1.3: Develop evidence database for CPMS content 2nd ed. | |
| | 1.4: Hold consultations on drafts. | |
| | 1.5: Finalize 2nd edition text. | |
| | 1.6: Translate 2nd edition - final and draft | |
| | 1.7: Print and disseminate hardcopies of 2nd edition CPMS. | |
| | 1.8: Publish online version of 2nd edition CPMS. | |
| | 1.9: Launch 2nd Edition CPMS. | |
| | 1.10: Develop and disseminate communications around 2nd edition changes and availability. | |
| Objective 2: The CPMS are known and institutionalized in humanitarian and child protection frameworks and within agencies. | 2.1: Update, administer, monitor and share the results from the CPMS institutionalization survey, including new Alliance members. | |
| | 2.2: Regularly monitor and follow up CPMS use to advocate for greater awareness according to gaps in target populations of users. | |
| | 2.3: Facilitate interagency learning through documentation of case studies. | |
| | 2.4: Promote integration of the CPMS in all relevant child protection and humanitarian sector tools and guidance at global level. | |
| | 2.5: Contribute to Humanitarian Standards Network and ensure cross-reference between standards to the CPMS / Monitor use of and maintain the CPMS portion of the joint mobile app. | |
| Objective 3: Support actors using the CPMS in context for preparedness and response for improving programming quality. | 3.1: Develop an online training module on the CPMS, based on the CPMS videos. | |
| | 3.2: Update supporting resources to reflect changes in the 2nd edition CPMS, including the F2F training package and other Alliance resources. | |
| | 3.3: Provide support to interagency groups in countries to align programming with the CPMS, undertake contextualization and implement the CPMS through ToT workshops and on-going community of practice. | |
| | 3.4: Link with 3-4 sectors and global and field level to document ways of better working together building on the collaboration during the revision process. | |
| | 3.5 Finalize the CPMS videos series | |

Working Groups

| Working Group 2 Advocacy Working Group (AWG) | | |
|---|--|---|
| Outcome: Child Protection in humanitarian settings is understood and prioritized by key humanitarian agencies, existing and potential donors, and states. | | |
| Lead agency(ies): | ChildFund International and World Vision International | Total Budget 2018-2020: \$96,000 Budget 2018: \$32,300 Total received: \$0 Funding gap: \$32,300 |
| Contributing members: | Terre des hommes, UNICEF, World Vision International, Plan International, UNHCR, International Rescue Committee, UNHCR, War Child UK | |
| Objectives | Activities | |
| Objective 1: Reported increase in funding for Child Protection in Humanitarian Settings (perceived increase as reported by coordinators, in at least 50% of countries responding) | 1.1: Launch of a study on obstacles to CPIE funding. | |
| | 1.1.1: Support the development of a study on obstacles to CPIE funding. | |
| | 1.1.2: Launch study results with donors. | |
| | 1.2: Advocate for all donors to include the CPMS in funding requirements and strategies. | |
| | 1.2.1: Map donors' inclusion of CPMS in funding requirements and strategies. | |
| | 1.2.2: Develop donor advocacy strategy. | |
| | 1.3: Continued roll out of the donor guidance. | |
| | 1.3.1: Donor guidance is completed and used by donors. | |
| Objective 2: Improved understanding of CPIE and its lifesaving nature amongst humanitarian decision-makers and donors | 1.3.2: Organize meetings with donors. | |
| | 2.1: Advocate for inclusion of CPIE in pre-deployment trainings of HCs. | |
| | 2.2: Advocate for inclusion of CPIE in CERFs in emerging crises. | |
| | 2.3: Create checklist/flow chart on CPIE issues for humanitarian advocacy colleagues to encourage integration. | |
| | 2.4: Work with GPEVAC to ensure meaningful inclusion of fragile and humanitarian contexts. | |
| | 2.4.1: Develop briefing on solutions on humanitarian action. | |
| Objective 3: Influence civil society discourse on child rights and child protection in humanitarian settings | 2.4.2: Develop messaging on CPIE in fragile contexts to use internally and externally. | |
| | 2.4.3: Support CSOs working in emergencies in NGO Forum for the Global Partnership. | |
| | 2.4.4: Support INGO colleagues working with the GPEVAC with input on fragile and humanitarian contexts. | |
| | 3.1: Outreach to local NGO and staff for participation in AWG. | |
| | 3.2: Work with 2 additional sectors to develop messaging on the lifesaving nature of both sectors relevant to a particular context(s). | |
| | 3.3: Hold at least 2 joint global events with additional sector highlighting both CP and additional sector. | |

| Working Group 3: Learning and Development Working Group (L&D WG) | | |
|--|--|---|
| Outcome: Bridging the human resource capacity and competence gaps for child protection in humanitarian action | | |
| Lead agency(ies): | Terre des Hommes, UNICEF, UNHCR, CP AoR | Total Budget 2018-2020: \$1,666,871 Budget 2018: \$726,171 Total received 2018: \$110,00 Funding gap 2018: \$616,171 |
| Contributing members: | UNICEF, UNHCR, Save the Children, IFRC, Plan International, IRC, WVI, War Child, IOM, ILO, ISS, The Watchlist, Child Frontiers, Child Safe Horizons, UKZN, Columbia University, Kings College London, Bioforce Institute | |
| Objectives | Activities | |
| Objective 1: Increased learning and development opportunities for CPIE actors at global, regional and national levels | 1.1: Develop Child Protection in Emergencies (CPIE) Face to Face (F2F) training, with feedback loop to review and revise. | |
| | 1.1.1: Rebrand CPIE F2F package. | |
| | 1.1.2: Revise the CPIE F2F package with inputs from across the Alliance. | |
| | 1.1.3: Develop a roll out plan. | |
| | 1.1.4: Deliver new CPIE F2F Training at regional and country level. | |
| | 1.2: Delivery of Coordination learning opportunities including in refugee settings. | |
| | 1.2.1: Update coordination training package. | |
| | 1.2.2: Deliver Regional Level Coordination Training, including in refugee settings. | |
| | 1.2.3: Online coordination training developed. | |
| | 1.3: Promote and Support existing CPIE Certificate and tertiary level courses with academic institutions including increasing partnerships and the development of a mentoring system for junior professionals. | |
| | 1.4: Revise and re-develop the Child Protection in Emergencies (CPIE) Competency Based Framework | |
| | 1.5: Assist country level coordination groups in developing capacity needs assessments and strategies based on evidence | |
| | 1.6: Support the development of online and face-face training for the Field Guide to Strengthening CBCP in Humanitarian Action | |
| Objective 2: High quality learning material and support are made available and accessible for CPIE actors at all levels and across stages of emergencies | 2.1: Revisit and revise current global level training materials including the CPWG CPIE Face to Face package | |
| | 2.2: Develop a pre-induction course for CPIE actors, based on the agreed interagency materials | |
| | 2.3: Expand and strengthen the use of online platforms and forums to deliver learning in partnership with other TFs and WGs | |
| | 2.4: Conduct a lesson learnt evaluation on tertiary initiatives | |
| | 2.5 Operationalize on the recommendations of the CPIE Mapping and Market Analysis | |
| Objective 3: CPIE professional, interagency developments and opportunities correspond with up to date capacity gaps and needs | 3.1 Develop an Alliance Learning and Development Strategy including M & E tools with other Alliance task forces and working groups | |
| | 3.2 Develop learning and development monitoring and evaluation tools to support an evidence-based approach to our on-going capacity development with the AME WG | |
| | 3.3 Support the development of mentoring & coaching guidance as well as training materials, in collaboration with the CMTF, in line with their work plan | |
| | 3.4 Strengthen and expand the existing global CPIE IA resource pool of trainers and community of practice through delivery of ToTs and online engagement | |
| | 3.5 Develop an online open source platform with a community of practice to host and facilitate access to learning material and support | |
| | 3.6 Develop, give technical inputs, collate, to ensure consistency and quality of learning and development materials across the Alliance task forces and working groups | |

| Working Group 4: Assessment, Evidence and Measurement Working Group (AME WG) | | |
|--|---|---|
| Outcome: Agency specific and inter-agency evidence is generated synthesized and used in order to promote effective interventions | | |
| Lead agency(ies): | Save the Children and CPC Learning Network | Total Budget 2018-2020: \$575,000 Budget 2018: \$210,000 Total received 2018: \$150,000 Funding gap 2018: \$60,000 |
| Contributing members: | Terre de hommes, UNICEF, World Vision International, Plan International, Womens Refugee Commission, International Rescue Committee, UNHCR, War Child Holland, IOM and Child Protection Area of Responsibility | |
| Objectives | Activities | |
| Objective 1: Methods and tools for assessment and monitoring are revised and developed as necessary | 1.1: Develop, review and support tools for child protection assessment; | |
| | 1.1.1: Update CPRA toolkit based on outcomes of review | |
| | 1.1.2: Translate updated CPRA toolkit to at least 1 language other than English | |
| | 1.1.3: Disseminate CP in multi-sector Assessment Guidelines | |
| | 1.1.4: Support implementation of CP in multi-sector Assessment Guidelines | |
| | 1.1.5: Provide on-going support and advice on the application and use of the tools in humanitarian contexts; | |
| | 1.2: Develop standard methodologies and approaches for CP situation and response monitoring; | |
| | 1.2.1: Complete pilot testing of the Situation & Response Monitoring Toolkit in 2 locations | |
| | 1.2.2: Finalize and publish Situation & Response Monitoring Toolkit | |
| | 1.2.3: Translate finalized Situation & Response Monitoring Toolkit to languages other than English | |
| | 1.3: Build capacity of CP actors on the use of assessment and monitoring tools; | |
| | 1.3.1: Conduct 3x regional trainings on Situation & Response Monitoring, with follow-on support for national trainings | |
| | 1.3.2: Conduct 3x regional trainings on CPiE assessment, with follow on support for national training | |
| | 1.3.3: Further develop online training options for assessment and monitoring; | |
| Objective 2: CPiE sector benefits from a stronger evidence base for programming | 2.1: Support initiatives aimed at addressing defined evidence gaps in CPiE; | |
| | 2.1.1: Disseminate research prioritization findings to academic institutes, donors and practitioners in order to influence research priorities; | |
| | 2.1.2: Provide technical support to Cash & CP Task Force to evaluate the effectiveness of CTPs on child wellbeing | |
| | 2.1.3: Provide technical support to the CBCPM Task Force to evaluate the CB MHPSS approach and Field Guide | |
| | 2.1.4: Provide technical support to the Case Management Task Force to evaluate the effectiveness of case management programming | |
| | 2.1.5: Provide technical support to the Family Strengthening Task force to evaluate the effectiveness of family strengthening interventions | |
| | 2.1.6: Provide technical support to the Child Labour (CL_ Task force to evaluate the effectiveness of CL interventions to reduce CL | |
| | 2.1.7: Undertake a best practice review for engaging and capacity building para-social workers in humanitarian contexts in coordination with the L&DWG | |
| | 2.1.8: Evaluate the effectiveness of PSS interventions to improve child wellbeing in coordination with the MHPSS Reference Group | |
| | 2.2: Synthesize and disseminate evidence on CPiE; | |
| | 2.2.1: Develop a position paper on what constitutes evidence for the sector | |
| | 2.2.2: Establish a process to synthesize evidence generated through assessment, monitoring and research initiatives; | |

| | |
|---|--|
| | 2.2.3: Communicate existing evidence through Alliance website, infographics, social media, podcasts etc.; |
| | 2.2.4: Facilitate discussions and critiques of evidence, and sharing of information and program evaluations through Alliance website; |
| | 2.3: Review and synthesize existing evidence to define common risks and vulnerabilities to inform preventative strategies; |
| | 2.3.1: Based upon synthesis of evidence on risks and vulnerabilities related to select CP issues (i.e. CP standards), develop a methodology for country level risk factor analysis |
| | 2.3.2: Pilot test the risk factor analysis methodology in 3 humanitarian contexts. |
| | 2.3.3: Support pilot contexts to develop preventative strategies based on the risk factor analysis |
| | 2.4: Finalize and use of CPiE set of indicators |
| | 2.4.1: Develop CPiE standard indicator set and accompanied guidance is developed (linked with activity 1.2) |
| Objective 3: The revision of the CPMS is grounded in robust evidence | 3.1: Define and measure child wellbeing within and across sectors |
| | 3.1.1: Define wellbeing and incorporate it into the revised CPMS |
| | 3.1.2: Develop a measurement framework for Wellbeing (linked to activities 2.2.1 and 3.3) |
| | 3.2: Synthesize and reflect evidence into the revised CPMS |
| | 3.2.1: Undertake synthesis of evidence on risks and vulnerabilities and effective responses against each CPMS |
| | 3.2.2: Develop / refine prevention and response strategies for each CPMS in accordance with evidence; |
| Objective 4: Innovative practices are created and available to promote evidence generation. | 4.1: Produce recommendations for CPiE Practitioners on use of technology for data collection in humanitarian context |
| | 4.1.1: Conduct a review of data gathering and analysis technology tools for evidence generation in humanitarian settings, including recommendations |
| | 4.1.2: Implement a select number of the recommendations of the review |
| | 4.2: Develop and test a predictive analytic model for projecting separation; |
| | 4.2.1: Define causal factors for separation in different humanitarian contexts (link to activity 2.3) |
| | 4.2.2: Develop a prototype projection tool |
| | 4.2.3: Pilot test the prototype projection tool in 1 context |
| | 4.2.4: Evaluate cost and benefit of further development |

Task Forces

| Task Force 1: Case Management Task Force | | |
|---|---|---|
| Outcome: Improved response on case management as part of child protection systems | | |
| Lead Agency(ies): | International Rescue Committee and UNICEF | Total Budget 2018-2020: \$1.585,000 Budget 2018: \$330,000 Total received: \$15,000 Funding gap: \$315,000 |
| Contributing members: | CP AoR, International Rescue Committee, Plan International, Save the Children, Terre des hommes, UNHCR, UNICEF, War Child-Holland, World Vision International | |
| Objectives | Activities | |
| Objective 1: Improved response on case management as part of child protection systems building | 1.1: Develop a tool to evaluate the CM system already in place in line with the CM guidelines | |
| | 1.2: Provide technical assistance to inter-agency requests for support on CM programming at country level, including where possible field visits | |
| | 1.3: Develop an app for tablets/android phones to support case management and interaction with children | |
| | 1.4: Collect lessons learned, experiences and approached to using the CM guidelines in different context - including refugee and mixed population contexts - and child participation approaches to CM | |
| Objective 2: International and field level emergency responders have enhanced and standardized knowledge and skills to implement case management interventions | 2.1: Conduct global, regional and country level trainings and coaching on CM guidelines and tools | |
| | 2.2: Establish a mentoring/coaching support on CM for participants (CB TF is developing a manual on coaching - liaise to adapt this | |
| | 2.3: Develop standard SOPs for case management (to be used as guidance for contextualized versions) | |
| | 2.4: Develop a measurement framework for case worker and manager/supervisor competencies | |
| | 2.5: Conduct an evaluation of the CM guidelines and tools developed through consultation with field users. | |
| Objective 3: Support the roll out of the CP IMS+ module of Primero *(NOTE: the CP IMS is reflected here but is under the responsibility of the IA CP IMS Steering Committee and not the CM Taskforce.) ¹ | 3.1: Identify a CPIMS+ coordinator to support roll out of CPIMS+ to current and new users | |
| | 3.2: Develop a training manual for the new CPIMS+ | |
| | 3.3: Conduct trainings at country level for current users of the IA-CPIMS to transition to CP IMS+ | |
| | 3.4: Support the migration of data from the current IA-CPIMS to the new CP IMS+ | |
| | 3.5: Identify an IT helpdesk support to provide IT support to current and new users of the CP IMS+. Strong and frequent communication to the field (through steering committees, TAs and CP IMS+ Coordinator) on availability and function of the helpdesk to ensure it is widely used. | |
| | 3.6: Conduct 2 regional trainings on the CP IMS+ to establish a pool of professionals able to support countries and agencies wishing to use the new CP IMS+ | |
| | 3.7: Design and launch CPIMS+ website to share relevant documents, training dates and supporting resources | |
| | 3.8: Collect lessons learnt from CPIMS+ roll out to feed into version 2 of Primero, including lessons from use in refugee settings | |

¹ A workshop about the CPIMS+ occurred in February 2018 with discussions about the linkages with the Case Management Task Force. Some of the activities above might be subjected to change

| Task Force 2: Cash Transfer and Child Protection Task Force | | |
|--|--|---|
| Outcome: Policy and practice with respect to cash transfers and child protection in emergencies is improved through a strengthened and documented evidence base and increased investments in measurement, learning and collaboration. | | |
| Lead agency(ies) | World Vision International, International Rescue Committee, CPC Learning Network | Total Budget 2018-2020: \$1,108,000 Budget 2018: \$54,000 Total received: \$22,500 Funding gap: \$31,500 |
| Contributing members | Save the Children, Plan International, UNHCR, Human Rights Center (UC Berkeley), IOM, UNICEF, CP AoR, Cash Learning Partnership | |
| Objectives | Activities | |
| Objective 1: Current evidence-base on cash transfer programs and child protection in emergencies is thoroughly documented and analyzed to determine and publicize evidence needs. | 1.1: Produce a 'state of the art' or evidence map (what we know and what we don't know about cash and child protection in emergencies), publically accessible via a website. | |
| | 1.2: Produce a series of standardized case studies on cash and child protection to document and disseminate learning about program implementation successes and challenges accessible via a website. | |
| | 1.3: Consult with 'evidence users' on their needs, priorities and current thinking | |
| | 1.3.1: Consultations with cash and CP donors on their priorities and evidence needs | |
| | 1.3.2: Consultations with cash and CP implementers | |
| | 1.4: Prioritize the evidence gaps and develop a corresponding research agenda for CTP and CPIE | |
| | 1.5: Publish and promote the research agenda for cash and child protection in emergencies through multiple channels | |
| | 1.5.1: Engage with key donors and funding agencies to raise research funds (and link it with programme funding) | |
| | 1.5.2: Engage implementing agencies to support research in programmes | |
| Objective 2: Evidence-base on pathways of impact and effectiveness of cash transfer programs on child protection outcomes in emergencies is strengthened in accordance with the Task Team research agenda | 2.1: Develop concepts and study designs to fill the evidence gaps. | |
| | 2.2: Develop CP M&E components to be incorporated into newly developing Cash Transfer M&E frameworks and systems in order to generate comparable data on cash & child protection in diverse settings. | |
| | 2.3: Use the research agenda to develop targeted proposals that raise funds for new research | |
| | 2.4: Encourage and facilitate collaboration to support and carry out research. | |
| Objective 3: Evidence-based, practical tools and guidance to mitigate risks and increase effectiveness of CTP and child protection are developed and disseminated | 3.1: Revise CPMS standards to reflect current cash and child protection knowledge. | |
| | 3.2: Use the current 'state of the art'/evidence map to produce and publicize practitioner tools and/or guidance describing cash interventions that have been proven to have at least one positive child protection outcome. | |
| | 3.3: Apply newly generated research findings from the taskforce supported research to develop and produce further tools and/or guidance to help practitioners adapt and monitor their programs and policies to maximize child protection outcomes across multiple domains. | |
| | 3.4: Promote the availability of tools, guidance and direct support from the taskforce for quality programming and continued learning through websites and webinars | |
| Objective 4: Child protection actors are equipped with available evidence/tools and connected with fellow practitioners, as well as with cash actors, donors and other policy makers, to effectively coordinate and advocate for improved policy and practice. | 4.1: Pursue opportunities (conferences, workshops, webinars, digital platforms, advocacy campaigns, etc) to disseminate and promote uptake of research findings and guidance/tools in programming and policy design | |
| | 4.2: Ensure proactive and consistent communication and information sharing with relevant Cash & Protection coordination structures and networks | |

Task Force 3: Community-Based Child Protection in Emergencies Task Force

Outcome: CPIE practitioners are connected to a robust Community-Based network and have the necessary tools and evidence to improve the quality of CBCP activities in humanitarian contexts.

| | | |
|-------------------|--|---|
| Lead Agency(ies): | World Vision International, Plan International, UNICEF | Total Budget 2018-2020: \$259,000 Budget 2018: \$66,000 Total received 2018: \$52,000 Funding gap 2018: \$14,000 |
|-------------------|--|---|

Contributing members: BIFERD (DRC), Care (Mozambique), Child Frontiers, Child Fund Alliance, Child Safe Horizons, Community Action Network (Pakistan), Community Child Protection Exchange, CP AoR, CPC Learning Network, Ghiras Foundation, Hurras Network, ICCRD, International Rescue Committee, Islamic Relief Worldwide, Rise Learning Network, Save the Children, Terre des hommes, UNHCR, UNICEF, University of Bedfordshire, War Child Holland

| Outcomes | Activities |
|----------|------------|
|----------|------------|

| | |
|---|---|
| Objective 1: Technical tools and resources on CBCP are developed/ revised based on evidence, including feedback from CPIE practitioners at all levels | 1.1: Develop a Field Guide for Strengthening Community Based Child Protection in Humanitarian Action |
| | 1.1.1: Collect and synthesize existing tools, evaluation reports, donor reports, research, desk reviews, and other key resources on CBCP. |
| | 1.1.2: Develop a CBCP Terminology and Resource Database |
| | 1.1.3: Develop a Field Guide to Strengthening CBCP |
| | 1.1.4: Contextualize the Field Guide to Strengthening CBCP for Refugee Contexts |
| | 1.2: Document and Share Resources on Mobile Programming |
| | 1.2.1: Document current practices across multiple contexts and develop replicable approach |
| | 1.2.2: Conduct an evaluation on existing documented practices in 3 countries |
| | 1.2.3: Develop guidance document on Mobile Programming |
| | 1.3: Lead the revision of Standard 16 in collaboration with the CPMS WG |
| | 1.3.1: Lead a Drafting Group for the revision process |
| | 1.3.2: Prepare note on revision structure, content, and mainstreaming into other Standards for launch meeting |
| | 1.3.3: Develop pre-draft of Standard 16 |
| | 1.3.4: Draft 1 consultations and revision |
| | 1.3.5: Submit Draft 2 to CPMS WG for review - country and online consultations to be held. |
| | 1.3.6: Submit Draft 3 to CPMS WG and Advisory Group |
| | 1.3.7: Final draft and editing/translation to the CPMS WG |
| | 1.3.8: Support the development of the Standard 16 video |
| | 1.4: Conduct pilot activities for Guidance produced |
| 1.4.1: Develop feedback mechanism for the Field Guide and Training Package | |
| Objective 2: Improved availability and accessibility of relevant knowledge on CBCP in humanitarian action. | 2.1: Develop an online e-course and face-face training package for the Field Guide to Strengthening CBCP in Humanitarian Action |
| | 2.1.1: Develop training package and e-learning course |
| | 2.1.3: Provide technical support to pilot country work plans to strengthening CBCP |
| | 2.1.4: Disseminate Guidance and Training package through various regional and global workshops/events. |
| | 2.2: Facilitate knowledge sharing on CBCP approaches in collaboration with Inter-Agency WG/TF and other sectors. |
| | 2.2.1: Conduct webinars with other sectors, southern actors, member agencies, academics, etc. |
| | 2.2.2: Curate and disseminate case studies of CBCP actions in various contexts/lenses |

| | |
|---|--|
| | 2.2.3: Conduct regular meetings with TF members |
| | 2.2.4: Disseminate key resources, research, and related materials to CBCP TF members |
| | 2.2.5: Develop KM/Communication strategy |
| Objective 3: Improved linkages with other CB initiatives strengthened | 3.1: Create space for meaningful dialogue and collaboration with key initiatives (ex: IALI, CCP Exchange, CPC Network, UNHCR Exchange, etc.) |
| | 3.1.1: Conduct regular coordination calls |
| | 3.1.2: Promote each other's resources through dissemination on list serves, webinars, etc. |
| | 3.1.3: Establish stronger linkages with other sectors such as Nutrition, Health, etc. |

| Task Force 4: Child Labour Task Force | | |
|--|--|--|
| Outcome: Humanitarian responders and development actors have the knowledge, skills and tools to implement quality and coordinated child labour in emergencies preparedness, prevention and response actions. | | |
| Leading agency(ies): | Plan International, International Labour Office (ILO) | Total Budget 2018-2020: \$148,500 Budget 2018: \$37,500 Total received 2018: \$37,500 Funding gap 2018: \$0 |
| Contributing members | Advocacy for Child Relief (ACR) (Uganda); CP Area of Responsibility; CPC Learning Network; Ghiras Foundation; IOM; International Rescue Committee; FAO; Save the Children International; Terre des Hommes; UNHCR; UNICEF; World Vision International | |
| Objectives | Activities | |
| Objective 1: Technical tools, standards and guidance: Inter-agency technical guidance, standards and tools to prevent and respond to (the worst forms of) child labour in emergencies are available and reflect the latest evidence and lessons learned. | 1.1: Child Labour Toolkit: Finalize Toolkit based on new evidence and feedback and knowledge gathered during field-testing phase. | |
| | 1.1.1: Child Labour Toolkit: Collect and compile feedback on Child Labour in Emergencies toolkit | |
| | 1.1.2: Child Labour Toolkit: Update Toolkit based on feedback and knowledge gathered during field-testing phase. | |
| | 1.1.3: Child Labour Toolkit: Translate final CL Toolkit in multiple languages (French, Arabic, Spanish) | |
| | 1.1.4: Child Labour Toolkit: Dissemination through webinars and email/webpages to local, national, regional and global platforms. | |
| | 1.1.5: Child Labour Toolkit: A regional version of the CL Toolkit for MENA is developed based on extensive piloting in Middle East Region | |
| | 1.2: Publish a report of lessons learned in CLiE based on learning gathered during the 2017 toolkit field-testing phase | |
| | 1.3: Document good practices and lessons learned in child labour in emergencies programming. | |
| | 1.4: Make new evidence (as well as good practices, lessons learned) widely available through global platforms, webinars, global events, etc. | |
| | 1.5: Factsheet: Develop a Child Labour in Emergencies 2-page Factsheet for the Alliance incl. global definition, figures, resources and work of the CLTF. | |
| | 1.6: CPMS Revision: Revise the CPMS Child Labour Standard | |
| | 1.6.1: CPMS Revision: Create and orientate Revision Group | |
| | 1.6.2: CPMS Revision: Conduct first round of revisions with practitioners at different levels | |
| | 1.6.3: CPMS Revision: Provide inputs on child labour and trafficking to other revision groups | |
| 1.6.4: CPMS Revision: Based on feedback finalize CPMS Child Labour Standard | | |
| Objective 2: Capacity building: Humanitarian responders have enhanced knowledge and competencies to prevent and respond to (the worst forms of) child labour in emergencies | 2.1: F2F training module: Update the Child Labour module as part of the global Child Protection in Emergencies Face to Face (F2F) training, in collaboration with the LDWG under the Alliance. | |
| | 2.2: Online learning: Develop online learning resources on Child Labour in Emergencies (e.g. webinars, online learning modules) made available through global platforms, in collaboration with the LDWG under the Alliance. | |
| | 2.3: Case management module: Develop a child labour case management training module as part of the global CM Package in collaboration with the Case Management Task Force | |
| | 2.4: Technical Support: Provide technical support on CL to practitioners | |
| | 2.4.1: Provide remote technical support on Child Labour in Emergencies (CLiE) to practitioners | |
| Objective 3: Coordination, policy and advocacy: Child labour in humanitarian settings is integrated/reflected in the agenda of relevant global, | 3.1: Inter-sector CLiE paper: Develop a paper on CLiE with Education and CALP/FSL sectors on how to jointly tackle Child Labour in Emergencies | |
| | 3.2: TF Coordination: Ensure coordination on CL in emergencies between humanitarian actors and between global initiatives | |
| | 3.3: Donor mapping: conduct a donor mapping for Child Labour in Emergencies funding and influencing opportunities | |

| | |
|--|--|
| regional and local platforms, including but not limited to the 8.7 Alliance and other Task Forces under the Alliance for Child Protection in Humanitarian Action | 3.4: Research: Based on the outcome of the AME WG research prioritization exercise, initiate one research conducted under the global CLTF, led by two or more members of the CLTF, in collaboration with the AME working group |
| | 3.4.1: Set Child Labour in Emergencies research and advocacy/influencing priorities, in collaboration with Alliance 8.7 |
| | 3.4.2: Research: Based on the outcome of the AME WG research prioritization exercise, initiate one research conducted under the global CLTF, led by two or more members of the CLTF, in collaboration with the AME working group |
| | 3.5: Influence global initiatives, policy and advocacy work to include children in humanitarian context perspectives |

| Task force 5: Family Strengthening Task Force | | |
|--|--|--|
| Outcome: Children in humanitarian settings have improved psychosocial wellbeing and are better protected from abuse, neglect, violence and exploitation through a positive strengthened family environment. | | |
| Lead agency(ies): | War Child Holland, International Rescue Committee, Save the Children | Total Budget 2018-2020: \$797,000 Budget 2018: \$797,000 Total received 2018: \$0 Funding gap 2018: \$797,000 |
| Contributing members: | Action Contre la Faim; CP AoR; Columbia University; International Committee of the Red Cross; MHPSS Reference Group; Plan International; Save the Children; Terre des Hommes; TPO Uganda; UNHCR; War Child (Holland); WHO; World Vision | |
| Objectives | Activities | |
| Objective 1: Evidence-base for family strengthening programs in humanitarian settings is improved. | 1.1: Generate evidence on the link between programming with caregivers and outcomes for children's psychosocial well-being (such as involvement of fathers in caregiver interventions, support to parental psychosocial wellbeing, joint child/caregiver programming, programs addressing Intimate Partner Violence) | |
| | 1.2: Test new delivery platforms to disseminate parenting skills content | |
| Objective 2: CP practitioners have access to programmatic guidance and learning platforms that incorporate evidence generated on family strengthening. | 2.1: Develop a guidance note/case study on: - Opportunities to strengthen focus on parental PSS wellbeing within existing CP activities - key learning generated under objective 2. | |
| | 2.2: Incorporate PSS & family strengthening learning into relevant global level interagency training materials (e.g. case management, CPiE, PSS, CFS, CPMS) | |
| | 2.3: Pilot and revise e-learning module on Caregiver Psychosocial Wellbeing | |
| | 2.4: Develop new e-learning modules as related to evidence generated under Objective 2. | |
| Objective 3: Minimum standards related to Family Strengthening are developed/ revised. | 3.1: Lead revision of CPMS standard 10: Psychosocial Distress and mental disorders | |
| | 3.2: Lead development of new standard on Family Strengthening | |
| | 3.3: Contribute to standard 8 - Physical violence and harmful practices | |
| Objective 4: Improved inter-agency collaboration around interventions related to Family Strengthening in humanitarian settings | 4.1: Making relevant resources available and accessible to the TF members, CPiE & MHPSS practitioners, including regular updating of the mapping of parenting interventions with caregivers (living document) | |
| | 4.2: Ensure regular information and knowledge sharing amongst members of the Task Force | |
| | 4.3: Strengthen links with IASC MHPSS Reference Group on interventions related to parents/ caregivers and families | |
| | 4.4: Coordination with relevant other WGs and TFs to prevent duplication of work and increase collaboration with Alliance WG and TFs | |

Task Force 6: Unaccompanied and Separated Children Inter-Agency Work Group

Outcome: Separation is prevented and UASC receive evidence-based and high-quality intervention (identification, documentation

| Leading agency (ies) | IOM (rotating) | Total Budget 2018-2020: \$685,000 Budget 2018: \$ 315,000 Total received 2018: \$35,000 Funding gap 2018: \$280,000 |
|--|---|--|
| Contributing members | ICRC, World Vision International, International Rescue Committee, UNHCR, Save the Children, Terre des hommes, UNICEF and IOM | |
| Objectives | Activities | |
| Objective 1: Technical standards and tools for UASC programming reflect latest evidence and feedback from all relevant actors, including other sectors and local partners | 1.1: Revision of standard 13 based on latest evidence and lessons learned | |
| | 1.1.1: Leading the revision group | |
| | 1.1.2: Collect and agree on feedback from different experts | |
| | 1.1.3: Draft the different revisions | |
| | 1.1.4: Finalize the different revisions and acquire necessary endorsement | |
| | 1.2: Revision of the inter-agency identification form on UASC | |
| | 1.2.1: Collect feedback from the field on the practical use of the inter-agency UASC forms | |
| | 1.2.2: Share all collected feedback with Case Management WG to coordinate with other reviewing ongoing reviewing processes | |
| | 1.2.3: On the basis of final feedback from the CM WG, propose and agree on a final harmonized version | |
| Objective 2: Existing technical tools and knowledge on UASC in humanitarian contexts are made more readily accessible to actors at all levels and contexts, in particular local actors | 1.2.4: Disseminate reviewed versions of the IA UASC forms | |
| | 2.1: Translation of Handbook & Toolkit from English into 3 languages | |
| | 2.1.1: Prepare project proposal to obtain funding for translation & dissemination of UASC handbook & toolkit | |
| | 2.1.2: Translate both handbook and toolkit into 3 additional languages (Arabic, French and Spanish) | |
| | 2.2: Printing of Handbook & Toolkit in 4 languages | |
| | 2.2.1: Seek funding (project proposal) for printing of both tools in each translated language and print additional copies of English version where requested | |
| | 2.2.2: Printing of both tools in 3 additional languages and in English where requested | |
| | 2.3: Dissemination of the handbook and the toolkit, in 4 languages | |
| Objective 3: Collaboration with other groups and entities internal and external to The Alliance is efficient and coordination, participation and contributions of all UASC WG members - and timely response to all questions and issues addressed to the UASC WG- is ensured | 2.4: Capacity building on UASC & Handbook and Toolkit in 4 languages | |
| | 3.1: Coordination of UASC WG members and with the other WG and TF | |
| | 3.1.1: Organize bi-monthly calls amongst members & ad hoc calls - also with other WG/TF as necessary. Meetings | |
| | 3.2: Timely response to all tasks, and request addressed to the UASC WG | |
| | 3.2.1: Share all received questions/issues with UASC WG members for their feedback and provide comprehensive responses based on evidence as possible and in a timely manner | |

ⁱ The Minimum Standards for Child Protection in Humanitarian Action are under revision during the 2018–2020 period.

ⁱⁱ As per the Alliance governance document, the NGO co-lead rotates every three years.

ⁱⁱⁱ Alliance website, 'How We Work', <https://alliancecpha.org/stepping-up-child-protection-in-humanitarian-action/how-we-work-2/>.