CF Item = Barcode Top - Note at Bottom =
CF_Item_One_BC5-Top-Sign

Page 5
Dat 8/2/2002
Time 11:19:18 AM
Login wbq

CF/RAI/NYHQ/SP/SSC/2002-01064

Full Item Register Number [auto] **CF/RAI/NYHQ/SP/SSC/2002-01064**

Ext Ref: Doc Series/Year/Number **SP/SSC/WSC-000.26**

Record Item Title

**A Synthesis of Views - Reference Book: Preparatory & Reference Documentation on the World Summit for Children (1990: July); Special Session for Children**

| Date Created / on Correspondence | Date Registered | Date Closed |
|---|---|---|
| 7/1/1990 | 12/28/2001 | |

| | |
|---|---|
| Primary Contact | Rijuta Tooker (Temp Assist) |
| Owner Location | Special Session & Global Movement For Chil = |
| Home Location | Special Session & Global Movement For Chil = |
| Current Location | CF/RAF/USAA/DB01/2002-04904 > Special Session & Gl |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| File Container Record ID | CF/RAF/USAA/DB01/2002-04904 |
| File Container Record (Title) | Reference Book: Preparatory & Reference Documentation on the World |

| N1: Number of pages | N2: Doc Year | N3: Document Number |
|---|---|---|
| 0 | 0 | 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**

DOS File Name

Electronic Details **No Document**

Alt Bar code = RAMP-TRIM Record Number **CF/RAI/NYHQ/SP/SSC/2002-01064**

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 | | 26 |

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

**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 de 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

# unicef ⊕

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

| To | : Mr. Sadig Rasheed | From | : Denis Caillaux |
| | Director, Programme Division | | Director |
| | UNICEF New York | | UNICEF Brussels Office |
| | | | |
| Fax : 1-212-824 64 70 | | Fax : + (32 2) 231 14 25 | |
| | | Phone : + (32 2) 230 56 16 | |
| Date: 26 May 1998 | | Internet: DCAILLAUX@UNICEF.CH | |

| Ref : DC/8309 MOST URGENT, pl. |
| Subject: 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,

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 achievemenet 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 rigourous 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")[1]

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

---

[1]We suggest that a number of appropriate cross references to these important Guidelines by 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