



Guidance for Producing Localisation Dashboard for child protection coordination groups

Background:

The Protection and Education Clusters are seeking to meet the commitments made in regards to localisation and are keen to ensure and increase local actor engagement in both field coordination mechanisms and global strategic decision making. This work is being led by the Child Protection Area of Responsibility, as outlined in the Concept Note circulated on 11 July 2017. To guide this work, the CP AoR is examining the extent to which local actors are currently engaged in child protection responses. This will be done through both an analysis of existing data (from this dashboard) and additional in-country research in selected countries.

Purpose of the Dashboard:

The dashboard is designed to support child protection coordination groups in the following ways:

- To develop a baseline from existing data, to track progress over time
- To sensitise coordinators and child protection coordination groups members to issues of localisation.
- To provide a basis for a more informed discussion within child protection coordination groups, as the HRP strategy is developed and throughout the year as progress is tracked

Instructions for Producing Dashboard

For 2017, all child protection coordination groups are encouraged to develop a dashboard prior to the Global Coordinator's Retreat, based on the example prepared in South Sudan. This data should be readily available from existing IMS or previous analyses.

Completed dashboards or requests for support or clarification should be sent to the Global Helpdesk (cp-aor@unicef.org).

Following the Retreat, Coordinators and IMOs will be encouraged to present the Dashboard to both their SAG, broader membership, and the management of the Cluster Lead Agency UNICEF, to stimulate discussion and promote evidence informed decision-making as part of the child protection coordination group's –within the Protection Cluster's- HRP strategy development.

Dimension	Graph/Diagram	Source	Possible Discussion Questions
			The over-arching question is <i>“bearing in mind our collective commitment to the spirit of the Grand Bargain (as local as possible, as international as necessary) do we have the balance right?”</i>
Governance and Decision Making	Leadership/Co-Leadership Arrangements	Direct from child protection coordination group team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has local leadership/co-leadership been considered? • What would be the conditions needed to achieve local (co)leadership? • Is there a strategy in place (even long term) to support this transition? • Is there a SAG in place and how could it be supported to make localisation-sensitive decisions? (# of women / # of men on the SAG)
Influence and Participation	Pie Chart on Membership	5Ws Meeting minutes CCPM reports or similar evaluation process & report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are all the relevant local members engaged in the coordination group? (including Private Sector, Universities etc)? • If not, what steps could be taken to reach out to these potential members? • Are all local members accessing relevant information? If not, what steps need to be taken (e.g. translation, alternatives to email, facilitating transport)? • Are all members (both female and male) able to participate and speak during meetings? Are other forums necessary to ensure their views regarding CP are influencing discussions?
Partnerships	Children Targeted and Reached	HRP (for target) 5Ws (for reach)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who is carrying out service delivery? What are the implications of this? • Is our membership and decision-making processes appropriate for our service delivery model?
	Project Impl. Partners	Review of HRP project sheets	
Funding	Funding Requested vs Received	HRP (for requested); received may need to be done by multiple sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who is receiving funding? Is this an appropriate profile/balance when looking at the burden of service delivery, capacity etc? • Are approved local partners being funded through the CHF and pooled mechanisms; what other sources of funding are available/not being utilised? • What steps could be taken to encourage greater funding to local partners (advocacy etc)? • Is the CP allocation within the PC appropriate, given the PiN, capacity and reach/results?
	Sources of Funding	5Ws	
	% PC request allocated to CP	HRP (for funding requested); Allocation to CP may need to be done by qualitative review	
Institutional Capacity	Capacity Building Activities	5Ws Training Reports CP Coordination Group Training and/or Work Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are institutional capacity building opportunities being planned and provided? • How could we capture this in our 5Ws? • Is there a long term, comprehensive institutional capacity strategy for our local partners and is this reflected in the HRP?

The following is drawn from the Concept Note - Accelerating progress towards locally-led coordination of protection responses and outlines some of the actions that country coordination groups could take or promote, to increase localisation.

Localisation Dimension		Possible Actions that could be implemented at country level (pending resources and commitment) to be supported with learning activities, mentoring and guidance development from CP AoR
Governance and Decision-Making	This includes having equitable opportunities to play leadership and co-leadership roles; and have a seat at the table when strategic decisions are made.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment of SAG with local representation • Co-leadership with national actors • Develop guidance on working with governments, including longer term, transitional arrangements
Participation and Influence	Local actors need equitable access to information on coverage, results etc; the capacity to analyse this information; and the skills to effectively and credibly convey their thoughts and ideas to influence those making decisions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant data included in 3W/5W dashboards • Translation of key documents and messages; alternative communication channels for partners in remote locations (e.g. WhatsApp, SMS, phone calls) • Expand membership to include non-traditional local actors (universities, private sector, diaspora) • Promoting the application of the Principles of Partnership within the coordination group
Partnerships	Partnerships must make a philosophical and practical transition from sub-contracting to more equitable and transparent relationships, including recognising the value of non-monetary contributions by local actors (networks, knowledge).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocating monetary values to non-financial national actor contributions • Joint workplans, M&E and risk assessments and honest feedback mechanisms • Encourage Non-financial partnerships – e.g. coaching, embedding staff in local organisations etc • Amending HPC documents to allow for non-monetary partnerships to be reflected (e.g. in project sheets, partnership agreements) • Support development of institutional strategic plans, so programme design is led by national actors and partnerships support a coherent organizational strategy
Funding	Local actors should receive a greater share of the humanitarian resources, including more opportunities to access direct funding.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase small scale partnerships (requiring willingness to invest in greater transaction costs for funding partners) • Embed expert staff in local organisations to reduce risk and enable larger grants • Reverse funding flow - provide funding to local actors, to engage international support
Institutional Capacity	Local actors continue to request more support for their operational functions, in order to scale up effectively.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase access for both female and male colleagues to institutional capacity building (e.g. partnerships with private sector/university focused, secondments to/from local actors) • Amend IM systems to capture institutional capacity building