

HUMANITARIAN INNOVATION FUND

Final Report

Organisation Name	CMPR, Swansea University (Lead Applicant) in partnership with Save the Children, UNHCR and GIZ
--------------------------	--

Project Title	Innovation through refugee children's participation
Problem Addressed / Thematic Focus	Lack of refugee children's participation in protection. Protection processes do not meet the needs of children.
Location	Kyaka II Refugee Settlement, Uganda
Start Date	1 Apr-end Sept (no cost extension to end Nov) 2012
Duration	6 months (extended to 8).
Total Funding Requested	£7,003

Partner(s)	UNHCR, Save the Children, GIZ staff time. UNHCR Small Grant for first month's research in field £3,202.
Total Funding	£7,003

Innovation Stage	Invention
Type of Innovation	Process
Project Impact Summary	A range of benefits for the refugee children involved and their communities. Skills and capacity building for refugee incentive workers and NGO protection staff. Changes in attitudes and practices of humanitarian staff in relation to children. An alternative pathway through the refugee protection process for children, based on the ideas of refugee children and humanitarian practitioners, ready to be further tested and evaluated in practice.

Reporting Period	April 1st – November 30th 2012
Total Spent	£7,003

ACTIVITIES CARRIED OUT

Interim Report submitted (**attached**) outlines project activity April 1st - 30th June 2012. Activities 1st July - 30th November include:

1. Webinar for project partners - 6th September. Staff from UNHCR and Save the Children attended; HIF team supported. Focus: research methods, children's protection problems and alternative (innovative?) refugee protection process.

2. Field visit - 20th September - 20th October. Main aim: to gain feedback from all main stakeholders, including refugee children, on any areas of innovation for the refugee protection process arising out of the previous period of research.

Activities included:

- Participatory feedback workshops with 6 groups of refugee children (6-16 years) who were involved in the previous period of research.
- Presentation and feedback meetings with (1) OPM Protection and Community Services staff, Kampala and (2) OPM, GIZ and UNHCR staff in Kyaka II. Discussed findings and implementation / application.
- Evaluation and debrief meeting with refugee support workers / translators.
- Individual follow-up meetings with 7 staff from GIZ and UNHCR (including field managers) – their feedback on previous research, any impact / change since, what could be implemented in the future.
- Information from research contributed to participatory protection assessment with UNHCR, GIZ, OPM in Kyaka II for 2012.

3. Workshop - 28th November at Swansea University. Targeted practitioners and academics working on: child participation, child protection and refugee children. Presented findings and explored potential for innovation development.

ACHIEVEMENTS

- All planned activities completed. Additional activity e.g. second field visit to check research findings with stakeholders.
- Confirmation of 'problem' statement through consultation with children and practitioners i.e. lack of child participation in the refugee protection process and procedures not child friendly.
- Collection of ideas to support a process innovation: a more child friendly, child specific, participatory refugee protection process for children. Further confirmation of ideas and 'voting' on priorities via follow-up visit. Development of a 'model' for an alternative process, drawing on ideas (**See: Webinar presentation on alternative model, online HIF profile**).
- Indication that delivering refugee protection process in these ways to children could be more effective (e.g. in terms of disclosure of protection information currently missed), better quality (e.g. children's experience in a comfortable, safe space with fuller understanding of what is happening) and socially better (links between older and younger children, development of personal and social skills, psycho-social benefits) and efficient (e.g. protection interview using more child friendly methods took the same time as 'standard' protection interview, gave more information

and was a better process for the child). Need to do further work to more fully pilot and evaluate the suggested ideas for change.

- Engagement of refugee children (6-16 years) in the innovation process – gathered range of ideas and suggestions from children – and learning on what methods work best to enable this.
 - Some small-scale implementation of ideas e.g. decorated interview room as child friendly space; developed child friendly information on the refugee protection process; provided of play resource boxes. **See: both of these reported in blogs on HIF online profile:**
http://www.humanitarianinnovation.org/sites/default/files/anna_a2_poster_6_6_12.pdf
<http://www.humanitarianinnovation.org/blog/CMPR/finishing-field-activities>
-

METHODOLOGY

1. Participatory Workshops

- Some individual games did not work / were not understood by certain groups or too 'young' for older children and were substituted or adapted accordingly. Good to be flexible in approach.
- Overall, participatory, activity / game based methods worked well. Children enjoyed the workshops and thought these methods were a good way to work with children and to get their ideas. **See project films: *What did you enjoy? And: Is this a good way? showing feedback on methods from refugee children engaged in workshops:***
<http://www.humanitarianinnovation.org/projects/small-grants/CMPR/films>
- Refugee support workers / translators commented on the effectiveness of these methods for children: *'Children in the camps are very shy and don't have the chance to talk to adults. Appreciate your way to use games and pictures – without that, you would not get any information from them.'*
- Drawing worked well; produced an additional dimension to children's views of protection problems and innovative solutions. It helped to jog younger children's memories. Role play also very effective.
- Filming children's views and feedback and photos for documentation of ideas worked well.
- A rich and varied bank of information was collated through these methods and children also benefited in a range of ways from the process (**see section on impacts below**).

2. Semi-structured Interviews

- Adults understood the questions and responded well to the format of semi-structured interviews, allowing some supplementary questions to be asked or tailoring the interview to their particular role and areas of expertise. Interviews were shorter than expected but all areas covered.

3. Observation

- A lot of additional and very useful information gained by observation e.g. of interviews with children or how staff interacted with children day-to-day.

This would not have come out from the two methods used above and was useful for cross-checking against information from the above.

MAJOR OBSTACLES

- Interim Report outlines obstacles and how addressed April-June 2012.
 - These obstacles were not encountered during the follow-up field visit in September e.g. adequate venues were known; the researcher was well-known and trusted by practitioners. The follow up visit itself helped to tackle the previously noted obstacle of not having sufficient time to process and analyse findings and report back to all stakeholders in the field. This was the main purpose of the return visit.
 - Project environment was very supportive – refugees and practitioners in field and senior managers at strategic level. For both visits to the field, the researcher was able to conduct all workshops and interviews that had been planned.
 - Time for practitioners to step outside of day-to-day programme work and feed into workshops or interviews was always an (understandable) issue. Further thought would need to be given to this if the project was scaled up.
-

BENEFICIARIES/HUMANITARIAN INTERVENTIONS IMPACTED

1. Refugee Children

- Rewards and recognition in workshops - *'If you give a child a certificate, it's better than giving him money – it can help him in the future.'*
- Recognition from community and organisations – *'...sometimes they feel like they are ignored by some organisations, but with this project they were recognised and knew how they should be treated in the community.'*
- Benefited from methods / activities / approach used in workshops - *'Through the games they were able to expose their feelings and also to explain their problems.'*
- Information and support gained through workshops - *'Through drawing pictures...they have understood and learned the procedure'* and: *'...children were able to know where they can go when they have problems, feel unsafe.'*
- Contact and information sharing with other refugee children – first time unaccompanied children brought together as groups.
- **See project films (link above) for what children felt they benefited from.**

2. Refugee Community

- Parents see benefits for children - someone *'going into the villages'* to talk to children and to *'take their problems'* – *'they are appreciating your work.'*
- Community attitudes changed - *'Now children are known in the community as those who are having problems...after the workshop we did and*

children was telling them what they have learned - now they are concerned...now they know children also should be given time to talk...'

- Community sensitisation / learning about child rights - *'Children could go back and they could teach their fellow children what they learned and different games and mostly communities could know that children have their rights and they have some organisations which could care for them and listen to their views..'*

3. Refugee Project Workers

- Work experience, training, certificates and written testimonies of contribution to project as well as play resource kits to support future work.
- Increased understanding of children's issues - *'I heard a lot from children when they had just arrived in camp and the challenges they face.'*
- Participatory methods for working with children - *'I have gained the way I can talk to the children...steps I can follow to get the information. Now I have skill and knowledge how I can plan and help my community to know the problems and views from children.'*
- Improved relationship with children - *'Helping us to extend, to bring us closer to children. Children see us – they no longer fear us.'*
- **See Project Worker profiles – project benefits as they see them:**
<http://www.humanitarianinnovation.org/http%3A/www.humanitarianinnovation.org/projects/small-grants/CMPR/Refugee-workers>

4. Humanitarian Practice (UNHCR, GIZ, OPM)

- Changed perspectives and attitudes - *'an eye opener'*.
- Training for staff / development of skills – *'knowing how to work with children and learning what children think of us and improving on learning methods.'*
- Making spaces more child friendly e.g. interview room - *'had several interviews in there and children busy looking around at pictures; for staff it is the best interview room...helped children to start talking, open up.'*
- Identification of gaps in protection to be addressed – GIZ developed a protection plan based on research findings and research fed into UNHCR participatory protection assessment exercise for 2012.
- Change in practice – *'seen change in partners and the way they approach children...at least 2 members of staff. Saw during the verification exercise... talked to the children separately from the adults. Very positive thing and due to [your] feedback to staff and as a result of the research.'*
- Awareness and action for children - *'Refugee children got solution to their problem, more especially those staying in the Reception Centre complained their roof was leaking but a few days later it was repaired, toilets were improved.'*
- Commitments to short-term change at field level – list of immediate actions from staff e.g. children only sensitisation in Reception Centre. Advocacy for longer-term change e.g. child protection post in Kyaka II.
- Products - at field level (play resources, child friendly poster) and strategic level (quick reference note for UNHCR on child friendly procedures).

- **See: notes from feedback sessions with OPM Kampala (19th Oct) and Kyaka II staff (17th Oct); notes from one-to-one feedback meetings with protection practitioners.**
-

PARTNERSHIPS AND COLLABORATION

Save the Children initial host for fieldwork for the project in Dadaab. Due to insecurity in Dadaab, an alternative field location had to be found. UNHCR assisted with this: Kyaka II Refugee Settlement in Uganda was identified. GIZ, as main implementing partner for protection in Kyaka II, became new project host. UNHCR, Save the Children and GIZ remained strong partners throughout. OPM (Ugandan Government) was a key partner on the ground and remains so in terms of any implementation of changes in refugee protection.

DISSEMINATION

- Online HIF project profile – varied submissions including photos, films, feedback from refugees, blogs and links to papers based on the research.
 - Webinar (September) – recorded and put on HIF project online profile.
 - Workshop at Swansea University (November) – attendance from academics (London, Lancaster), UNHCR and Save the Children UK.
 - Presentation to Child Protection Working Group, Geneva (October) – 100+ practitioners, range of organisations and global reach.
 - Presentations / webinars to UNHCR (Geneva) and field staff (global) (October) and input into UNHCR documents e.g. quick reference guide.
 - UNHCR *New Issues in Refugee Research* (July) paper submitted on fieldwork in Kyaka II.
 - Presentation at Museum of Childhood Studies (London) (November) event on refugee children's participation in research. Range of UK based academics and practitioners in audience.
-

TRANSFERABILITY

- The components of the refugee protection process – arrival and reception, registration, Refugee Status Determination, Best Interests Determination – are common to all refugee contexts including camps, settlements and urban, as well as protracted and rapid onset environments.
- This project makes some suggestions re: how these can be done differently – an alternative model for children – and there is scope for further developing, implementing and evaluating this in practice in a range of pilot contexts (**See: participant comments notes from Webinar**).
- Senior level staff at UNHCR have expressed interest in building on the findings of the research e.g. RSD in urban context.
- Research relevant to policy at global level. UNHCR's *Framework for the Protection of Children* (2012) prioritises children's participation in their protection and child friendly protection procedures.

- Links with refugee protection in UK and European contexts – UNHCR in UK about to launch three-year project on more child friendly and participatory protection processes for children.
- Key partners in place to support development and implementation of innovation. Already discussed potential submission to Large HIF Grant in 2013 (**See: notes from CMPR Workshop 28th Nov**).