



## **Assessing and Monitoring Child Friendly Communities and Cities**

### **Supporting advocacy and capacity building in local governance**

Workshop report and Update on the Child Friendly Cities Research

Prepared by Children's Environments Research Group (CERG)  
and the Innocenti Research Centre (IRC)



December 2009

## Table of Contents

I.	Introduction .....	3
II.	Update on the CFC research initiative .....	4
III.	Summary of the key outcomes and recommendations of the CFC workshop .....	6
IV.	Report of the individual sessions .....	8
1.	Opening and welcome remarks .....	8
2.	Meeting the cities .....	8
3.	State of Child Friendly Cities and Communities monitoring and assessment mechanisms .....	10
4.	Piloting the community assessment tools: feedback from the Philippines and Brazil .....	11
5.	Working groups .....	13
6.	Using the assessment toolkit – the process Step-by-step .....	16
7.	Organising and presenting indicators through DevInfo .....	18
8.	Documenting and reporting .....	19
V.	Final discussions and conclusions .....	20
	APPENDICES .....	21
1.	AGENDA .....	21
2.	LIST OF PARTICIPANTS .....	25

*This report provides a summary of the main points of discussion, conclusions and recommendations of the Child Friendly Cities research workshop that took place in Rome on November 25-27, 2009. Furthermore, it includes a brief update on the research initiative.*

*Special thanks to the Italian Committee for UNICEF that co-hosted the workshop in Rome; in particular, many thanks to Christoph Baker from the National Committee, who helped with the logistics.*

## **I. Introduction**

Child Friendly Cities (CFC) are cities of different sizes that are committed both at the community level and within and the municipal administration to become a place “fit” for children by fulfilling their rights. In the last two decades, cities and communities have experimented different ways of meeting the CRC obligations by promoting a wide variety of initiatives addressing children’s rights. The CFC Initiative was launched in 1996 at the UN Conference of Human Settlements (Habitat II) in Istanbul, to orient and strengthen a common voice advocating for the role of local authorities in the implementation of children’s rights and for ensuring that children are heard in decision making processes. Throughout the years, there has been a continuously increasing interest in Child Friendly Cities, which is rooted in several factors such as the high pace of urbanization, a world-wide trend of governmental decentralization, a recognition of the effectiveness of community initiatives toward the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and the need for a rights-based, integrated approach that stimulates participatory civic engagement in the enhancement and realization of children’s rights at the local level. Gradually, there has been recognition that communities should be explicitly acknowledged under the CFC label.

In the year 2000, a Secretariat of the Initiative was established at the Innocenti Research Centre in Florence to provide a reference point and hub for knowledge management within the CFC Movement. Based on the documentation of a wide variety of experiences, in 2004, the Secretariat produced the “Framework of Action” which highlights nine key components that feature the process toward becoming “child friendly”.

After more than a decade, there is a renewed interest in CFC to accelerate the implementation of the UN CRC at the local level, including through community and children’s involvement, to build on and promote decentralisation efforts. Within UNICEF, the Medium Term Strategic Plan (MTSP 2006-2011, now extended to 2013) acknowledges the role of local authorities in providing a systematic response to the need of children in deprived urban contexts and recommends strengthening partnership with them to promote Child Friendly Cities.

In 2008, in a Consultation held in Geneva, and organized by UNICEF, researchers and practitioners recognized an increased need of communities and cities for evidence- based assessment including tools/instruments that allow them to comprehensively and systematically assess their situation through a participatory approach and to subsequently monitor their improvement on this basis.

To help bridge this gap a Child Friendly Cities research initiative was undertaken by the Innocenti Research Centre, in partnership with Childwatch International, a network of research institutions involved with children's rights, and with other offices of UNICEF, including the Adolescent Development and Participation Section in UNICEF headquarters. The research is being coordinated jointly by IRC and the Children's Environments Research Group (CERG) based at the City University of New York. The Bernard Van Leer Foundation is helping support the initiative.

## II. Update on the CFC research initiative

The Child Friendly Cities and Communities Research Initiative aims to improve the conditions of children living in urban settings by enabling communities and cities to **better assess the degree to which they are fulfilling children's rights** and to **look self-critically at the governance structures and processes that are designed to support families and their children**. Concretely, the research is intended to yield a package of participatory tools which, through a comprehensive set of rights-based indicators, will contribute to expanding the breadth and quality of data on children's conditions and will improve the cities' and communities' assessment and monitoring capacities. The tools are universal templates designed to be adapted to the specificity of different local contexts. There are two main components, for assessing: a) the nature and degree of cities' and communities' child-friendliness (community tools); b) the appropriateness of local government structures and processes to the fulfilment of children's rights (governance tools).

The tools will enable action research at both the community and municipal level. The community assessment and monitoring tools will enable residents of all ages, including children, together with community service providers, to engage in an informed reflective process, leading to local planning and advocacy for children. The governance tools will support local government officials in the review of municipal policies, structures and processes for children and families. A key component of the work is the strengthening of CFC networks to collect, analyze and disseminate the knowledge generated and for the joint development of the tools.

So far, the research has completed a number of steps:

- Formation of a **consultative group of researchers** and practitioners which serves as an advisory group for the research initiative by providing guidance to the methodology and tools and exchanging good practices and lessons learned. The network has been consulted and will continue being involved in providing input on the tools and the process itself.
- **Critical review of existing approaches, tools and instruments** for assessing and monitoring the fulfilment of children's rights at the local. The review was analyzed at the experts' consultation held in The Hague in November 2008.
- **Design of the research methodology and of innovative tools**, based on the critical review. CERG with IRC's collaboration and the involvement of the consultative group produces a modular set of tools to be adapted locally.

- **Pilot testing in two select countries and modification of core tools:** piloting in two countries (The Philippines and Brazil) has allowed for refinement of the tools before applying them in all countries. The lessons learnt have enriched the tools to best fit the target groups. A preparatory workshop for piloting was held in Brazil on March 19-21, 2009.
- **Collaboration with DevInfo,** a database system established by the UN to monitor progress on MDGs, to enable mapping of child friendly data. This collaboration will be on going through the process.

Based on the pilot tests they have been refined as needed and will now be put to use in a wider range of cities and communities in 10 countries. These reflect a variety of contexts in terms of location, setting and size: Brazil, The Philippines, the Dominican Republic, Russia, Jordan, Sudan, South Africa, France, Italy and Spain.

UNICEF Country Offices and National Committees will coordinate with selected municipalities and support a local research teams to carry out the assessment from January to July 2010. To support the research process locally, the workshop “*Assessing child friendly cities and communities – Supporting advocacy and capacity building in local governance*” was organized and included teams from the countries participating in the research. Its main objective was to ensure a common understanding of the assessment toolkit and of the research protocol, in addition enriching the research process and to facilitating the exchange of experiences with regard to practices, including in monitoring and assessment. The main outcomes, conclusions and recommendations of the workshop are summarised in this report.

During the implementation of the research, technical assistance will be provided by IRC and CERG to ensure the effective conduct of the process. An interactive website will be launched in the month of December to encourage learning and exchange of experiences, as well as monitoring, among all the countries and cities involved. The wiki will also be a tool to channel requests of assistance regarding the research or other CFC-related issues.

Once the research is completed in loco and local reports have been completed (July 2010), findings will be analysed by the IRC and CERG team and will be compiled to be disseminated. The findings include: a) a research protocol, including a set of indicators, for community and cities to self-assess their degree of child friendliness; b) description of mechanisms used by local governance structures in the self-assessment process, including a critical analysis of the ways of working at both the community and local government levels; and c) data on the situation of children in participating cities.

#### *The toolkit*

The toolkit currently includes the following items:

- Community tools addressed to:
  - Children (aged 8-12)
  - Adolescents (13-18)
  - Pre-school parents

- Primary School parents
- Community Providers
- Comprehensive tool ( for use with mixed age groups and to summarise findings)
- A Facilitator's guide for the administration of the community tool
- Governance tools:
  - Core tool for municipal stakeholders (discussion guide and answer sheet) and related instructions.

Based on the outcomes of the workshop, a community tool for parents of adolescents and a tool for mapping institutional roles vis-à-vis child rights violations will be developed together with a governance tool guide. Through the implementation of the research, the tools and guides will be further revised.

### **III. Summary of the key outcomes and recommendations of the CFC workshop**

The workshop met the objectives that had been set and led to the following **results**:

- Exchange of on-going activities on child friendly cities and communities in the participating countries. Most countries have developed a plan and have already built the research process in the current and future actions in relation to CFC.
- Understanding of existing assessment and monitoring mechanisms in place to assess child friendliness at the local level, including current efforts in countries participating in the research. To some extent, many of the countries involved have developed some tools and mechanisms and have reflected on how to combine the newly developed assessment tools with current methods.
- Full recognition of the action component of the CFC research initiative. In addition to improving the breadth and quality of data collection on children in cities and communities, the research protocol and process allow for the identification and strengthening of priorities for programme actions, such as the development of new local plans of actions and tailoring of existing policies for children, the changes in structures and processes responding to children's needs and rights, an increased awareness of children's rights among local government and community stakeholders and the mobilisation of communities.
- The establishment of a network of countries and cities participating in the effort has been established and will be strengthened by the research initiative. The interactive webpage (*wiki*) hosted by the CFC website ([www.childfriendlycities.org](http://www.childfriendlycities.org)) will allow for interactive dialogue, exchange of updates and lessons learnt regarding the research as well other CFC-related issues and experiences. UNICEF offices connected with CFC research effort and other external researchers will also be included. The *wiki* will become be a hub for exchange of information and technical assistance in relation to the research.

- Learning from the countries that have piloted the community assessment tools has contributed to sharing recommendations as well as to addressing questions regarding the administration of the tools.
- Both the piloting country delegations and the participants in general acknowledged that the tool for community assessment with children and parents is a powerful instrument to raise awareness on children's rights and to mobilize communities in identifying their priorities and in engaging in a dialogue with local authorities to advocate for change. As far as the governance tool is concerned, the value of the process of bringing representatives of the different sectors and agencies of the local government was emphasized, as it may lead to a new culture of mainstreaming children's rights in policy making as well as of coordination among agencies to fulfil children's rights.
- The finessing of the components of the toolkit was enabled by the contributions of participants.

The following **key recommendations** were agreed upon:

- It was recommended that the research initiative is made visible through a communication strategy that suggests: a) Child Friendly Cities are placed high on UNICEF's agenda as an effective contribution to the MTSP and an entry point for work in urban contexts; b) the assessment toolkit and methods is a useful instrument to strengthen Child Friendly Cities.
- It was suggested considering the possibility of having a minimum set of indicators on CFC to compare cities in the future. This will be only possible in the long-term, as the main feature of the research protocol is to ensure a participatory approach and is not based on rigorous sampling. Nevertheless, the final research report will allow for some comparison among the participating cities. It was also recommended allowing for flexibility throughout the process to combine methodologies based on rigorous sampling with participatory methods and to supplement the data collected with hard core data.
- Specific suggestions were made to further refine the community tools. Recommendations regarding the governance tool were also made; in particular, it was suggested a comprehensive governance toolkit be developed. Furthermore, it was stressed this should remain as a discussion guide to be adjusted and used in a flexible manner in different contexts.

The **participants** to the workshop included: UNICEF focal points, researchers and some municipal government representatives from the countries involved in the research (India attended as observers); members of the research consultative groups; representatives of UNICEF Geneva; and a faculty member of the University of Colorado and consultant to UN-Habitat (see list of participants in appendix 2). UNICEF NY was not represented due other compelling commitments.

A constraint of the workshop was the absence of the Sudanese delegation and of two members of the Jordanian delegation, due to visa constraints. A separate workshop will be held during the month of January 2010.

## **IV. Report of the individual sessions**

### **DAY 1**

#### **1. Opening and welcome remarks**

Christoph Baker welcomed participants in Rome in lieu of Roberto Salvan, Executive Director of the UNICEF National Committee for UNICEF. David Parker, Deputy Director of IRC, also welcomed the delegations and emphasised that research is an action-oriented effort contributing to the MTSP. A summary of the history of the CFC Initiative and the role of UNICEF and IRC was given. It was highlighted “Child friendly” is an appealing label to be used in advocacy and programmatic work.

#### **2. Meeting the cities**

The session aimed to exchange experiences on Child Friendly Cities and Communities in the participating countries. It was arranged as an exhibition of posters summarising key activities, outcomes and lessons learnt from the work conducted in one of the cities where the research will take place. Highlights of these initiatives are summarised below:

**Russia** - Joined the CFC Initiative in 2007. UNICEF has defined the CFC criteria and four cities have now been labelled “child friendly”. Assessment tools are currently being developed.

**Italy** – Three examples of child friendly cities were displayed: 1. Cremona and the “young guides” project to promote the children’s mobility and sense of belonging to the territory; 2. Turin, which has been engaged with CFC since 1997 and has obtained two awards. Urban participatory planning has been promoted through the “Sustainable City Laboratory” and has involved 5,000 children over the years; 3. Rosa, which has worked on the implementation of the nine building blocks and has created a “Magnificent Council of Children” with 20 elected child representatives.

**France** – There are currently 193 Child Friendly Cities in France. To be acknowledged as CFC, cities and towns are requested to complete an application form that is then reviewed and assessed by an evaluation committee with regard to 5 areas: everyday life of children; child participation programmes; promotion of international solidarity; knowledge of children’s rights and partnership with UNICEF. Recently, UNICEF France together with its partners developed a Programme of Action for Children that all members of the network will have to implement by 2014. UNICEF France is undertaking a review on the partnerships process in order to widen the network to the departmental level.

**Spain** – There are 42 cities who have been accredited as CFC since 2004. The example illustrated was Palencia which became a CFC in 2007. As it is one of the criteria of CFC in Spain, Palencia has developed a plan of action on children and has actively promoted child participation by creating a Children’s Assembly. Palencia has distinguished itself for efforts in favour of migrant children and their families.

**South Africa** – The city of Johannesburg was an example of CFC for a few years but the initiative itself unfolded with changes in the administration. However, some important structures and interventions are

still in place: the City's Youth Unit, which coordinates, facilitates, advises and monitors the mainstreaming of youth development policies and programmes; the Students' Council and, since 2007, the Children Council (a five-year pilot project); the Positive Partnership Programme, which aims to coordinate the different organizations providing developmental services to residents; the strengthening of ECD services; and 2 Xtreme Parks (barren land in underprivileged areas transformed into a fully developed public parks).

**Jordan** – The Greater Amman Municipality began implementing the CFC approach in 2004 by establishing an Executive Agency for a Child Friendly City which oversees the implementation of programmes for children and ensures inter-sectorial coordination at the local level. Later the document “Policy and Priorities for Children” was developed through a participatory approach and approved. Four municipal councils of children were established through elections but the goal is to extend them to the 27 districts. The City of Amman has redesigned its organigram to make children visible in the structures.

**Brazil** – Rio de Janeiro and Sao Paulo were the cities presented, in which the strategy *Platform for Urban Centres* is being implemented, more specifically in 126 poor communities. The assessment tools were piloted in 6 of these communities. The Platform is a strategy entailing communication, social mobilization and political articulation efforts. A strong participation component is a key feature. The aim is to promote the commitment of different sectors in the reduction of inequalities in children's access to services through policy changes and behavioural changes. To attain progress, municipal and community goals have been defined in 6 areas: survival and development, education, HIV/AIDS, violence, participation, diversity. Based on performance of communities and municipalities in terms of these goals, a certificate is given.

**Dominican Republic** – The overall CFC strategy was briefly summarised. In the past, 50 % of the municipalities had declared themselves “child friendly”. Recently an evaluation of the strategy was conducted and new criteria are being designed by UNICEF jointly with other government partners, among them the Commission for State Reform (CONARE). Among the main challenges faced are the limited level of decentralisation and the lack of coordination among institutions involved in the implementation and development of the local action plans, one of the key CFC criteria. The recognized strength of the initiative is the participation of children and young people through the creation of Youth Councils (Ayuntamientos Infantiles).

**The Philippines** – The city of Manila has attained the “four gifts” for children – a criterion to participate in the Presidential Award for the CFC label: a comprehensive action plan, an investment plan for children, the Manila City Children's Welfare Code, and the State of the Children's Report. Youth Councils have been elected and the Manila City Council for the Protection of Children was established and is responsible for policy formulation, planning, programming, assessment and evaluation of existing programs for children of the city. Furthermore, a Comprehensive Programme for Children in Need of Special Protection is being implemented. Pasay City won the “Most CFC Award” in 2003. Its programme on children focuses on the following issues: street children; child labour; education and health conditions; and children's participation. In 2005, the City Mayor and UNICEF signed an agreement to implement CFC activities projects in all of the city's barangays and schools. Pasay City uses a Community-Based Monitoring System (CBMS) to monitor progress vis-à-vis the fulfilment of children's rights.

**India** – the team attended the meeting as observers. UNICEF and the Government are currently revising efforts in urban programming to develop a new strategy.

### **3. State of Child Friendly Cities and Communities monitoring and assessment mechanisms**

Roger Hart's presentation aimed to provide a state of the art of current methods of monitoring and assessment at the local level. A key point raised was that CFC assessment is constrained by limited availability of data at the local level. The range of methods reviewed and described included: official data, surveys, census, focus groups, community workshops, mapping, rating scales, checklists and participatory research. The pros and cons were highlighted for each method analysed. It was stressed that two key elements are needed: assessing the full breadth of the UN CRC and identifying other community priorities together with children through a bottom-up approach. The CFC toolkit aims to address these needs.

Countries were then asked, on a voluntary base, to briefly share any information on current monitoring and assessment mechanisms and to briefly comment on their expectations regarding the newly developed toolkit. Below is a summary of the key interventions made by the country delegations:

**Russia** –They are currently developing three tools: a. an overall self-assessment tool; b. an assessment tool of the child participation model and c. a tool to assess the expenditure on children. The child participation component is weak and will be strengthened with the community tool developed within the CFC research initiative.

**The Philippines**– There is an intention in the Child Friendly Movement to integrate children's views in the Mayor's reports. This tool is seen as an opportunity to meet this objective.

**France** – The CFC effort has developed a number of tools to facilitate the process of accreditation of cities, namely: the application form, the quiz and the scoreboard which is also used in the evaluation of progress. The toolkit will become useful to strengthen the child participation component.

**Spain** – the new edition of the accreditation system is about to be launched; indicators have been reviewed to include smaller towns. The toolkit is expected to be used in the process of evaluation of cities that have applied for the certificate.

**Dominican Republic** – The Commission for State Reform (CONARE) and the Federation of municipalities are reviewing the CFC strategy. There are 105 towns who have so far been accredited. The toolkit will allow for assessing whether those cities are meeting the new criteria.

**Jordan** – A major gap is the availability of data at the city level. A number of participatory appraisals have been conducted. However, the administration is missing a systematic method and does not have a situation analysis of the city. Their plan is to use the toolkit in 3 districts and to then bring it to scale. Jordan expressed great interest in the governance tool to help assess and think critically on existing mechanisms and structures.

**Italy** – The CFC accreditation system functioning in the past involved one child in the jury. Financial support to the initiative ended and the initiative did not continue, although some cities are still engaged in

CFC efforts. UNICEF's plan is to re-design new criteria. The toolkit will be needed to support municipalities in meeting the criteria.

**Brazil** – The Seal of Approval is an accreditation system promoted by UNICEF in collaboration with authorities in 11 states of Brazil and involves 1700 municipalities. It acknowledges progress in meeting targets based on the MDGs and the CRC. Certificates are released based on quantitative and qualitative assessment. The toolkit will be used to strengthen the participation approach for the development of local plans of action in the Platform for Urban Centres, implemented in the cities of Rio de Janeiro and Sao Paulo.

Discussions emphasised the scarcity of data at the local level; a need to reflect on the concept of child friendliness and how this research effort may contribute to reviewing or enriching the concept; and the connection between child friendliness and child well-being.

#### **4. Piloting the community assessment tools: feedback from the Philippines and Brazil**

The research teams from the Philippines and Brazil presented results and the lessons learnt emerged from piloting the tools in local settings.

**Philippines (Marita Aguirre Guevara and Mary Racelis)** – The tools were piloted in two informal settlements in Manila (Kalayan and Baseco), which showed significant variations both in terms of population and living conditions for children. In the adaptation of the tools, indicators from the Philippine National Strategic Framework for Plan Development for Children were integrated. As Filipinos are not used to self-administered tools, the team opted to conduct individual interviews in addition to focus groups. In total, 200 individual interviews were conducted (100 per community –mothers and children of different age groups) as well as 34 focus groups. Mothers were selected as through them researchers could obtain information on maternal health; furthermore, they are considered to be more credible. The piloting unfolded in five phases: instrument construction; preparations; data collection; data encoding and interpretation; and report writing.

The team stressed the positive aspects and usefulness of the tools, as they allow for the collection of both quantitative and qualitative data, contain a wide range of indicators and are very appealing to children in terms of their administration. On the other hand, the piloting led the research team to point out the following recommendations:

- reduce the length of the tool by limiting the number of indicators especially for younger children;
- make the tools more visual for children;
- use a three-scale instead of a four-scale rating for children;
- include fun activities in the individual and focus group sessions with children;
- The team highlighted it is important to provide a feedback to the community, which in their case had to be postponed due to the weather conditions.

**Brazil (Luciana Phebo, Ana Lima and Katia Edmundo)**– The tools were piloted within the context of the UNICEF *Platform for Urban Centres*. As the Platform has a solid participation component, the

assessment tools found a fertile ground for their administration. At the same time, the UNICEF team was interested to develop a participatory tool that could contribute to strengthening the Platform strategy and found the tool to be ideal for the purpose. The challenges they faced included: to ensure the assessment methods fit into the structure and framework of the Platform, to guarantee compatibility between the tools' content and the indicators of the Platform and to enable large-scale replicability in the future. Researchers carried the pilot assessment out in 6 poor communities of Rio de Janeiro and Sao Paulo, which greatly differed from one another in terms of leadership, services and living conditions. The adaptation of the tool implied the introduction of some indicators, particularly in the areas of violence and HIV/AIDS. Researchers opted for a three-rating scale as it is more accessible to children and adolescents. A peculiarity in the methodology consisted of having adolescents as facilitators of the sessions. They worked with children and adolescents of three age groups (7-10; 11-14, and 15-17) as well as with parents (although only mothers attended). Differently from the Philippines, they did not conduct individual interviews; children answered individually by raising their hand in the group. Furthermore, they combined the community tools with other instruments, more specifically mapping of services and opportunities, consultations with community members and community fora.

Some of the lessons learned and recommendations emerged from the piloting in Brazil included:

- The methodology is appealing and leads to the expected results. The tools have strong potentials for replication on a large-scale.
- Prior to the administration of the tools, it should be ensured that participants understand what the process entails and that they want to be part of it.
- Employing adolescent facilitators is effective, as they are better communicators than adults with their peers. However, creativity is a key ingredient to optimise the application of the tools.
- Furthermore, introducing each area and explaining the indicators contained is key to ensure participants understand the object of discussion.
- Tabulation of results is not easy, particularly for adolescent facilitators. Therefore, it should use a very simple method if adolescents are requested to do it live with the groups.
- Choosing schools as place for the group sessions has advantages and disadvantages: on one hand, they offer suitable spaces; on the other hand, the risk is that only the 'best' students are selected by their teachers.

In terms of future plans, the Brazil's team has already shared the findings in community fora and are getting ready to prepare the community plans of action (2010-2011), as envisioned in the Platform strategy. Furthermore, the CFC certification of the community will be conditional to the re-application of the tools to assess impact of actions undertaken through the implementation of the plan of action.

The discussion raised triggered by the presentations raise the following important **points**:

- Some participants requested a set of **minimum indicators to compare cities**. There is, however, a concern that comparison might not be appropriate as the methodology does not rely on rigorous sampling. A key feature is not to provide scientifically collected data but rather to ensure the participatory approach. It was highlighted that even if a minimum set of indicators is not

produced, the multi-country study will allow for some comparison among cities. In the future, based on the experience of the current research initiative, it may be possible to agree on a set of indicators to compare cities.

- Furthermore, it was proposed that some **flexibility is allowed for combining the participatory approach with methodologies based on rigorous sampling**. A set of indicators and corresponding data sources that may be retrieved at the local level was suggested to be added as an annex to the guide. It was also highlighted that follow-up actions should be built in the research plan from the start.

## DAY 2

### 5. Working groups

#### *Adapting the Community assessment tools*

This session started with an introduction to the community tools, presented by Pamela Wridt in collaboration with Roger Hart (CERG). Community tools allow for the gathering of community data, with children, caregivers and community service providers. On the other hand, governance tools enable collection of municipal data on the processes and structures with local authorities and NGOs. The presentation outlined the two types of approaches that can be promoted for the administration of the tools: the rapid and the comprehensive assessment. The research methodology focuses on the comprehensive assessment by underlying the steps which should be followed (to be analysed in detail in the last day of the workshop).

Participants were then asked to split into three groups based on regional similarities, interests but also levels of implementation of CFC activities. However, some changes were made at the last minute based on the interests expressed by the delegations. The final composition of the groups was as follows:

Group 1 – France, Italy, Russia, Spain

Group 2 – South Africa, Brazil and India

Group 3 – Dominican Republic, the Philippines, Jordan

The groups were asked to provide an overall critique of the tool and to reflect on the best use of the tools in their context. Summarised below are the **key conclusions** of the group and plenary discussions:

- Overall, the groups acknowledged that the community tools are a powerful instrument to raise awareness on children's rights among different actors; to meet consensus among stakeholders in the setting of priorities for action to address children's needs and rights; and to make children visible in the policy agenda at the local level. Furthermore, the tools can contribute to creating a culture of evaluation and assessment in addition to promoting children's participation in governance.

- The CFC Framework includes the 9 building blocks (components) that most cities use and understand. The community tools supplement the CFC Framework of Action as they lead to an analysis of the processes and services related to each block. The contents of the tools and the Framework should integrate and reinforce one another.
- The participants expressed an interest to combine the data collected through the community tools with datasets available at the municipal level. The two sets of tools could be brought to the community meetings so residents could see how their perceptions relate to government data on these topics.
- It was pointed out that the community assessment tools should ask the same questions to children, adolescents and parents. Some items only expect children to answer; others are only meant for parents to respond. In order to make comparisons among the groups, all items should be asked of each participating sub-group.
- Suggestions to the contents of the tools include the addition of: 1) ecological concepts – climate change, recycling, environmental stewardship, access to nature; 2) children’s participation needs to be more robust on this topic, including by integrating some of the governance tool indicators in the community tools; 3) informal education settings; 4) disadvantaged or marginalized groups – need to get at perceptions of these groups; 5) home environment – suggestion to integrate additional indicators and 5) peer-to-peer relations – looking at bullying, substance abuse, peer pressure etc. in more detail.
- Along with the tools for parents of children aged 0-7 and children aged 8-12, there should be a tool for parents of adolescents aged 13-18 for comparison purposes.
- It was suggested that the items in the tools should have several objectives or layers – survey items that cover a full range of cities in a given country (rural to urban), survey items that cover the specifics of a particular city (unique items for a city like Moscow, versus a rural area), and survey items that allow cities in different countries to compare themselves.
- The word “community” is sometimes understood as “neighbourhood” – perhaps there should be something in the tools that acknowledges this.
- It was noted that the four-scale rating system might be complicated for children, especially if they are engaged in the summary of the data collected. Nevertheless, considering the difference of appreciation of the two middle categories “Sometimes true” and “Usually true”, it was agreed that the universal tool should retain the four-scale rating and that each country will reduce to three if appropriate. Only for the youngest children, the scale shall be reduced to three rates.

#### *Adapting the Governance assessment tool*

As explained by Selim Iltus and Roger Hart in their introduction, the governance tool is intended to trigger a process through which municipalities critically reflect on their governance structures to assess their relevance with regard to meeting children’s rights and needs. The tool has not been tested, as it has been developed after the piloting of the community tools. The instrument is divided into two parts: I. Government commitments to children and II. Children’s rights within sectors. It contains a series of key questions in each of the two areas and under each question are listed a number of possibilities and options to think about in assessing the degree of child friendliness from the governance perspective. The

introduction clarified that the tool is not a questionnaire. It is instead envisioned as a tool for dialogue and discussion, which should be administered by a skilled facilitator to maximise interaction and reflection. Ideally, to complete the tool, a group of representatives from various departments in the municipality such as transport, housing, education etc should be gathered in order to facilitate interagency reflection and coordination. Along with this tool, it was suggested an organigram of child-centred agencies be designed to identify who deals with children in the municipality and how coordination is promoted. This exercise could be done by colouring the agencies dedicated to children in the current municipal organigram. The Amman organigram was shown as an example of how the CFC initiative has shaped the organigram to make children more visible in the organisational structure.

The three working groups were asked to: a) review the tool and provide a general critique, in light of the fact that it had not been tested. They were encouraged to do this through a role play; b) discuss how they would possibly develop an organigram displaying structures for children.

The plenary session drew insights from all three groups. The main **conclusions and recommendations** that emerged from the group work were:

- The process of bringing representatives of different agencies together to reflect upon the municipality's response to children's needs and rights has an added value. The tool is expected to enable a discussion across sectors and to encourage players to define and state their responsibilities and figure how different agencies/sectors could work together for the fulfilment of children's rights.
- In response to emerging doubts, it was highlighted that the tool does not focus on the services but rather on existing structures and processes in place. Furthermore, it should assess how children's rights are being fulfilled regardless of who is responsible of structures and services– the city municipality or local partners.
- It was recommended a toolkit be developed including: a) a revised version of the current tool, taking into accounts the comments and suggestions collected. In particular, the contents will be reorganized to replace the sectoral approach with a child-rights based structure; b) a mapping tool analysing scenarios and the critical routes to address and prevent violations of children's rights. The mapping tool was preferred to the organigram option which might be a constrained way of looking at the fulfilment of children's rights and may end up focusing on reinforcing systems that do not work; and c) a guidebook detailing the use of the tools.
- As the toolkit is a universal template, and considering that countries have a diversity of contexts and are at different stages in terms of assessment of governance, the toolkit should aim to be a discussion resource which promotes reflection and thinking through a coordinated approach. Countries and cities will be able to use it freely and adapt it to their local context – i.e. as a checklist to enrich their existing tools; as an interview guide for officials; as a guide for adolescents to engage in a dialogue with local authorities. In areas where the CFC initiative is owned by the cities, the tool could be used by municipalities for critical self-analysis of governance structures. But in areas where this is not the case, and the process is still owned by an external partner, the tool could be used in a focus group format that involves various government officials and is facilitated by an external actor. The tools would be a way to bring together officials from various sectors, identify gaps in governance structures, and work towards improvements.
- Recommendations on the amendment of the current tool included:

- Questions should be worded so to assess structures in terms of what happens when children’s rights are violated. A response flow chart and a critical route that shows the responsibilities of various sectors and how they address a child rights violation could reveal how inter-sectoral work unfolds on the ground.
- Detailed interviews of decision makers could be an alternate approach to the governance tool.
- It was noted that a ‘Yes’/‘No’/ ‘In process’ response mechanism would be more appropriate to effectively assess the situation.
- The tool could be used to engage adolescents in a discussion with local authorities regarding the structures and gaps to meet children’s rights and needs.
- It is recommended ensuring a more direct link between the community and governance tools. One way to achieve this could be to orient the questions in the governance tools towards child rights.
- It was also suggested that the information collected be combined with existing municipal data so to enable municipalities to identify gaps and provide a response. The tool could become a strategic process for city governments to show how child friendly they are.

### DAY 3

#### 6. Using the assessment toolkit – the process Step-by-step

This session explored the process of application of the assessment tools and was presented by Pamela Wridt. It enabled a detailed insight of the research protocol through a step-by-step interactive presentation. The contents followed the *Facilitator’s Guide* for the community tools. Considering that an in-depth discussion of the governance tool had taken place in the previous session and that the governance tool requires further development, the presentation mainly focused on the community tools, which are more complex to administer to ensure democratic participation as well as appropriate preparations and follow-up.

The contents of the presentation included:

- Purposes of the tools (Introduction; comprehensive and rapid assessment; and objectives).
- Preparing for the use of the tools (Defining the community, selecting the sample, ensuring democratic participation, adapting the tools for local relevance, selecting the facilitator, organizing the space, forming the local committee etc.).
- The Comprehensive Assessment process (Conducting the sub-group assessment, Data synthesis and Creating Visuals for analysis of Data, Community-wide meetings, sharing the results and recommended follow-up actions).
- An alternative Rapid Assessment process (which does not require the tabulation of data).
- 

Details about the process are thoroughly explained in the Guidebook and will not be repeated in this document. Nevertheless, a few points regarding the process should be highlighted:

- a. The tools, which are universal templates and attempt to reflect the full breadth of the UN CRC, require local adaptation to include local priorities which are specific to the country, municipal and community contexts.
- b. The application of the tools requires some preparation to ensure an effective use of the tools. In particular, the selection and training of a facilitator, the preparation of the spaces and the awareness raising and information dissemination to the community and the stakeholders involved.
- c. The appointment of a community committee is recommended to ensure ownership of the process as well as a support throughout the process, in particular the organization of the community meetings to disseminate results. Furthermore, decision makers should be involved from the start to guarantee a follow-up dialogue and action to the assessment process.
- d. The selection of the community should be based on genuine interest and the definition of the sample should ensure democratic participation and a good mix of ages and gender.
- e. It is essential that findings are shared with and presented to the entire community and that there is a discussion which may help prioritise the key gaps and actions needed to be addressed in a community plan of action.

Additional **key discussion points and related conclusions** for the way forward were:

- The tools have grouped children according to three age groups: 0-7 (for whom parents are responding), 8-12 and 13-18. The break-down and number of groups within these ranges will vary from country to country, depending on the specificity of the context and on the developmental stage of the children involved.
- The replication of sampling from the community to the city-wide level can be ensured by applying the community tool with all the schools from the different communities. In this case, to ensure inclusion of children out of school, a strategy would have to be planned, i.e. through NGOs working with these groups of children.
- Ethical considerations should be borne in mind. Children and caregivers should be fully informed about the goal of the process right at the beginning. Private information, if it emerges in the session, should be kept confidential. Permission to take and display pictures should be ensured.
- The sessions in which the tools are administered should ensure that children and parents are asked about what the ideal child friendly community would look like. This step is important in engaging participants in the discussion by pointing out a clear objective.
- A visual analysis of the findings should be done with the participants but tabulation of results may require trained facilitators. Children should be engaged as assistants in counting the number of answers (stickers) and placing them in the comprehensive tool. The issue of timing may be addressed by having a break in the session, during which children count and prepare the poster-size charts. A suggestion was put forward to have different colours of stickers for each dimension (e.g. my school). It was also recommended that after the tabulation visuals are produced to make the community meeting discussions more interesting and appealing to participants.
- As far as the guidebook is concerned, it was advised to make it more visual to be attractive and understood by facilitators with limited training and education as well as by adolescents.

Furthermore, a session providing details on the administration of the tool for community providers should be integrated.

- The community providers tool should list the range of actors that could be considered in this group – private sector, government service providers, NGOs etc. Each country will have a different composition of this group depending on the context and the responsibility of local stakeholders.

## **7. Organising and presenting indicators through DevInfo**

DevInfo (<http://www.devinfo.org>) is a database system, initially developed by the UN, to track progress towards the Millennium Development Goals. It allows for data to be easily presented and shared in the form of maps, graphs, charts and reports. As a number of countries already have baseline data in DevInfo it also allows for comparison of new data with baseline data. Other useful functions of DevInfo are:

- enables data to be visually drilled down on various geographical scales
- allows mapping of data on google earth by theme, intensity, etc.
- supports 4 and 5 dimension analysis using bubble charts
- platform for social networking for various partners working on a process
- possible to have a child friendly section which allows for children to access data easily
- allows for data entry from multiple sources like excel, SAS, SPSS, etc.

Different options were illustrated for the use of DevInfo in the context of the CFC research, among them:

- use of PDA/Web/Excel sheet for data capture and dissemination
- Gameworks and other collaborative networking options of DevInfo
- wiki for social communication in Child Friendly Cities
- Piloting UrbanInfo including adaptations on CFC indicators.

Considering that all the countries involved in the research have access to both DevInfo and its adaptation for urban contexts (UrbanInfo), the software can easily be adapted for the countries to use it within the context of the CFC research initiative and their future work on CFC. The session also presented the work done with DevInfo and the Moscow – Child Friendly City Initiative.

There was great interest in the possibility of using DevInfo as a data dissemination tool. However, some concerns were also raised. One major concern was how data collected through the community tools when transformed to polished maps might suggest a more sophisticated means of data collection (i.e. rigorous sampling or official data instead of the participatory approach used in the CFC research). However, it was clarified that a disclaimer can be introduced.

In the end, it was agreed that DevInfo would be a good way to see how participants in the research could systemize and share data and analysis. IRC will continue working with DevInfo to explore the best application of the database in the context of the research.

## **8. Documenting and reporting**

### *a. Ongoing and final reporting*

To facilitate the carry-out of the research and maximise the exchange of experiences among the countries involved in the research, country teams were encouraged to keep a detailed log of the process. All throughout the period of the research, the coordinators (CERG and IRC) may provide suggestions on how to involve various actors – children, parents, facilitators, officials etc. – in monitoring the process.

Some ways suggested to document and critique the process were agreed as listed below:

- One page evaluation forms for parents which could be in the form of a checklist with space for additional comments;
- A log for facilitators to record, critique and give input on the process or a brief discussion after the sessions to get input on the process from the facilitators;
- Photographic documentation of the process;
- Address process based questions to all participants so there can be collective learning and exchange of ideas;
- Monthly reports to keep the teams in touch with one another – they will have to be uploaded on the interactive webpage within the CFC site. A format structure for the monthly reported was requested by the participants.

A structure for the final was shared and accepted by the participants. The deadline for the country final report is July 30<sup>th</sup> 2009.

### *b. Communications*

A customized Wiki (interactive web-page) will be the main platform for sharing, using, and editing data. This will be the key communication tool. The wiki will allow users to post documents, pdfs, pictures and videos and create forums for discussing the process. They will access materials for the research and upload their reports. It will also be endowed with a word processing tool – similar to word - that allows users to make notes, add links, and create documents. The tool will also allow for online translation of the CFC website. In this stage, access to the wiki will be limited to the participants of the research as well as to experts and colleagues who may be connected to the process. The wiki will be available to participants by mid-December.

The following suggestions were made by the participants:

- Ensure the wiki can support large files (25-30MB),
- Prompts are sent out to all users when information is posted,
- A clearly defined organization structure is ensured for data and discussion so finding information on a specific issue is easy.

Apart from the wiki, emails can also be used to communicate with IRC and the research team.

It is suggested that direct communications be maintained from UNICEF Country Office to IRC and vice versa; and from local research teams to CERG and vice versa. However, UNICEF focal point in the country, IRC and CERG should be copied in all communications.

## **V. Final discussions and conclusions**

The workshop offered an opportunity to exchange experiences and lessons learnt on CFC and related initiatives in the participating countries and cities. The country delegations were trained on the research protocol and the toolkit to conduct the “child friendly” assessment in cities and communities. Finally, the contributions of participants will allow for further improvement of the assessment toolkit.

Overall, it was emphasised that the research initiative is an action-oriented effort and it was acknowledged that the tools and the co-related method of administration are powerful instruments to raise awareness of municipal and community stakeholders on children’s rights; to define priorities of action to address children’s needs and rights by cities and communities including through improved data collection; and to mobilise communities and children themselves in identifying and advocating for their priorities.

It was recommended that the research initiative is made visible through a communication strategy that suggests: a) Child Friendly Cities are placed high on UNICEF’s agenda as an effective contribution to the MTSP and an entry point for work in urban contexts; b) the assessment toolkit and methods is a useful instrument to strengthen Child Friendly Cities.

Regarding the immediate follow-up for the effective implementation of the research, a few steps were suggested:

1. All the documents from the workshop as well as the toolkit will be placed on the *wiki* as soon as ready to support the research implementation in the countries.
2. The community tools and the related guide for facilitators will be integrated with the suggestions made to the maximum extent possible. The final instruments will be placed on the *wiki* for use. On the other hand, the governance tool require further work, as in addition to the core tool, a guide book and a tool for mapping have to be developed. The full set will be ready in the month of February. Once ready they will also be uploaded on the *wiki*.
3. The deadline to submit the country reports is July 30 2010.

## APPENDICES

### 1. AGENDA

#### Assessing and Monitoring Child Friendly Communities and Cities

##### *Supporting advocacy and capacity building in local governance*

November 25-27, 2009

Rome, Italy

#### Agenda

Within the framework of the Child Friendly Cities Research initiative - a partnership between UNICEF Innocenti Research and Childwatch International, with the collaboration of Children's Environments Research Group (CERG) and the support of the Bernard Van Leer Foundation- **the workshop** aims to critically analyse the newly developed child friendly communities and cities assessment tools and to review the process to support their effective use in selected countries. Monitoring and assessment of child friendly cities and communities through these innovative tools will support advocacy efforts for the fulfilment of children's rights and will contribute to promoting the development and implementation of child friendly policies and programmes at the local level. The workshop will provide an opportunity to review existing monitoring and assessment methods, to share experiences on related strengths and weaknesses, to analyse the newly developed assessment toolkit and to agree on a common framework for its use at the local level.

#### November 25

##### *Morning*

9:00 – 9:30 Welcome remarks and introduction to the assessment process and the Research–  
*David Parker (IRC) and Roberto Salvan (Italian National Committee for UNICEF)*

9:30 – 10:00 Introduction to the assessment process and the Research  
*Dora Giusti (IRC) and Roger Hart (CERG)*

10:00 – 11:30 Meeting the Cities – Country teams  
Informal tour of an Interactive Exhibit of the Child Friendly Municipalities and a  
Sample Community from each one  
*Facilitator: Christoph Baker*

*Coffee break included*

11:30 -13:00 State of Child Friendly Cities and Communities Monitoring and Assessment  
mechanisms  
Introduction on existing mechanisms – *Roger Hart*  
Country presentations and discussion – *Country teams*

*Facilitator: Christoph Baker*

*Countries will be invited to speak about the existing methods and the gaps they see in the current methods.*

*13:00 -14:00 Lunch*

### ***Afternoon***

14:00 – 14:30 Introduction to the Child Friendly Community Assessment and Monitoring Tools – *Pamela Wridt*

*The Community Assessment Tools are designed to assess to what degree cities fulfil children's rights by involving beneficiaries, in particular children and their parents.*

14:30 – 17:30 Experiences from Piloting the Child Friendly Community Assessment Tools

- Brazil – *Ana Lima and Katia Edmundo*
- The Philippines – *Marita Castro Guevara and Mary Racelis*
- CERG – *Roger Hart*

*Facilitator: Selim Iltus*

*The two country teams will present the outcomes, lessons learned and challenges of the piloting experience in their country.*

## **November 26**

### ***Morning***

9:00 – 11:00 Adapting the Child Friendly Community Assessment Tool to country contexts

Working groups  
*Facilitator: Roger Hart*

*A particular focus will be placed on modifying the indicators to be appropriate for different countries. Each group will review the tools and propose additional indicators that may be relevant to each member's context and experiences.*

*The groups will be as follows:*

*Group 1 – Italy, France, Spain and Russia (Resource persons: Pamela Wridt and Ray Lorenzo)*

*Group 2 – Brazil, Dominican Republic and South Africa (Resource persons: Dora Giusti and Selim Iltus)*

*Group 3 – Philippines, India, Jordan and Sudan (Resource persons: Anupama Nallari and Roger Hart)*

*11:00 -11:30 Coffee break*

11:30 – 12:15 Introduction to the Child Friendly Governance Assessment Tools – *Selim Iltus*

*The Child Friendly Governance Assessment Tools test the pertinence of local government structures and processes to the fulfilment of children's rights. They are addressed to municipal officers.*

*12:15 – 13:15 Lunch*

### ***Afternoon***

13:15 – 15:00 Adapting the Child Friendly Governance tools to country contexts

Working groups  
Facilitator: Selim Iltus

*Three groups will be formed as above. Each group will review the content and suggest amendments/comments. Special focus will be given to the complementarity between the two sets of tools. (Resource persons: Pamela Wridt, Anupama Nallari and Ray Lorenzo)*

*15:00 – 15:30 Coffee break*

15:30 – 16:45 Adapting the Child Friendly Governance tools to country contexts

Plenary and discussion

*Each group, through a rapporteur, will present the key results, amendments and additions. An open discussion will follow.*

17:00-18:00 Mapping with children – Pamela Wridt

*This workshop looks into possibilities of involving children in the assessment of issues identified in the child friendly community tools. The method described will be optional and not part of the research process.*

## **November 27**

### ***Morning***

8:45 – 12:30 Using the Child Friendly Community and Governance Assessment Tools – Pamela Wridt and Roger Hart

*This section will offer a step by step review and open discussion of the assessment process. It reviews the process to carry out the community and governance tools, starting from the selection of the community, methods for interviews, focus groups with beneficiaries and sessions with the municipal authorities, analysis of data, using data for a plan of action and advocacy work. It will be an open session in which participants can interact.*

*Coffee break included*

*12:30-13:30 Lunch*

## ***Afternoon***

13:30 – 15:00 Documenting and reporting the assessment process– *Dora Giusti, Patrizia Faustini and Roger Hart*

- a) Methods for the on-going critical evaluation of the process

*An introduction to ways of observing the process and for building evaluation into the community facilitation process and into the use of the governance tools*

- b) On-going discussion and documentation of the process through the wiki -website

*An introduction to tracking progress through the wiki space available on the CFC website; how to upload information*

- c) Format for the final reports

*A review of the reporting format for the preparation of the final country website.*

*15:00 – 15:15 Coffee break*

15:15 – 16:15 Organising and Presenting Indicators through DevInfo – *Sameer Thapar*

*This session will include a short presentation on Dev Info and its application with regard to the research.*

16:15 – 16:45 Communicating internationally between the 11 countries– *Roger Hart and Dora Giusti*

*This session will clarify the flow of communication and means of communications between all actors*

*Break*

17:00 -18:00 Opportunities, challenges and questions – open discussion  
*Facilitator: Selim Itus*

18:00 – 18:30 Summing up and closure – *Roger Hart and Dora Giusti*

## 2. LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Name	Title/Organisation/Email address
<b>Grace Agcaoili</b>	Social Policy Specialist, Social Policy and Local Development Section UNICEF Philippine Country Office <a href="mailto:gagcaoili@unicef.org">gagcaoili@unicef.org</a>
<b>Gregorio Aranda Bricio</b>	Coordinator CFCI Campaign, Spanish National Committee for UNICEF, Madrid <a href="mailto:garanda@unicef.es">garanda@unicef.es</a>
<b>Yuri Averin</b>	Head of the Chair of Sociological Faculty Moscow State University <a href="mailto:aup@inbox.ru">aup@inbox.ru</a>
<b>Christoph Baker</b>	Assistant to the Executive Director, Italian National Committee for UNICEF, Rome <a href="mailto:c.baker@unicef.it">c.baker@unicef.it</a>
<b>Erika Bernacchi</b>	Researcher, Project and Development Services Research, Training & Documentation Section Istituto degli Innocenti, Florence <a href="mailto:bernacchi@istitutodeglinnocenti.it">bernacchi@istitutodeglinnocenti.it</a>
<b>Martina Burberi</b>	Intern CFCI UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre, Florence <a href="mailto:mburberi@unicef.org">mburberi@unicef.org</a>
<b>Gema Campos Hernando</b>	Dept. Developmental Psychology & Education, Faculty of Psychology Universidad Autonoma de Madrid <a href="mailto:Gema.campos@uam.es">Gema.campos@uam.es</a>
<b>David Chabalala</b>	Director, Ministry for Women, Children & Persons with Disabilities, Johannesburg <a href="mailto:davide@po.gov.za">davide@po.gov.za</a>
<b>Katia Edmundo</b>	CEDAPS, Rio de Janeiro <a href="mailto:katia@cedaps.org.br">katia@cedaps.org.br</a>
<b>Dora Giusti</b>	Child Protection Specialist UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre, Florence <a href="mailto:dgiusti@unicef.org">dgiusti@unicef.org</a>
<b>Joaquin Gonzalez-Aleman</b>	Chief, Social Policy, Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation UNICEF India Country Office, New Delhi <a href="mailto:jgonzalezaleman@unicef.org">jgonzalezaleman@unicef.org</a>
<b>Monica Gonzalez</b>	Tenure-track lecturer Research Institute on Quality of Life Studies University of Girona <a href="mailto:monica.gonzalez@udg.edu">monica.gonzalez@udg.edu</a>
<b>Yulia Grimalskaya</b>	Deputy Head Department of Family and Youth Policy of Moscow Government <a href="mailto:dsmprgrim@mail.ru">dsmprgrim@mail.ru</a>
<b>Marita Guevara</b>	Department of Interdisciplinary Studies

	Ateneo de Manila University <a href="mailto:mguevara@ateneo.edu">mguevara@ateneo.edu</a> , <a href="mailto:maguevara@gmail.com">maguevara@gmail.com</a>
<b>Jumana Haj-Ahmad</b>	Jumana Haj-Ahmad Adolescents Specialist UNICEF Jordan <a href="mailto:jhajahmad@unicef.org">jhajahmad@unicef.org</a>
<b>Melusine Harle</b>	Chief, local Governments relations and partnerships French National Committee <a href="mailto:MHARLE@unicef.fr">MHARLE@unicef.fr</a>
<b>Roger Hart</b>	Director Children's Environments Research Centre, City University, New York <a href="mailto:roghart@gmail.com">roghart@gmail.com</a>
<b>Selim Iltus</b>	Selim Iltus Studies & Research Officer Bernard van Leer Foundation <a href="mailto:selim.iltus@byleerf.nl">selim.iltus@byleerf.nl</a>
<b>Felicity Kitchin</b>	Researcher South African Cities Network <a href="mailto:felicity@ionaccess.co.za">felicity@ionaccess.co.za</a>
<b>Amitabh Kundu</b>	Director, Centre for Studies of Regional Development Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi <a href="mailto:kundu_amitabh@yahoo.com">kundu_amitabh@yahoo.com</a>
<b>Francesca Lange</b>	Consultant, Child Rights Advocacy & Education Section Private Fundraising and Partnerships UNICEF Geneva, Geneva <a href="mailto:flange@unicef.org">flange@unicef.org</a>
<b>George Laryea-Adjei</b>	Chief, Social Policy UNICEF Pretoria <a href="mailto:glaryeaadjei@unicef.org">glaryeaadjei@unicef.org</a>
<b>Ana Lima</b>	Instituto Paulo Montenegro <a href="mailto:Ana.Lima@ibope.com.br">Ana.Lima@ibope.com.br</a>
<b>Ray Lorenzo</b>	Cooperative ABCittà, Milan <a href="mailto:rayloren@tin.it">rayloren@tin.it</a>
<b>Horacio Medrano</b>	Decentralization Consultant of Consejo Nacional de Reforma del Estado (CONARE), Santo Domingo <a href="mailto:hmedrano@conare.gov.do">hmedrano@conare.gov.do</a> and <a href="mailto:horaciomedrano@hotmail.com">horaciomedrano@hotmail.com</a>
<b>Ayacx Mercedes</b>	Social Policy Specialist UNICEF Santo Domingo <a href="mailto:amercedes@unicef.org">amercedes@unicef.org</a>
<b>Anupama Nallari</b>	Research Associate Children's Environments Research Group (CERG), New York <a href="mailto:Anupama_nallari@yahoo.com">Anupama_nallari@yahoo.com</a>
<b>Mr. D. P. S. Negi</b>	Director Ministry of Housing & Urban Poverty Alleviation, New Delhi <a href="mailto:dpsnegi2000@yahoo.co.in">dpsnegi2000@yahoo.co.in</a>

<b>David Parker</b>	Deputy Director UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre, Florence <a href="mailto:dparker@unicef.org">dparker@unicef.org</a>
<b>Luciana Phebo</b>	Luciana Phebo Chief Field Office, Rio de Janeiro UNICEF Brazil <a href="mailto:lphebo@unicef.org">lphebo@unicef.org</a>
<b>Mary Racelis</b>	Director, Institute of Philippine Culture Atenao de Manila University <a href="mailto:maryracelis@pltdsl.net">maryracelis@pltdsl.net</a>
<b>Doug Ragan</b>	MM, PHD University of Colorado <a href="mailto:ragand@colorado.edu">ragand@colorado.edu</a>
<b>Frederike Seidel</b>	Programme Manager, Child Rights Advocacy Education Section, UNICEF Geneva <a href="mailto:fseidel@unicef.org">fseidel@unicef.org</a>
<b>Sameer Thapar</b>	Senior Trainer and Technical Advisor DevInfo Support Group, New York <a href="mailto:sthapar@devinfo.info">sthapar@devinfo.info</a>
<b>Pamela Wridt</b>	Associate Chair/Senior Instructor, Dept of Planning & Design College Architecture & Planning, University Colorado at Denver <a href="mailto:Pamela.Wridt@ucdenver.edu">Pamela.Wridt@ucdenver.edu</a>
<b>Elena Zotova</b>	Social Policy and Planning officer UNICEF Russia <a href="mailto:ezotova@unicef.org">ezotova@unicef.org</a>