



CF Item = Barcode Top - Note at Bottom =  
CF\_Item\_One\_BC5-Top-Sign

Page 1  
Dat 8/1/2002  
Time 4:33:30 PM  
Login wbq



CF/RAI/NYHQ/SP/SSC/2002-01050

Full Item Register Number [auto] **CF/RAI/NYHQ/SP/SSC/2002-01050**

Ext Ref: Doc Series/Year/Number **SP/SSC/WSC-000.12**

Record Item Title

**A Global Agenda for Children Beyond Year 2000 - Reference Book: Preparatory & Reference Documentation on the World Summit for Children (1990: July); Special Session for Children**

Date Created / on Correspondence  
7/1/1990

Date Registered  
12/28/2001

Date Closed

Primary Contact **Rijuta Tooker (Temp Assist)**  
Owner Location **Special Session & Global Movement For Chil =**  
Home Location **Special Session & Global Movement For Chil =**  
Current Location **Special Session & Global Movement For Chil =**

Fd1: Type: IN, OUT, INTERNAL  
Fd2: Sender Ref or Cross Ref  
Field

File Container Record ID  
File Container Record (Title)

**CF/RAF/USAA/DB01/2001-06648**  
**Background Documents (WSC)**

N1: Number of pages  
0

N2: Doc Year  
0

N3: Document Number  
0

Full GCG Code Plan Number  
Record GCG File Plan

Da1: Date Published

Da2: Date Received

Date 3

Priority

Record Type **A01ed Item Corr - CF/RAI/NYHQ/SP/SSC**

Electronic Details

No Document

DOS File Name

Alt Bar code = RAMP-TRIM Record Number

**CF/RAI/NYHQ/SP/SSC/2002-01050**

Notes

[Archives: CF/NYH/SP/SUM; Folder: S0355.] Contents: Section 1: Members of the Planning Committee - Schedule of (remaining) meetings and activities; Section 2: Schedule and Programme of the World Summit for Children; Section 3: Draft Declaration of the World Summit for Children - Draft Plan of Action; Section 4: Report of Meetings: - 1st, 2nd, 3rd Meetings of the Planning Committee - Meetings of the Working Group on Format - ~~Meetings of the Working Group on the Declaration - Statement of Agreement of the six Initiating Governments -~~

Print Name of Person Submit Images

Signature of Person Submit

Number of images without cover

*EDWIN RAMIREZ*

*48*

BLANK

## **A Global Agenda for Children Beyond Year 2000**

The EXD on A Global Agenda for Children Beyond Year 2000 was issued by the Executive Director too late for consideration by the first EAP/RMT of 1998, so there has been no opportunity for a full review involving participation from all country offices, such as those carried out in other regions. However, the Regional Director did brief the February 1998 RMT on the work in progress on the Global Agenda by the Tarrytown group, and an early draft of the report was circulated. In addition to the Regional Director, several other regional staff have participated either in the deliberations of the Tarrytown group itself or in working teams on specific topics, the output of which will be considered in the final formulation of the agenda. Discussion of the Global Agenda has already been identified as a major item for the next RMT in June, 1998.

Other opportunities to discuss the proposed agenda and to receive feedback from the field have occurred during the Regional Director's recent participation in programme preview meetings in the Philippines, Thailand and DPR Korea. The response from the region has been generally favourable, and UNICEF Representatives and other partners find the emerging agenda broadly responsive to the situation in the region. In some cases, as in the new Philippines country programme's activities to address the issue of violence against women, the agenda has clearly inspired a new, forward-looking perspective on UNICEF's work.

The highlights of the Global Agenda were presented to and discussed with a cross-section of UNICEF staff attending the regional Training of Trainers Workshop on the rights-based approach to programming in April 1998. Participants found the Agenda well suited to the emerging realities of countries in the region. The following observations are derived primarily from discussion within the region focusing on the priorities and strategies for maximum achievement of the World Summit goals—the unfinished agenda, which the Executive Director has characterized as the most pressing business now at hand—while at the same time responding to newly emerging issues and seeking to position UNICEF so as to anticipate problems likely to arise over the longer term. The February 1998 RMT meeting included formal presentations and extensive discussion on proposed strategies for the remaining years of the decade that had been developed over a period of many months. Thus, what follows primarily relates to the part of the Agenda that involves the year 2000 goals, completing the tasks to which we committed ourselves at the World Summit for Children. In many parts of this discussion the linkages and implications for the longer term are obvious.

### *The Regional Context*

In many ways the countries of East Asia and the Pacific typify the changes taking place globally, and patterns emerging or already clearly apparent in this region are likely to characterize much of the developing world in the relatively near future. In this sense, a careful analysis of trends and experiences in this region may be particularly useful in formulating UNICEF's global priorities and strategies.

Several countries in the region have, until very recently, led the world in rapid and sustained economic growth, accompanied by rising living standards and declining rates of poverty. Indicators of health and education, of access to information and modern technology and, increasingly, of public influence and participation in the processes of governance and policy formulation, have shown marked improvement in recent decades. Likewise, however, many of the less positive symptoms of rapid globalization, and largely unplanned social, economic and political change have come to prominence in a more striking fashion than in most other regions. Growing disparities between the haves and have-nots, the mainstream majority and ethnically or geographically isolated minorities, for example, have been noted in many countries. Child abuse, neglect and exploitation are on the rise everywhere, along with crime, environmental destruction and a breakdown in traditional mechanisms of social support and control.

In several large and populous countries the ongoing transformation from centrally planned and regulated economic systems to systems exposed to the vagaries and dictates of market forces has brought profound change to many millions of people, in all aspects of life. Even more strikingly, the sudden collapse of local currencies and the onset of economic crisis in many of the countries previously in the forefront of general development and social progress, has set in motion a series of closely interrelated events whose ultimate outcome is still far from clear. Already apparent, in less than a year, are rising levels of malnutrition, declining school enrolments, an increasing incidence of child labour and growing strains on the ability of families, communities and institutions to give adequate attention to the proper care and protection of children. Sincere efforts have been made in several countries to minimize the impact of budget cuts on the most critical social sectors. The extent to which affected governments can continue to support basic services at levels that made the achievements of the Asian 'economic miracle' possible, however, is still a matter of serious concern. The recent example of Indonesia shows how even the most apparently fixed and solid structures are vulnerable to abrupt and unpredictable disintegration. In this context, the emphasis of the Global Agenda on dealing with the structural causes of the violations of children's rights, good governance, the need to develop a dynamic partnership among state, civil society institutions and the private sector in the best interest of the child are seen as highly relevant for UNICEF's mission in the EAP region in the next decade.

### *Regional Progress in Goals and Child Rights Achievement*

Progress toward achieving the mid-decade goals was very substantial in most countries of the region. On a region-wide basis the best performance at mid-decade was in primary school enrolment and immunization (96 per cent and 91 per cent, respectively, in 1995). The least satisfactory performance was in sanitation coverage, in which the regional average at mid-decade was only 34 per cent. Interestingly, these same two goals showed the most (for sanitation) and least (primary enrolment) variability among countries.

In child health, high levels of immunization coverage and successful promotion of ORT for diarrhoea, coupled with the development of sound service delivery infrastructures, have contributed to good progress in reducing infant and under-five mortality. Though maternal mortality remains unacceptably high in many countries of the region, significant reductions have been achieved in Indonesia, Philippines and Malaysia. Yet even as sickness and death from these traditionally important causes have been reduced, new health problems have emerged in the form of HIV/AIDS, and resurgence of malaria. In addition, access to existing health systems, particularly for the most vulnerable groups, is increasingly threatened by budgetary constraints brought about by the current economic crisis and by the more general trends toward decentralized management and funding, privatization and cost recovery schemes. Sustaining EPI coverage and basic service delivery at levels achieved at mid-decade will remain a challenge.

Reducing malnutrition, providing adequate sanitation to all and promoting good hygiene practices have been elusive goals in the region. In all countries except China, Malaysia and Thailand moderate and severe malnutrition still affects more than 30 per cent of the young child population, and progress over the last decade has been slow. On the other hand, reduction of micronutrient deficiencies through such interventions as salt iodization and vitamin A supplementation has been generally successful.

In the light of the unfinished agenda in the areas of health, nutrition and WES which have commanded major UNICEF priority in the past two decades, UNICEF's counterparts in government are likely to expect a continuing activist role for UNICEF in these areas in the coming decade. In elaborating the "Adequate living standards" part of the seven-point priority themes for UNICEF advocacy and action, the Global Agenda should explicitly state UNICEF's continuing commitment to this unfinished business.

Although primary school access and enrolment levels are relatively high in almost all countries, quality and relevance have become the predominant issues throughout the region.

However, the impact of the current economic situation on both quantitative and qualitative issues has yet to be assessed, and it could be substantial. As in other sectors, there is growing concern for the disparities among groups and regions within and among countries, that will require increasing attention by UNICEF and its partners. The identification in the Global Agenda of the need to ensure an enabling learning environment for children and adolescents, responds well to the EAP region policy priorities.

As noted above, neglect, abuse and exploitation of children can be explained to a considerable extent as the negative consequences of rapid growth and development in the region over the past two or three decades. These same factors are also among the major causes underlying poor health, undernutrition and inadequate education. Recognition of these common causal elements suggests that strategies for addressing child protection issues and those for improving children's health and education should be closely interlinked to achieve maximum synergy and mutual reinforcement. This is one of the major conclusions that has emerged from a review of the situation of children and women from a regional perspective. Operationally, the following major approaches have been proposed, concentrating primarily on prevention rather than remedial action:

- Promote greater involvement of families and communities in identifying risks to children's rights and well-being, and strengthen their capacity to act appropriately. This includes expansion of ECCD programmes and advocacy for national policies and programmes for child and family development, and development of mechanisms to help respond with care and compassion to those suffering from HIV/AIDS.
- Strengthen linkages between communities and governmental or non-governmental institutions and facilities to help ensure that available services and other resources are utilized optimally. This is particularly critical in areas such as referral and safe delivery in cases of obstetric complications, in the proper handling of child abuse situations, and in ensuring protection of the rights of children affected by AIDS..
- Utilize existing institutions, such as schools and clinics, as focal points for community mobilization and participation, as vehicles for the delivery of life skills messages, and as concrete examples of good practice in areas such as hygiene and sanitation.
- Develop and promote programmes aimed specifically at adolescents, both as targets for special interventions and as partners in UNICEF programmes. This is an area in which the exercise of children's right to participate can yield particularly valuable information and insights for addressing a wide array of issues (e.g., HIV/AIDS prevention and other

life skills, involvement of boys in good child care practices, enhancing the status of women and girls, etc.).

- In all aspects of UNICEF programming, improve the quality and utilization of data, indicators and analysis for problem identification and assessment, monitoring and evaluation. In areas such as HIV/AIDS and CNSP, even basic indicators and baseline information are often weak or lacking; in better-established areas such as education data are often overwhelming in quantity and not always relevant to issues of concern. In all areas, available data are seldom properly analyzed, nor are findings widely disseminated to potential users.
- Strengthen partnerships with the region's media organizations in order to better promote and advocate for children's rights and child and family policies and programmes. The various media channels, especially the rapidly expanding television medium, can be utilized to influence attitudes and behaviour as well as policy and legislation, public opinion and the mobilization of resources for children.

The Global Agenda's action points on early child care and development, gender equity, elimination of violence and exploitation against children and women, respond well to these concerns. Promotion of children's participation, especially the empowerment of adolescents as a subject and holder of rights, is also highly relevant for the above actions.

\*\*\*\*\*

BLANK



**A Global Agenda for Children Beyond Year 2000**  
**Comments and review**  
**UNICEF Regional Office for the Middle East and North Africa**

*Synopsis of review methodology.* UNICEF MENARO has held a two-part review of the Discussion paper, A Global Agenda for Children Beyond Year 2000. In the first, internal, part of the review, the discussion paper was circulated to all UNICEF country offices in the MENA region, and to all staff in MENARO itself. Comments were made through discussion in many country offices.

For the second part of the review, a small panel of six experts was constituted. The members of the panel were leaders in civil society, journalism, academia, and private voluntary organizations, and came from four countries in the region.\* The panel was guided by four questions:

- \* Whether these themes will adequately address the needs of children in the Middle East and North Africa? Are there themes, or emphases, that should be added?
- \* Are these the right strategies to make use of UNICEF's comparative advantage, and to help us work effectively with partners with other comparable advantages?
- \* Do these themes and strategies show that we have learned well from our experience in the Middle East and North Africa?
- \* Do the real issues facing children in the MENA region come out, and can they be accommodated, in the proposed frame?

It was also agreed that the Region would hold a broader consultation to consider these issues in greater depth, at a later date.

***Main issues and areas of concern***

*Summary.* Both the internal and the panel review concluded that while the document opens discussion on critical issues, there is still a need for much greater focus on the issues and strategies which UNICEF should pursue in future. The emphasis on learning from the past is important and even more explicit emphasis needs to be placed on how we can build on both lessons and accomplishments. Creative efforts are needed to break into new ways of thinking. Finally, to make any strategy or approach more appropriate for the Middle East and North Africa region, more attention is needed on cultural and religious factors.

***On the focus and scope of the paper:***

The expert group thought that no clear methodology was set out for the selection of themes, other perhaps than on issues that are currently important or which have some momentum. In this the paper appears to build on the directions we are currently taking,

---

\* The members of the panel were: Dr. Hoda Badran, former Chairperson of the Committee on the Rights of the Child, activist in Egypt, and former UNICEF Representative; Ms. Lyse Doucet, foreign correspondent, BBC, Jerusalem; Ms. Asma Khader, lawyer and rights activist, Jordan; Dr. Ali Reza Marandi, former Minister of Health, Iran; Dr. Sabri Rbeihat, Professor, Philadelphia University, Jordan; Dr. Curtis Rhodes, Director, Questscope, Jordan.

rather than “breaking out of the box”. Alternative scenarios are not considered. In-depth analysis of past experience, and more data on what has actually happened, would help to guide the discussion. In addition, UNICEF’s comparative advantage needs to be better identified, and the complementarity with other agencies examined.

Several people felt that the document was written in the language and metaphor which they have come to expect from UNICEF. While this is normally clear and useful, at a juncture at which the future is being considered, new patterns of thinking need to be considered. UNICEF needs innovative approaches to the selection of issues and concerns, and the selection of models, technologies, and means of work. In order to do this, UNICEF needs to be more outward-looking, not inward-gazing.

For example, UNICEF seems to be trying to do too much, perhaps even “everything”. UNICEF should focus on its uniqueness in addressing issues that others do not cover, (such as Early Childhood Development) and should employ strategies that reflect its comparative advantage (as advocate and demand-creator rather than supplier).

In some cases, like adolescents, UNICEF must expand its awareness of and capacity to deal with new areas (“unstarted” not “unfinished” business). Complex social and behavioural issues build on and grow out of the health and education themes that were previously core themes.

Retooling of the organization and of means of working with partners will be needed to take on new issues and approaches, and the learning curve may be long. There is a danger that in-house managers of change are incapable of seeing and engineering large-scale shifts.

In many cases, the state is not only the key partner of UNICEF, but also the focus of the changes that are needed. How can UNICEF retain a creative tension in its work with government? How does UNICEF stand up for the needs of children even when official policies are disadvantageous to children? How does UNICEF work to engage and even strengthen civil society where it is weak?

### ***On the need for a focus/ global goal:***

Many of the respondents, both external and from within UNICEF, feel strongly that UNICEF’s efficacy in the past was due to the very clear and well-understood focus of the organization, for Child Survival, and further expressed in the strategies of GOBI. These goals are clearly linked to important accomplishments for children. They created unprecedented political will to undertake and implement extensive and difficult programmes; they enabled clear monitoring which itself promoted greater achievements; they enabled clear accountability.

Moreover, clear global priorities can drive new, challenging or even sensitive goals. The knowledge of accomplishment from other countries puts a useful pressure on governments and other partners as with EPI. A global context makes it possible to deal with previously difficult issues such as child labour or child abuse. A full decentralization of the choice of priorities could weaken the hand of UNICEF offices in raising such issues.

Without a clear programmatic focus and point of leverage for all programme areas, there are risks that

- \* UNICEF will be working very broadly but less effectively
- \* it will be difficult to explain or “package” and we will lose support.
- \* the progress that was possible through the pursuit of common goals will falter
- \* country offices, especially smaller offices, will lack capacity to build political will, programme strategies and ideas in the absence of a global framework.

At the same time, there are a number of serious constraints associated with the goals for children:

- \* Global goals are by definition not equally appropriate everywhere, and country-specific needs may go unmet.
- \* The pressure to achieve measurable goals within a short time frame often results in unsustainable and short term strategies.

Some of the UNICEF respondents maintained that without greater clarity and a common, clearly-defined purpose, UNICEF would have difficulties describing its own work succinctly and convincingly. This could affect our capacity to raise funds. UNDP with less clarity in its self-presentation has taken very large budget cuts in recent years. Agencies with a clear and clearly-expressed mandate, such as UNHCR and WFP have suffered less from budget cutbacks.

The theme of learning was suggested as an organizing principle by one participant. This could be encapsulated as a slogan “I have the right to an education” (in comparison to the previous: “I want to live”.)

### *On specific themes*

In the discussions, the suggestion of theme appeared to be as diverse as the participants and his or her discipline. It was argued to include:

- \* Neonatal death: As one third of child deaths occur within first 21 days of birth, if UNICEF cares about survival there needs to be a focus on this window. Not to do so, will signify a turning from the previous, successful approaches taken by UNICEF, and this is surely unfinished business.

*Others pointed out that to focus on the neonate it is necessary to take a broader view of the mother and family. Many neonatal deaths are linked with low birth weight; which is linked to poor antenatal care and to the mother’s age, nutrition, and health; which in turn are linked to broader social issues including the status of women, to caring practices, to education, to adolescent health.*

- \* There is a danger that, in many developing countries, the poor are being marginalised and disenfranchised. UNICEF should focus on some of the more basic causes and processes that cause these problems. In this context, ECD for poor children should be given priority as a strategy to address discrimination, disparities, and the rights of girls

- \* The concept of empowerment, especially that of women, which is not sufficiently present in the text.

### ***Region-specific issues***

The discussion on how well the Global Agenda reflects priorities and needs in the Middle East and North Africa region focussed mainly on three concerns:

1. issues related to rights in the context of traditional culture;
2. gender issues; and
3. the role of religion.

*Traditional perceptions of rights, and the role of the family.* In the MENA region, there is great concern with the rights of the family; there is less emphasis in the popular culture as a whole on individual rights. Thus the rights-based approach raises the issue of universality vis-a vis cultural sensitivities and common traditional practices. In addition, a reaction against globalisation and “imported culture” may make it more difficult to mobilize for CRC, and this requires more understanding and innovation in working for rights.

Given the central role of the family, and the power structures within families, in the MENA region the promotion of rights will necessarily involve the promotion and protection of rights through the building of democracy within families.

*Gender and age discrimination is pervasive* in the region. With respect to the status of women, there are indications of regression. UNICEF should energize and side more forcefully with groups and with movements that advocate women’s rights. There will be conflicts with tradition; here UNICEF needs to stand firmly for the universality of rights, and to find culturally-sensitive ways of expressing these universal rights.

In addition, children are often seen as the property of adults. There needs to be a strong emphasis on combating discrimination and promoting children's rights to express themselves is a key requirement.

*One key area bringing together these concerns for universal rights, respect for the family, and to curb age and sex discrimination would be a focus on ending early marriage, which remains acceptable in many parts of the region.*

*Religion* in the MENA region cannot be ignored. It needs to be mobilized as a positive force for progress and dialogue, rather than allowing religious themes to be misused to suppress the rights of women and children. Effort should be put into identifying the beliefs and themes that support child well-being, child rights, and women’s rights.

### ***On the global agenda and the structure of UNICEF***

Another topic raised is the implications of the current programmatic discussions on the current and future structure of UNICEF. To assume that our current structures should continue will necessarily colour the programme directions we take. For example:

- \* What are the implications of working on child rights in a universal framework, for the current typology of UNICEF offices which are either country programmes, or National Committees? How should UNICEF best work for child rights in

industrialized countries where there may be large numbers of marginalized children?

- \* To what degree will our choices of issues or topics be driven by the competencies that we have on staff at the moment? How can we ensure that on the one hand, we are as open as possible to the real needs of children, and on the other to building the skills that we need?
- \* How will our current relations with Government and civil society determine the choices of issues and of methodology? How should UNICEF work with civil society in countries where it is weak or highly regulated?

There may also be a need for parallel discussions on the kinds of structures we need to complete our mission.

BLANK

## **"A GLOBAL AGENDA FOR CHILDREN BEYOND YEAR 2000"**

### **COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS FROM THE COUNTRY OFFICES AND THE REGIONAL OFFICE IN THE CEE/CIS AND THE BALTICS REGION**

---

By request of UNICEF Executive Director (23 March 1998), discussions on initial paper "A Global Agenda for Children Beyond Year 2000" have been initiated both at the field and regional levels. Useful contributions have been obtained from UNICEF offices in Romania, Croatia and Moldova. Regional office professional staff meeting also resulted in several suggestions. In general, the paper has been well accepted and considered as a straightforward conceptual framework for future UNICEF actions. Comments and suggestions on the paper may be summarized as follows.

#### **1. GENERAL:**

- An important point is made under the Global Agenda assets that more attention should be given (1) to priority themes that have to be addressed by the world community - all partners together - and not just by UNICEF, and (2) to effective cooperation structures between major partners concerned: state and government institutions, civil society, UN and other international agencies, including UNICEF. Joint commitments and actions are called for.
- It is now important to work out how agencies like WB, UNDP, UNFPA, UNHCR, WHO, WFP, FAO and others concerned are involved in the Global Agenda preparation and their ideas and commitments together with the specific proposals on priorities, linkages and cooperation schemes are considered (UNDAF is obviously one way).
- UNICEF's role and functions as a leading world agency for children have been highlighted, however they could be further justified and worked in more detail.
- Clear linkages should be established between the global challenges that remain (pp. 2-3), the challenges of global trends (what we have now is a repetition of remaining challenges), and new/emerging challenges. These last group of challenges - the most important when planning for a new agenda - is not very visible in this document.
- There does not seem to be a tight fit between the "global challenges that remain" and the priority themes for UNICEF.
- We should be talking not just about challenges (that remain or new) but also about new opportunities provided by new technologies, new communication means, new partnerships and networks, consensus ethical framework of the CRC, etc. More attention should be given to "lessons learned" from past experience as well as to monitoring and evaluation.
- The agenda should be more specific on mass media/communication strategy and resource mobilization strategy.

#### **2. CONDITIONS AND TRENDS OF THE REGION:**

- Some challenges as well as priorities are region-specific. We would suggest considering formulating in brief the regional priorities, regional agendas and key issues that have to be addressed under specific regional and country circumstances - e.g. countries in transition (not just CEE/CIS but also several countries of Latin America, South East Asia), LDCs, emergency countries, etc.

#### **3. PRIORITIES FOR THE CEE/CIS:**

- Social policy and legal reform - protecting the rights of youth, juvenile justice, children and youth in conflict with the law; working children; street children and youth; children of minority groups; adolescents at risk of drug abuse and HIV/AIDS; children affected by war.
- Supporting system reforms from the bottom-up: technical support in capacity-building of government institutions and NGOs; empowerment of civil society.
- Early childhood development: identifying ECCD innovations; disseminating information to parents, community leaders and policy makers.
- Country specific approach: clustering of common concerns - safeguard practical achievements of the past building on existing strengths. Groupings: support to social sector service delivery, public policy and system reform, strengthening of civil society and public institutions, and emergencies.
- Coordination, cooperation and cost-effectiveness in assessing more accurately the needs and rights of children and women, and service delivery where urgently required. Reach children and women with specific urgent services (e.g. immunization, maternal and child health, universal iodization of salt, acute respiratory infections and diarrhoeal diseases, iron deficiency anaemia and breast-feeding). Integrated approach (health-nutrition-sanitation), HIV/AIDS.
- Mobilization and empowerment: empowerment of children, adolescents and women; empowerment of families.
- Emergencies: fostering early recovery and stabilization, improving prevention, early warning and preparedness activities.
- Monitoring and evaluation: TRANSMONEE system, support the production of national reports, situation analyses, evaluations and studies.

#### **4. PRIORITY THEMES FOR UNICEF'S ADVOCACY AND ACTION:**

- The future agenda and priority themes are different from the current in terms of priorities and of emphasis. It is not a question of fear of the "new" but rather responsibility for commitments already made with children both on the global and country levels. This raises a question - do we envisage further shift in service delivery/capacity building/empowerment/advocacy balance?
- How does the new conceptual/thematic division that is introduced relate to the four major areas as approved by the WSC Declaration/Plan of Action - survival, development, protection and participation? How do they relate to the four CRC "foundation" principles: non-discrimination, best interests of the child, rights to life, survival and development, views of the child?
- The overall rights-based approach, including learning more about rights-based situation analysis, cross-sectoral and integrated approach should be highlighted and elaborated on.
- Are the seven priority themes listed in the agenda are the UNICEF only priorities? From UNICEF experience in the CEE/CIS, issues like "reforming child protection systems", disabled children, parent education, "new" illnesses like cancer/tuberculosis, emphasis on rural/urban disparities are emerging.
- Violence: child abuse is not only exploitation or sexual abuse, can also be ethnic discrimination.



- Women's issues should be presented in a broader sense. Gender equity - not just girls, in some countries situation of boys compare to girls is also a problem.
- Marginalized groups - to be added: UNICEF special attention to reaching the most marginalized, CEDC, etc.
- We do feel that among the many issues which need to be discussed, two of the most important at this time are early child care and development, and adolescents. The latter should increasingly be seen as an integral part of UNICEF. In countries in transition a special emphasis is being put on this group. Somehow we need to consider an emergency programme of communication with this group. Youth empowerment measures should be included: access to information for adolescents.
- We would prefer to see some of the currently proposed priority themes as crosscutting concerns (e.g. gender, children participation) even if cross-sectoral implementation is very difficult to put in practice.
- The paper implies that there must be more integration of activities between "standard UNICEF programmes". The biggest challenge is to create this integration in an existing internal structure, which at time still discourages integration. Another option would be to expand number of priorities in order to satisfy more broadly sectoral and/or regional concerns.
- The core values of education should be considered: tolerance, equity and democracy. We would like to see, in addition to what is presented, UNICEF playing a major role in "education for peace". "Learning achievement" should include trauma healing, tolerance building, peaceful conflict resolution, mine awareness education (at least for certain countries), environmental care education or more general: country specific relevant education subject areas.
- Spreading different aspects of health among almost all priority themes was considered as risk of loosing health specific focus in benefit of having small pieces everywhere. Current focus on child and women health allows UNICEF to have coherent strategy implemented with other partners. A new "triangle for action": child - women - adolescent may be proposed.

May 12, 1998

BLANK

**INTER-OFFICE MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Philip Van Haecke  
**cc:** André Roberfroid  
Bilge Bassani  
**FROM:** Jack Glattbach  
**REFERENCE:** **Date:** 15 May 1998  
**SUBJECT:** National Committees' responses to the Global Agenda discussion paper

---

Dear Philip,

Here is a summary of responses by the National Committees at the Martigny Annual Meeting to the "Global Agenda for Children Beyond 2000" discussion paper, intended for quick feedback to Maria Calivis.

The points are taken both from responses to Carol's speech in the plenary and from the reports of the five working groups, which were asked to focus on three areas: (a) general comments (b) potential of the seven themes for fundraising/resource mobilisation and (c) potential of the themes for being "flagship issues for UNICEF".

I think it's important to say upfront that the overall reaction to the paper was **strongly positive**. The strongest criticisms came from those who also made the best proposals for follow-up (and these were the strongest Committees). In these meetings there's always a tension between the fundraisers and the "care-givers", between traditionalists and progressives, which is on-going -- and every small group exercise never has enough time. But it's fair to say that all were genuinely engaged by the paper. The appreciation expressed for the consultation was also genuine, for three main reasons: one, it happened early in the development of the paper; two, after a couple of years of internal focus, it's reassuring to know work is on-going on the "big issues" of helping children; and, three, the paper is leading us to a new articulation of substantive issues and policies on which "year 2000" activities by the NatComs can be focussed.

**A. General comments:**

1. Many speakers wanted our "new directions" to be founded on a major evaluation and analysis of what happened, and did not happen, for children in the 1990s. "How far have we got with the 1990s goals," asked one. The development of new themes should be based on what we have learned. This is not to say there is disagreement with the new themes proposed but, as major advocates for UNICEF, the NatComs need to be able to explain why and how we are taking these new directions. "We want to maintain UNICEF as the international gold standard for children," said the UK. But with a broadening agenda UNICEF must focus on those specific areas where it has proven superiority and set very clear targets and objectives. One working group hoped for a 5 to 10-year action plan which was "SMART": Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Timebound. Another group expressed the concern that UNICEF remains needs-driven rather than goals-driven.
2. There was no adverse comment to the seven specific themes proposed: gender equity, early child care and development, violence and exploitation, and education were the most frequently mentioned. (And this debate was before Stephen's strong presentation on

progress and report on results;

monitor and supervise the Brussels office and manage effectively and efficiently the administrative, human resources, finance and training functions of the Regional Office in accordance with all applicable rules, regulations and policies.

## II. HEADQUARTERS

18. Through the course of the management excellence program, the role of headquarters was clarified as one of providing overall strategic direction and guidance that reflects linkages to the United Nations system and the policy guidance of the Executive Board, with responsibility for strategic planning and oversight for the organization as a whole. Headquarters also provides leadership in developing the global UNICEF perspective by integrating the experience and contribution of all parts of the UNICEF system and by ensuring that the global perspective informs planning, policy development and guidelines for management and quality assurance.

### A. Office of the Executive Director

19. The Office of the Executive Director (OED) is responsible for the general direction of UNICEF operations under policy directives of the UNICEF Executive Board, ECOSOC and the UN General Assembly.

20. OED consists of the Executive Director; two Deputy Executive Directors; the Director, Change Management; the Principle Adviser; the Chief of Staff; and professional and general service support staff. The Deputy Executive Directors support the Executive Director in fulfilling the functions of the Executive Office, and are responsible for oversight of Division Directors in New York, Copenhagen, Tokyo and Florence.

21. The accountabilities of the Executive Director are to:

(a) guide UNICEF in the pursuit of its mission and set strategic objectives for the organization;

(b) serve as a global advocate for children, creating a global constituency for children and advocating the objectives UNICEF seeks to achieve;

(c) mobilize political will at the highest level to take action and/or provide resources in support of the First Call for Children and the 20/20 initiative;

(d) serve as the lead advocate for children within the UN system and maintain coordination with relevant UN organizations, and maintain contact with delegations to the United Nations;

(e) provide leadership in the planning, coordination and direction of UNICEF activities, leading organizational strategic planning and setting organizational priorities;

(f) ensure the organization is structured, directed and managed to fulfill its mission in accordance with all applicable rules, regulations and policies;

(g) provide leadership in management excellence, including ensuring that accountabilities are understood, strengthened and exercised;

(h) recommend to the Executive Board changes in, or development of, policies as required;

(I) recommend to the Executive Board approval of programmes of cooperation and budgets, and report on progress, key activities and organizational

violence.) Child participation was supported but the lack of specific actions noted. Several speakers referred to the absence of significant mention of disabled children and many thought that family issues should be strengthened, perhaps added as an eighth theme. But discussion did raise several "operational" concerns, including:

(a) the paper needs to describe what will be undertaken and how for these new themes. In these areas the paper was criticised for being ambiguous or simply not mentioning implementation.

(b) several questions related to how do these "new" themes relate to existing "traditional" activities and approaches. As our traditional activities seem to be included in the proposed themes, I think this was essentially a concern about emphasis, and perhaps resource allocation. The Natcoms want clarity, confirmation, continuity and improvement. Hence many said that our "unfinished business" of the 1990s must go on. Some also wondered if the term "unfinished business" did sufficient justice to a world in which 35 million children died annually: "UNICEF must speak with a loud voice on the situation of children everywhere, but with resources declining we must set keen priorities."

(c) the paper does not focus at all on our work in humanitarian emergencies, which is vital to the NatComs in both advocacy and fundraising. We may not want to think about emergencies in the 21st Century but they will almost certainly still be with us.

(d) a related issue was the tension between developing programming/advocacy partnerships with NGOs/Civil Society and the increasingly tough competition with NGOs for resource mobilisation. Hence the frequent demands by NatComs for UNICEF to have clarity and specificity of vision, mission, targets and concentrating on its areas of proven superiority.

(e) some Committees also asked if they could afford a broader, rights-based role for the proposed activities, given both the tensions with NGOs and the limitations of present retention percentages. The role of UNICEF country offices in better-off developing countries (NICs), many of which have income levels similar to several NatCom countries, was also questioned (particularly from the fundraising perspective). But there was general agreement that there is no easy transition from recipient to donor status.

3. Understandably perhaps, Lisbet Palme, as a member of the Committee on the Rights of the Child, felt that the paper would be strengthened by a stronger articulation of the values which underpin all our work, including, of course, the CRC which will be our foundation stone for the foreseeable future. Other speakers also mentioned that our rights-based approach could be expressed more forcefully.

Ms.Palme urged that the term gender equity should be replaced by gender equality through the paper, as recommended by the Beijing World Conference on Women..

4. A point of cultural sensitivity. Dr. Simai (Hungary) noted that many cultures count time differently, e.g. Muslims and Buddhists, for whom the year 2000 is not a new millenium, etc..

5. Despite being introduced as a "draft discussion paper to promote debate, not for line

by line editing" there were, inevitably, criticisms of the language ("too sociological", "too vague", "too general", "not easy to understand") and a few of the structure (unspecific, apart from one group proposing that it be refocussed on the theme of "Giving Children a Good Start in Life" and one speaker noting that "harmful social practices" appeared under more than one theme). This should be seen in the light of the strongly positive response to the paper and one of the critics also suggested what the NatComs would like to see with further articulations of the paper: it should describe *how* the new themes proposed would be achieved, include specific goals (timebound if possible) and be expressed in easy-to-understand language, accompanied by a shorter "popular version".

6. A final general indication of the positive response was that several (major) NatComs saw the substance of the paper as having the potential to lead to a second World Summit for Children. Robert Smith (UK) said that the internal process which had developed this document ( a small task force of "bright minds") should be extended: "UNICEF needs to pick on the finest minds everywhere to develop the agenda for children in the 21st Century," he said. By broadening this process beyond UNICEF and the National Committees we would "help give a sense of ownership of the agenda to all those working for children" while maintaining UNICEF's authority. The climax of such a process could be a second world summit for children in 2001.

#### **B. Potential of the Seven Themes for Fundraising/Resource Mobilisation.**

Most groups said that they had not enough time to fully address the second and third questions but there were some valuable pointers.

1. The consensus position appeared to be that UNICEF should speak out for children everywhere but devote nearly all its resources to groups of children in greatest need.

2. Dietrich Garlich (Germany) said NatComs always seemed to be telling UNICEF that its themes were too broad -- so NatComs must help UNICEF to focus its fundraising. As expressed, in rather theoretical and generalised language, the seven proposed themes did not have any direct popular fundraising appeal. But many good fundraising themes could be developed from them, for instance in three areas:

(a) for "flexible basic services", of which health had the most appeal.

(b) for education, "the most critical factor for human development".

(These he described as "classical" UNICEF fundraising themes.)

(c) from the rights perspective, there were many good themes, focussing on the grossest violations of children's rights and the most disadvantaged children, e. g. child victims of sexual exploitation, violence and child labour; disabled children, children in homes, children in war.

3. One group summarised our competitive strengths and weaknesses as being:

*Strengths:* Credibility, Popularity, Partnerships with NGOs, Strong Field and NatCom Networks, Delivery Capacity and our exclusive mandate for children.

**Weaknesses: Shrinking Resources, Increasing Competition for Resources, Slow Reaction to Competition, More Oriented to Processes than Products, Negative aspects of association with the UN.**

Priority should be given to "finishing unfinished business" while not "spreading ourselves too thin". The CRC had significantly changed the UNICEF landscape: in developing countries priorities were set by the countries themselves, not UNICEF, and there were few "one size fits all" solutions.

4. Another group noted that fundraising for children in conflicts had greatest popular appeal, followed by "basic services" themes -- while education was of acknowledged importance but "difficult to sell".

5. One speaker noted that there was a decreasing public understanding of the essential problems of development, for which he highlighted the need to sensitise the young, which could start by identifying with the problems of youth -- and appointing youth representatives to the boards of National Committees.

### **C. "Flagship" themes**

The consensus appeared to be that there was insufficient time, and perhaps it was premature in the development of new themes, to achieve this.

The two "flagship issues" mentioned in the working group reports were "Giving Children a Good start in Life" and "Early Child Care and Development".

### **D. Response by Carol Bellamy**

Several NatComs asked for information about the schedule for developing the paper.

Ms. Bellamy said that this discussion was a valuable contribution to remarks she will make to the June Executive Board. In the next two months all regional management teams and UNICEF staff had been asked for input on the paper. She hoped that by September a revised draft would be completed, which would be shared with the National Committees, so that by the end of the year "we should be able to say 'this is where we're heading'".

Mechanisms for discussions with UNICEF's major external partners were also being explored.

---

BLANK



**Global Agenda Beyond the Year 2000**  
**(A Synthesis of Views Emerging from the Meeting of Headquarters Divisions)**  
**New York, 26 May 1998-06-04**

This meeting was the culmination of a series of divisional meetings held in Headquarters to discuss the Global Agenda Beyond the Year 2000, as requested by the Executive Director in CF/EXD/MEM/1998-2000. The meeting was called by the PD Director, who invited participants to present the views of their respective Divisions on the Agenda.

The following main points emerged from the meeting:

1. Participants commented on the general content and found the trends described in the document to be sound. They noted that, overall, the document strikes a good balance between the differences and common elements of UNICEF's work in the various regions. Several participants remarked however, that the paper needs to acknowledge the world's changing political environment, widespread instability, political collapse, emergence of democracies and globalisation. Participants felt that the document projects the image of a static environment rather than the unstable one in which so many children live.
2. Participants recommended that the content of the paper be strengthened with input from studies being undertaken by various Divisions, specifically EPP.
3. Participants felt that the document does not clearly differentiate between the "Global Agenda for Children" and "UNICEF's Agenda Beyond 2000". The confusion is partly due to the fact that it was widely understood that the Tarrytown group was looking at defining the UNICEF agenda. Participants recommended that the agendas be clearly identified; some suggested that separate documents be prepared for each purpose. Participants generally agreed that on the UNICEF side, the document lacks a strong statement of principle and should be clearly linked to the Mission Statement.
4. Participants noted that the document would be strengthened considerably by including a solid and detailed analysis on lessons learned from the failures and achievements of the 1990s e.g. mid-decade successes and end-decade failure to achieve the goals. Participants challenged statements in the documents attributing UNICEF's success and strength to intersectoral community based approaches arguing that our successes have largely been in areas of vertical/sectoral interventions. Participants agreed that this evaluation was a priority task for EPP to start immediately.
5. Many participants found the priority themes and the corresponding table of flagship elements to be disconcerting and confusing – too many flagship elements and missing key elements in the themes e.g. AIDS orphans and child soldiers. This was attributed in part to the absence of a clear framework to guide and organise the priority themes.

Suggestions were made to re-organise the priorities either in terms of phases of the life-cycle, or along the lines of the CRC Committee clusters or of the Human Rights Programming conceptual framework. The majority of participants agreed on the need to introduce a conceptual framework for the priority themes. However no consensus on a particular format nor a specific list of themes was reached.

6. Participants recommended that the paper include a discussion of “what others are doing” including a discussion of UNICEF’s mandate versus that of other agencies and/or partners. The paper needs to address the changes and evolving relations that are part of the UNDAF process at country level.
7. Participants raised several concerns regarding country level implementation of the priorities. Several participants emphasised the need to assist countries with prioritizing themes and actions for management and programming purposes. Participants noted that priorities need to be adjusted to differing country situations i.e. emergency or LDC countries.
8. Participants emphasised the need to link and harmonize the concepts, objectives, strategies, methodologies and terminology appearing in various recently issued key UNICEF documents, namely the PRO on 1998 – 2000 Programme Priorities, the MTP and the ExDir on Human Rights Approach to Programming. Participants made reference to the DAC agenda and argued that the paper needs to be clearer about the need to finish what we started, addressing the unfinished agenda with proper packaging of themes and with resource allocation. Five out of the seven proposed themes appear to be new. Participants agreed, however, that it is necessary to clearly emphasise the change in philosophy and approaches when addressing UNICEF’s unfinished business.
9. Participants agreed that the process of building ownership and partnerships is of primary importance for achieving the objectives. Proper attention must be given to the in-house process of building ownership, understanding and mobilization around the Global Agenda.
10. Participants warned against the implications of the document on UNICEF’s role in industrialised countries and the difficulties that this has raised with Natcoms. Participants feared that the document could open the door for increased Natcom activities in their own countries.
11. Specific programming issues and concerns were raised:
  - Conceptual issues including debates around gender equality vs gender equity; poverty alleviation vs adequate living standards;
  - Monitoring and evaluation issues, namely how do we help countries reduce the scope of interventions to measurable impact?
  - How much flexibility will country offices have?

The meeting benefited from the input of three members of the Tarrytown group, Marta Santo-Pais, Maria Calivis and Marjorie Newman-Williams who provided information on the background to the paper, clarified its content and described the process of consultation and the next steps. Participants in the HQ meeting unanimously felt that the added information contributed by colleagues who were part of the Tarrytown process contributed to a better understanding of the document' content and the ongoing process of discussion and consultation.

Attached to this document are copies of the written input provided by ICDC, Supply Division, Brussels Office, PFO and PD.

Programme Division  
GMT Meeting, 8 – 9 June 1998

BLANK

## **Programme Division's Response to "A Global Agenda for Children Beyond Year 2000"**

At the request of the Director, individual PD sections held professional staff discussions around the four questions posed by the Executive Director on the Global Agenda. An extended PDMT discussed the Global Agenda in depth at a meeting held on Thursday, 21 May 1998.

The following common themes emerged from the PDMT meeting and reports of the sections:

In answer to the question *Have the conditions and trends in your region been taken into account?* PD sections noted that:

- Important regional trends are missing e.g. trends related to child and women's mortality, to the spread of HIV AIDS, peace and conflict, to decentralisation and democracy, to the privatisation of the social sector and to the emergence of a civil society. It does not take into account regional goals and priorities.
- The document does not sufficiently analyse the socio-economic and political picture setting the background and the context to the priorities.
- Issues related to north/south disparities are missing; equally, strategies related to disparity reduction are also missing.
- Similarly, the document lacks a discussion on how to safeguard and maintain the levels of progress achieved or existing in individual regions.
- Trends and implications related to UN reform are also missing from the document.
- It is important to develop the links between the Mission Statement, the 1998 – 2000 Priorities, A Human Rights Approach to UNICEF Programming, the Medium Term Plan and the Global Priorities.

In answer to the question *Are the priority themes informed by the lessons learned from the 1990s?* sections noted that:

- The group felt that while the themes in the document adequately relate to the actions and lessons of the 90s, the analytical aspects of this section could be substantially strengthened.
- Participants shared the feeling that the document does not take stock of the mid-decade achievements and progress. Similarly, it does not analyse the reasons for the "failure" to achieve the end-decade goals. It would be useful to include a discussion on lessons learned from the 1990s experience of "programming with goals".

- Important areas need to be included e.g. social mobilisation and community participation, experience with multilaterals.
- We need to draw lessons from the changing nature of our advocacy programmes and on the need to integrate advocacy into the hard core programming aspects. In parallel, there needs to be a discussion of our role as a service providing organisation. Participants recommended that this section include a wider discussion of the nature of UNICEF in the coming decade, what will we be: a funding or an “influencing” agency. Participants recommended that the discussion include a review of the functions and future role of UNIPAC as well as its contribution to achieving the priorities.
- More specific concerns were raised, including the confusions caused by the interchangeable use of the words gender and “female”, the absence of discussion of the issue of gender related economic opportunity, the need to better define our target group when it comes to youth vs adolescents.
- The issue of sustainability needs to be brought to the forefront including the need to address institutional and policy development aspects as well as issues related to human resource development (capacity building).
- Participants felt a serious discussions of the pros and cons, the does and don’ts and the implications of intersectoral approaches to programming needed to be included in this section.
- The group agreed that PD would be preparing itself to contribute to this important task as necessary.

In answer to the question *Should these be the priority themes for UNICEF’s advocacy and action in the future?* the group felt

- No fundamental disagreement with the themes; the group, however, felt that more work was need to organise and better define the nature of the themes. The present clustering brings together population groups, development , issues and goals, some of which are cross-sectoral. The group recommended that a conceptual framework be introduced to bring coherence to this important section.
- Participants pointed to a conceptual discrepancy between the text and the corresponding tables. Whereas the text provides priorities, the table includes all existing programmes and as such dilutes the idea of priorities.
- It was recommended that the paper take stock of the new range of technologies that are available and explore their contribution to programmes and the processes of participation and change.

- Participants felt that a number of priorities needed to be added to the proposed ones, particularly in the survival area. Some participants suggested that the themes be linked with Board approved strategies, i.e. Nutrition, WES, Primary Environmental Care, etc.
- Participants suggested that the priority themes be linked to specific criteria, e.g. what is deliverable, manageable, sustainable and affordable. Participants widely shared the feeling that the concept of “prevention” which characterises UNICEF’s actions was missing and needed to be re-introduced as a priority.
- Participants expressed specific concerns i.e. maternal mortality reduction and safemotherhood are subsumed under gender, the notion of child protection needs to be re-introduced.

In response to the question *How do we define UNICEF’s contribution to this broad agenda (and how do we prioritise)?* the group felt:

- Two overarching recommendations emerged: that UNICEF should prepare the two documents: “A Global Agenda for Children Beyond Year 2000” and secondly UNICEF’s Agenda for Children Beyond the Year 2000; and that UNICEF involve in this process a group of outsiders – Task Force – including experts and academicians, NGOs, donors and others in the preparation of the two documents.
- A timeframe needs to be explicitly stated. This timeframe should be divided into more manageable segments, e.g. 2000-2010; 2010-2025. This, along side the conceptual framework that would allow us to plan against various levels of causality, would give us a better base for prioritisation.
- Specific targets and outcomes need to be identified for the transition phase while new strategies and new tools are being developed.
- We need to see and place ourselves in the context of the broader scene and of what others are doing, including the other agencies of the UN system.
- Prioritisation will come from linking the priorities to a UNICEF programming process of assessment, analysis, lessons learned, what others are doing and what our contribution can be.

In conclusion, the extended PDMT reflected on the next steps:

1. Responsibilities should be clearly defined as to how to take the process and document forward as well as reconcile all key programme documents (*1998-2000 Programme Priorities (CF/PD/PRO/98-003)*, *A Global Agenda for Children Beyond Year 2000 (CF/EXD/MEM/1998.20)*, *A Human Rights Approach to UNICEF Programming for Children and Women, Medium-Term Plan, Resource Mobilization*).

2. A focal point should be responsible for taking forward an institutional process.
3. The process of ensuring broad institutional ownership for the documents needs to be planned and carefully executed.
4. Children need to be actively brought into the process.
5. A series of brainstorming sessions ought to be organized with key partners to solicit their views on both a *Global Agenda for Children Beyond the Year 2000* and *UNICEF's Agenda for Children Beyond the Year 2000*.

Programme Division  
26 May 1998





Brussels Office  
Bureau de Bruxelles

United Nations Children's Fund  
Fonds des Nations Unies pour l'Enfance  
Fondo de las Naciones Unidas para la Infancia

P. O. Box 104  
Brussels 22  
B - 1000 Brussels  
Belgium  
Visitors: av. des Arts 20

## FACSIMILE

Total pages : 2

<b>To</b> : Mr. Sadig Rasheed Director, Programme Division UNICEF New York  <b>Fax</b> : 1-212-824 64 70  <b>Date</b> : 26 May 1998	<b>From</b> : Denis Caillaux Director UNICEF Brussels Office  <b>Fax</b> : + (32 2) 231 14 25 <b>Phone</b> : + (32 2) 230 56 16 <b>Internet</b> : DCAILLAUX@UNICEF.CH
<b>Ref</b> : DC/8309 MOST URGENT, pl. <b>Subject</b> : Comments on the Agenda 2000 Document.	

### MESSAGE:

Dear Sadig,

As requested, please find herewith a few quick comments on the above. I hope it will reach you on time for your meeting with Programme Division colleagues. I have intentionally used a somewhat telegraphic style as I guess you have been literally flooded with comments !

1/ The document presents the way we perceive ourselves. It is now time to reflect on how others are perceiving us. What are the views of our partners i.e. donors, NGOs, civil society etc...? How would they define our comparative advantage ? What themes do they think we should stress etc...? We have to ask ourselves these questions if we want to continue to be a true " People to People" organization.

2/ Some issues are considered by the average people in the street as " belonging" to UNICEF i.e. no one would understand that we do not get involved in some way. At our end here, issues such as the orphans of HIV/AIDS or Child Soldiers very much belong to that category.

3/ But more generally, there is a transversal or cross-cutting theme that keeps reappearing time and time again and that we have not yet sufficiently incorporated, namely Reaching the Unreached or the Poorest of the Poor. It truly cuts across all of the 7 themes. But shouldn't it constitute our best potential flagship and the notion with which the UNICEF name must become synonymous ?

This is not the place to discuss the programmatic implications of such a strategic choice, but they are clearly considerable. The issue is not - emphatically - to design programmes for the poorest only, but rather to design programmes that are really reaching the entire community. Primarily, this requires time; an emphasis on process over project; and a truly participatory approach that recognizes that if the poorest has indeed similar basic needs as the rest of the community, he/she can perceive them differently thus rendering necessary special service delivery mechanisms.

In case you deem it appropriate to pursue this further, I could join hands with other colleagues in offering additional comments.

With best regards,

Priority: Normal

Subject: Re: Fwd: As requested re: Agenda for Children beyond the year

---

Author: Anthony Kennedy  
Date: 5/26/98 12:07 PM

1. **Important and still missing:** The paper would benefit from a short, clear, attractive statement that conveys quickly and easily what UNICEF is about with a sense of passion and resolve. Our support depends on understanding and sympathy for our aims and our proven performance by many who may not be prepared to read in detail or reflect at length on complex issues.
2. In our concern for poverty, it would be helpful to link our work with the work of others. We must recognize our links with others in the U.N. system in what we are doing. To do so is both correct and at this moment - wise.
3. In looking to the future, let's go beyond UNICEF staff - open the window.
4. Consider including something on the comparative advantages of UNICEF, our focus and our achievements.
5. How may we better ensure that the governments we work with are part of this agenda?
6. There is little acknowledgement of differing economic situations among regions and in some cases the impact of the rapid changes that are underway.
7. The mention of family issues does not sufficiently recognize that in some countries - including some rather large Asian countries, the family and extended family systems are doing well.
8. Where issues of family structures and adolescent problems are discussed, it may be well to recognize that UNICEF has no track record of substantial knowledge or achievement in these areas.
9. Consideration could be made to giving special attention to the young child - 0 to 5 years. This is the most critical stage in overall personal growth and development and also the most neglected.
10. As the UN agency responsible for children and working within a global framework which is increasingly rights based, UNICEF will have additional importance in advocating and working for the well being of children in the western world and the industrialized states. The social indicators from the CIS states are alarming as are the reports on children in the U.S. (Children's Defense Fund ) for approximately 20% of American children live in poverty. Drugs, alcohol, early pregnancy, violence in the classroom and juvenile justice are issues with equal relevancy in poor and wealthy nations.
11. Within the section on leveraging resources for children, include: partnerships within the United Nations System and increasingly, the Bretton Woods Institutions particularly the World Bank and the regional banks. Add foundations as another important partner.

12. The report, *Children on the Brink*, indicates that nearly 16 million orphans will have lost their mothers or both from HIV-AIDS (prediction by the year 2000 in 23 countries). This number will increase to nearly 23 million by 2010. Nineteen of the 23 countries are in sub-Saharan Africa. This has a devastating effect on family life with major changes in the care and well being of children. This pandemic requires more attention with a demographic overview and UNICEF's response.

13. Satellites and technologies enhance our lives, but the technologies create even greater gaps between regions. Information technologies require an educational integration and dynamism within UNICEF assisted school systems.

14. No mention is made of capacity building with Governments. The document almost reads like a parallel mechanism. New strategies must be developed for ownership and implementation of the UNICEF goals.

15. All of UNICEF's programmes require closer affiliation with research and academic staff. The linkages with research institutions and staff and professional associations should be stressed.

16. Importance is given to the selection of an international advisory team to review this report. Note the team which is advising the United Nations International Trust Fund Partnerships or the United Nations Foundation. Key individuals in various disciplines should be invited to serve on the team.

**Comments by Tom Franklin, which found general agreement within PFO:**

1. The document would benefit from a more rigorous review of achievements in the 1990s. The first paragraph of the document treats women and children as objects of development and overlooks the distinction between advocacy, service delivery, capacity building and empowerment. Indeed, the first paragraph does little to show any progress where it really counts: in capacity-building and empowerment of the poor.

2. It is a pity that the document does not take the position of the poor from the outset: repeated global commitments have amounted to little concrete benefit for poor people. The document should acknowledge this. We are good at making global pronouncements, less good at making life more manageable for poor children and women. =

3. The document would benefit from an objective, quantified comparison between what we set out to do at the outset of the last decade and what we actually achieved. This should be followed by an analysis of lessons learned, an identification of best practices, and an assessment of future needs. In the absence of such a methodical approach, it would be all too easy to see the analysis of the present document as an attempt to shift the goalposts.

We had an agenda for the last decade, we don't analyse our performance, and we then glibly propose a 'new agenda'.

4. The document appears to ignore UNICEF's own approach to rights-based programming. The paragraph on unfinished business and the challenge ahead makes no mention of rights. Instead, the CRC is mentioned only in connection with 'the street, sweatshops, factories and armed conflict'. Surely of greater importance, in terms of numbers of children and women affected, is the fact that the standards laid out in articles 6, 24 and 28, for instance, are daily breached with impunity.

5. The justification for a 'new agenda for children' is much too weak and incoherently argued. The document needs to explain what was wrong with the agenda set out in the Convention on the Rights of the Child and the World Summit for Children, before it can assume that readers will go along with what becomes a merely rhetorical argument.

6. Nobody will quarrel with the "Vision for Children in the 21st Century", but the key question is how to realise this vision and what will UNICEF's role in that development be. Instead of addressing these vital questions, the document turns in on itself and repeats, verbatim, wording that has already occurred a mere two pages earlier.

7. The document does not link the 'key transformations for the realization on children's rights' with what went before. The reader is suddenly confronted with list of priorities that do not seem to flow from previous analysis and argument. For instance, strengthened families do not feature as part of the 'vision' presented earlier in the document. And it is hard to see why the end of discrimination against women is not part of the key transformations proposed.

8. There is considerable verbatim repetition in sections 4 and 5 and this demonstrates the fact that the document does not develop an argument.

9. The document needs to be much clearer about the distinction between the Global Agenda for Children and UNICEF's agenda. Of course, UNICEF cannot do everything on the Global Agenda, but nobody would expect it to.

10. Many would question whether UNICEF has developed comparative advantage in taking a cross-sectoral and holistic view of children and of the development process. The progress cited in the opening paragraph of the document suggests, rather, that our comparative advantage lies in well-defined, focussed interventions aimed at specific problems, such as immunization, salt iodization, micronutrient deficiencies, safe water and schooling. Significantly, the first paragraph makes no mention of holistic approaches like health sector reform. Even more critically, the list of our comparative advantages overlooks our strengths in mobilising decision-makers and others to solve specific problems

11. It is to be noted that key strategic priorities, such as sustainability, capacity building and empowerment of the poor have been removed from section 7. The document seems to argue that integration and the much discredited notion of participation' are more important than sustainability and empowerment. This is a very superficial attitude towards development.

12. It is difficult to understand why the priority themes for UNICEF advocacy and action are not more closely linked to any situation analysis, our comparative advantage and the Convention on the Rights of the Child. The least one would expect is an identification of articles in the convention which will be given immediate and priority attention. For many in UNICEF, articles 6, 24 and 28 are where we have a cutting edge. We should not forget this or we will spread ourselves too thinly.

We hope these comments will be of use.

Tony

BLANK

UNICEF INTERNATIONAL CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTRE (ICDC)

DISCUSSION NOTE  
ON

"A GLOBAL AGENDA FOR CHILDREN BEYOND YEAR 2000"

This note, prepared by ICDC, is in response to the Discussion Paper with the above title forwarded for comment by Carol Bellamy with her memo dated 23 March. The note begins with general comments on that Paper relating to UNICEF's long-range agenda. The second part includes some more specific suggestions for the actual text of the Discussion Paper.

GENERAL COMMENTS

We found the Discussion Paper useful as a step in the process of developing a "strategic vision" for children and families in a very dynamic global context and for planning UNICEF's evolving role as a major actor in promoting the well-being of children and their fundamental human rights. We won't focus on the many areas where we are in agreement with the Paper but rather touch mainly on points where, in our view, it could be strengthened -- including by being more explicit as to how UNICEF needs to strengthen its own approach to addressing the huge problems and challenges well summarized in the Paper.

Our first suggestion is that human rights/children's rights and the Convention (CRC) should be given more prominence earlier in the Discussion Paper. Since the drafting of the CRC began in 1979 and the Convention was unanimously approved by the General Assembly in 1989, surely this highly successful process deserves a bit more emphasis in the para. on "A decade of progress", as well as in the following para. regarding "global commitments". A note of modesty on UNICEF's part might even be added by recognizing that we were slower than many NGOs and some governments to recognize the extraordinary potential of the CRC and of a human rights approach to UNICEF's work.

The effective implementation of the CRC, in terms of both outcomes and processes, could, furthermore, be listed among the major elements of "unfinished business" (p.2) and surely the main challenge facing UNICEF and its partners for the coming decades. The point needs to be made, moreover, that the most difficult part of the challenge posed by the CRC is not so much the formal "implementation" of this Convention as a legal tool -- often providing ambiguous "standards" -- but rather the development of a broad and coherent social consensus around the human rights of women and children. That process entails a difficult and long-term challenge of changing values, attitudes and behaviour throughout societies. It could be useful to add the point that these fundamental changes are less difficult to make the younger the 'citizen', recognizing thereby early in the document the importance of the principle of the genuine participation of children and youth in forging a new social consciousness regarding the real meaning of human rights and the basic principles underlying the CRC.

With this sort of more 'spirited' introduction to a "human rights approach" to children,

there is then a natural lead-in to the section on p. 4 regarding the "Vision for Children in the 21st Century" and the elements of that vision which are inherent in the normative and ethical framework well provided by the CRC.

Our next main concern is that the section on "Priority Themes" (Section 7, pp.8-13), while comprehensive (providing "something for everyone" from our current and prospective range of activities), does not really prioritize in any useful sense of that term. A liberal reading of that section suggests that we might continue to do virtually everything we have been doing during the past couple of decades (especially under the "themes" of Early Child Care and Development; Learning; Adequate Living Standards; and Gender Equity) and also invite UNICEF to take on three largely new Priority Themes under the banners of Violence and Exploitation; Adolescents; and Children's Participation. This expansive approach, even tempered by the assurance that we will work more closely with our partners (always more easily said than done), is problematic when viewed in the context of UNICEF's stable or declining financial base, especially our General Resources, and certain limitations we face regarding the numbers and quality of our staff.

An effort was made, reflected in the "flagship elements" column on pp.12-13, to be more selective, but the results still represent a formidably broad array of "flagship" priorities. In further refining these "flagship elements", we would suggest that concerted attention be given to strategies for sequencing programme actions -- recalling that one of the "lessons learned" from UNICEF's past is surely the value of strategically designed "entry points": highly visible and achievable actions leading us and our partners into opportunities to address some of the more basic or structural causes of societies' inability to meet the basic needs of children and of the violation of children's rights. The identification of strategic entry points must be a process responsive to locally identified priorities and political 'openings'.

In addition, we would suggest three (inter-related) ways to address the challenge of being more selective or developing more "focus" in UNICEF's future work: (a) recognizing more explicitly that the world is made up of countries which are very different in many respects, including economic, social and cultural differences but also in terms of the extent to which they "need" or can effectively benefit from international co-operation; (b) leaving more decisions about prioritizing themes than is apparent in the Discussion Paper to decentralized decision-making processes, focussed especially on the country level but with stronger analytical support from human and organizational resources at the regional level, in and outside UNICEF, including in other parts of the extended UN family; (c) formulating more thoroughly the ideas in Section 8, pp. 14-15 on UNICEF strategies to make them more finely tuned: allowing for different strategies corresponding to countries in different regions and at distinct levels of development and ability to benefit from various types of outside assistance. (In this regard, major differences might also be cited between countries in chronic emergency vs. non-emergency situations.)

The first point (the world is full of distinctive countries at very different stages of development) is more relevant than ever for UNICEF, and there is very little reference to this diversity in the Discussion Paper. The diversity owes both to UNICEF's broadened geographical agenda (the Convention and UNICEF's mission now being "universal", including industrialized countries) and to the fact that "globalization" in many respects appears to be increasing gaps (especially in the economic, technological and information spheres) among countries as well as among socio-economic groups within countries or



regions. Ideological and political forces linked to these growing gaps may also be producing sharper differences around the world in terms of values, as reflected in various fundamentalist movements. The "human rights approach to UNICEF programming" requires that we no longer ignore value systems that are inimical to the development of the "social consensus" in favour of the rights and women and children. UNICEF's "global agenda" for the years beyond 2000 needs to be sensitive and responsive to all of these growing gaps and differences, be they evident in concrete and measurable outcomes or in the more subtle realm of values, attitudes and behaviour.

The second point (decentralization) follows to some extent from the first one but also appears to be in tune with prevailing thinking about governance and "management excellence" in today's world. Although there is a passing reference to decentralization as an element of the global context (p. 2), the Discussion Paper is virtually silent on decentralization as part of UNICEF's evolving programme strategy. Was that omission intended? In our view, if UNICEF is to have as broad and comprehensive agenda as the Paper outlines, we must leave more decisions about priorities and sequencing of action to decentralized programme management processes, responsive to national social agendas, including those of the civil society. The other side of the coin is that if most country offices feel compelled to undertake action in the full range of areas suggested as "priority themes", we would become spread much too thin in terms of the likely quality and actual impact of the resulting programme actions.

As far as the third point is concerned (the mix of different types of programme activities), we would reclassify the "broad generic strategies" cited in the first paragraph on p. 14, (where they are barely mentioned in passing) as follows:

1. **policy analysis and planning:** a fundamental starting point for a more strategic and rights-oriented process of programming
2. **service delivery:** distinguishing between emergency and non-emergency situations and explicitly recognizing the importance of "services" not just in fulfilling specific rights, e.g., to health, education or special protection, but also as visible entry points for enhancing participatory and empowering development processes
3. **institutional and individual capacity building:** strengthening the capacity of UNICEF and its major international partners, including elsewhere in the UN, but also reflecting an increased concern for national capacity building, including the strengthening of institutions required for enhanced participation and sustainability
4. **advocacy, social mobilization and empowerment:** mentioned last not because it is less important (in fact it is probably UNICEF's most powerful tool) but with the conviction that effective mobilization and empowerment strategies (empowering people, including children, not just their leaders and technocrats) should generally be an outcome of the three previous strategies rather than a premature point of departure (often leading to advocacy or "mobilization" from a paternalistic, top-down and institutionally weak knowledge and action base)

Responding to the major differences around the world (affluent industrialized countries to very resource-poor nations with weak governments and social infrastructure),

UNICEF needs to develop more strategically its mix of these types of activities to take into account comparative needs as well as opportunities and "absorptive capacities".

It could be argued that the "human rights approach to UNICEF programming" requires us to be involved, at a minimum, in advocacy, social mobilization and empowerment initiatives in all countries. We certainly must avoid any appearance of being concerned with violations of children's rights only in low-income developing countries and not in the wealthy nations of the world. In industrialized countries (including the better-off newly industrialized nations) we would rely largely on our National Committee network, duly strengthened in some countries, and in closer and more respectful partnership with NGOs, the media and others, for our advocacy and empowerment initiatives.. The extent to which we become involved in the other three types of activities will need to depend on a series of factors on both the "supply" and "demand" side: needs/opportunities as well as human, financial and organizational resources at UNICEF's disposal to address those needs and challenges. For work in children's rights in the better-off countries, we need to explicitly recognize that the challenge for us lies more in deploying highly skilled and professional human resources than in mobilizing additional financing.

It is our view that in all developing countries where we have regular country programmes, UNICEF should be engaged in the policy analysis and social/economic planning process (Activity 1 on the previous page) as it relates to the well-being of disadvantaged children and their families. It is appropriate that these policy-related activities focus on the "priority themes" outlined in the Discussion Paper (though probably not on all of them at once, in the same country). We shouldn't lose sight, however, of the inter-relationship among these themes especially when it comes to policy formulation. Policy issues concerning "violence and exploitation" and "gender equity", for example, cannot be neatly separated from policy issues in the theme areas of "learning" and "early childhood development and care". Particularly when it comes to questions of how to mobilize additional national resources to address problems in any of these theme areas, UNICEF and its partners need to become (or remain) engaged in the arena of fiscal policy and public/private expenditure patterns and potentials in order to help devise feasible resource mobilization and utilization strategies.

By becoming engaged in serious policy analysis and the policy formulation process we help make sure that we avoid the "artificial sectoral or isolated project" approach to which reference is made in the Discussion Paper (p. 15). An intelligent policy-oriented approach must be strategic, oriented towards the longer-run context (where UNICEF is often weak), and aimed (especially in less developed countries) at strengthening national and local capacities as part of a deliberate development process -- as opposed to "assistance" to help fill gaps without addressing the major challenges of national capacity building, popular participation and empowerment. Increasingly, for UNICEF, this development process must also be "rights-oriented" -- especially in the sense of being concerned with more empowering and participatory approaches, including children and youth, and explicitly addressing issues of disparities, discrimination and ethical values, including respectful social inclusion and equity. This broad and strategic approach in itself is a challenging new mission for UNICEF -- quite apart from the "themes" on which we choose to concentrate our attention.

One consequence of adopting this strategic process-oriented "policy approach" is that it forces us to assess not just our Priority Themes but also Priority Processes: a two-grid

approach to policy and programme development. We need to take a hard look at how UNICEF works not just on what we work. In order to be effective in a sustainable manner, furthermore, either in traditional fields such as health and nutrition or newer areas such as violence/exploitation or participation, we must be good at "project development" and "target setting" but more importantly in our co-operation with rights-oriented situation analyses, policy planning, capacity building, implementation and monitoring of programmes, and more strategic evaluations (i.e., learning from past experiences and assessing, documenting and disseminating good practices).

This two-grid policy approach is sufficiently demanding that we find it unlikely that UNICEF could manage in any one country a truly developmental and rights-oriented approach in each of the seven Priority Theme areas described in the Discussion Paper (recalling that several of them are extremely broad to start with, such as "Adequate Living Standards", "Learning" and "Adolescents"). We would suggest, at the country level, that UNICEF focus on three or four of these themes, approaching them with the right (longer-term, developmental) processes, rather than to try to do a bit of everything in each country. In this way, we could avoid problems UNICEF has encountered in the past, for example, in overly sectoral and vertical approaches to child health or in some traditional "pre-school training" approaches to early childhood development which have not served to address longer-run objectives of capacity-generation, sustainability and empowerment.

#### MORE SPECIFIC SUGGESTIONS FOR THE TEXT

The following suggestions are simply in the order they come up in the text of the Discussion Paper:

Page 4 (10th line): The phrase "full potential in health, learning and earning" is not especially felicitous; we suggest using a phrase based more on the language in Arts. 27, 29 or 32 of the CRC: "...their full potential in terms of their health as well as their physical, mental, spiritual, moral and social development."

Page 5 (line 7 from bottom): Since "tolerance" seems to have an ambiguous ring for some readers, a phrase might be added (or as a substitute for "tolerance"): "... respect for the inherent dignity of each person" (a phrase used in the "Guiding Principles section of the 17 April document on "A Human Rights Approach to UNICEF Programming for Children and Women")<sup>1</sup>

Page 6 (line 2): We have had a lively debate around the phrase "...the state is the effective guarantor of human rights and of access to a basic set of public goods." Perhaps part of the problem stems from the inclusion of the ambiguous phrase "effective guarantor". State Parties to international conventions assume certain formal obligations specified in those treaties including for promoting compliance throughout society. We need, nevertheless, to recognize more explicitly that by and large States (and governments) do not effectively guarantee human rights and, increasingly, they are backing away from the notion of reaching

---

<sup>1</sup>We suggest that a number of appropriate cross references to these important Guidelines be included in the Discussion Paper.

much beyond a very narrow definition of "public goods" they must provide. The role of the State "continues to be key" in theory (and that comforting assurance appears twice on page 6), but we must face the fact that actual practice, including in terms of resource availability, is increasingly at odds with the theory of the role of the State and its basic responsibilities to its citizens.

Page 6, Section 5: As this section is further developed, as indicated, it would appear to be one good place to recognize the importance not only of a "Global Agenda" but also of more finely tuned and responsive local, national and regional agendas for children (in line with our General Comments, above, regarding diversity in the world and the need for more decentralized planning (and therefore agenda-setting) in UNICEF.

Page 7 (line 8 from bottom): We feel that the reference to UNICEF's "effective track record" when it comes to our work "in sensitive areas and on gross violations of child rights" is overstated. It should be recognized that UNICEF is still a relative newcomer to work on some human rights issues that are politically sensitive. This might also be the place to work in the phrase about our need to become a more constructively "critical partner" of government -- a role we have historically shied away from, with a few notable exceptions. A specific reference here to our need for closer and mutually respectful collaboration with other parts of the 'international community' concerned with human rights might be useful.

Pages 8-11 (Section 7): The order of these seven themes might well be reconsidered (again without the suggestion that they must be priorities for all countries at all times). Partly reflecting the fact that Art.6, "the inherent right to life", is so basic and one of the four "founding principles" of the CRC, it could be useful to show as the first "priority theme" one entitled "Survival and adequate living standards", to be followed by "Early child development and care" and then "Learning". One way or the other, if only by editing the wording for the theme "Adequate living standards", the child's fundamental right to survival should not be neglected.

Pages 13-14 (Table): As suggested in our General Comments, there are too many "Flagship Elements" for this list to represent a "Global Agenda" of "high profile/achievable goals", especially in the short-term. If more choices regarding strategic "entry points" are left to decision-making at the country and regional levels, the list becomes more indicative rather than a set of global commitments. For example, female genital mutilation might be a powerful entry point, in terms of gross violations of girl's rights, in some African settings but irrelevant in many other countries. We would rather see some more general cross-cultural themes (such as male roles -- a significant problem everywhere in the world) highlighted as global "flagship" elements. Similarly, children's effective participation in schools (and more generally in learning processes) could be a very broadly agreed "flagship" element, even though it appears in the table only as a "long-term commitment". Another approach would be to have a general "Key Component" (long-term commitment) such as "Combating Violence/Exploitation", while leaving the specific targets of types of violence and associated short-term goals to more decentralized decision-making.

\*\*\*\*\*

We hope these comments are helpful. We very much appreciated the opportunity to

participate in the review of this important Discussion Paper and look forward to receiving the next and/or final version.

Florence, 15 May 1998

Blank

# A Global Agenda for Children Beyond 2000

## The Supply Division View

The draft paper dated 23 March has been discussed by managers and staff in the Supply Division. Overall, it is considered focused and provides a clear and manageable agenda for the Organization.

1) In terms of our view of the world, also in terms of priority themes and major UNICEF strategies, we feel that the role of supply is insufficient. The link between the unavailability of affordable essential supplies and poverty needs to be emphasized:

EXAMPLES: Imported school materials comprise 32% of all public and private spending on primary schooling in Burkina Faso and come from household budgets;

Uniforms comprise 39% of all public and private spending on primary schooling in Myanmar and come from household budgets;

Low income households in Nepal spend 6.9% of their annual expenditure on treatment of illness, mainly drugs, while middle income households spend 3.8% and high income households 2.7%.

Households in Kinshasa spend on average the equivalent of US\$99 annually on drugs, sprays, nets and other goods for the prevention and treatment of malaria;

24.3% of households in poor counties of China are in debt due to medical expenses, mainly drugs - 47% of these do not have sufficient food.

We suggest that references in the paper (under global challenges, priority themes and major UNICEF strategies) to "essential services" be changes to "essential services and supplies". Households/families do not necessarily obtain essential supplies through essential services. Thus, we see the fundamental pillars of the UNICEF supply function to be:

- \* Monitoring the availability of and access to essential supplies (defined in our context as vaccines, medical supplies and cold chain equipment, drugs, micronutrients, therapeutic foods, school supplies and textbook production, water equipment and sanitation supplies, and household products such as bednets);
- \* Supporting technically the strengthening of national supply systems, including an increased focus on local governments and other systems used by poor households;
- \* Offering our procurement services to help governments with the provision of essential supplies;

- \* Directly providing programmes with essential supplies.

These four represent the "supply transition" - in reverse order, moving from the direct provision of supplies to supporting national systems to monitoring the availability of essential supplies.

2) In terms of the UNICEF comparative advantage (although it needs to be said - compared to whom?):

We suggest that the clear advantages expressed under "7.5. Adequate Living Standards" should be elevated to the earlier discussion of our advantage as an Organization, specifically:

- \* Field-level presence and global expertise in the areas of basic health, education, nutrition, water and environmental sanitation;
- \* Experience in promoting and testing community-based approaches and strategies;
- \* Ability to form alliances and to advocate effectively for children based on practical field action;
- \* Procurement and supply facilities that enable essential supplies to be provided to field programmes and emergencies.

(We did notice under 7.5, UNDP and the World Bank. This is the only mention of specific partners and others absent, such as WHO, is noticeable - generic references would be better).

3) In terms of the world according to UNICEF, we have one or two observations:

We welcome very much the focus on family, but suggest that the paper recognizes more specifically than it does families headed-by-children and families headed-by-women, as these are those most in poverty and least able to resolve the problems they face.

We suggest also a greater focus on "social orphans" (children that are not necessarily real orphans, but who roam urban streets and rural areas basically without the context of family, which has in some form or another become dysfunctional) - the repercussions on next generations of children will be enormous, as these "orphans" have no family model on which to base their adulthood.

We believe the challenge to UNICEF of increasingly "targeting" individuals and specific families (social orphans, HIV-infected pregnant women, sexually-abused children, child-headed households...), as opposed to groups of some kind, has not been sufficiently stressed, and we suggest the logistics of approaches in this context be carefully considered. Much of UNICEF's future credibility may lie in this, especially in terms of ensuring every child can attain their rights.

We are acutely aware that technology is rapidly changing the world, and we suggest that



the paper reflects a UNICEF view of how new technologies (vaccines, communication, computers) may support the agenda beyond 2000.

We suggest that more emphasis be put on community approaches, where UNICEF has much experience and advantage.

supdiv/26.5.98

BLANK