Final Report to Norad

1. General

1.1	Name of grant recipient:	**Childwatch International Research Network**
1.2	Agreement number:	**QZA-A100036**
1.3	Agreement period:	**2011**

2. Reporting on Results:

2.1 What are the most important results achieved in the agreement period?

In the Childwatch International Annual Report 2011 the work and the results are presented in more detail. This is a brief presentation of the most important results:

Research Ethics:
- The work done by Childwatch started an international process to improve understandings, knowledge and practice regarding what constitutes 'ethical' research with/for/on children and young people
- An agreement reached in 2011 that Unicef will, in cooperation with Childwatch:
  - Develop an international ethics **Charter** for research involving children and young people
  - Develop ethics **Guidelines** that could be applied within and across different international (research, policy, practice) contexts.
  - Identify cost effective, flexible approaches to **training / capacity building** for organisations and disciplines seeking to adopt more ethical child and youth research practice
- The Norwegian National Committee for Research Ethics for the Social Sciences and Humanities will review the Ethical guidelines relevant for child research based on the outcome of the joint meeting and publication.

Training of young academics conducting child research:
- 23 young academics from five different countries in Latin America received extensive training, some of them have presented their research in a book published in 2011. Continued training is facilitated through an interactive web portal. The training material used is published as training manuals.
- A three week training for 17 academics from 10 African countries on **Children's Agency and Development in African Societies** was organised by CODESRIA in Dakar with support from Childwatch
- The institutes and academics involved in child research training done in Jordan in 2010, involving academics from Oman, United Arab Emirates, Palestine, Jordan, Syria and Lebanon conducted studies in 2011 on the following issues:
  - The Status of the Girl Child in Jordan
  - A qualitative survey of 3500 households in Jordan's urban areas to study different forms of violence

Child Friendly Communities:
- Field-testing and Modification of the Child Friendly Community Assessment Tools in nine countries. This included technical support to CFC development teams in each country for the use of the new tools, and their critical evaluation in the Dominican Republic, The Philippines, Brazil, The Sudan, Jordan, Morocco, Italy, France and Spain.

- The process and tools were made universally available on line in April 2011 (*http://www.childfriendlycities.org/en/research*).
- Based on a formal petition from 15 municipal districts which include towns and sections of cities with a high rate of crime and violence, The Research Program on Infancy and Childhood, Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana-Xochimilco , Mexico started working with these communities, applying the assessment tools developed by The Child Friendly Communities project.

Violence against Children
- A literature review from Australia, focusing on the English speaking literature, and summary reviews of the literature from Indonesia and Taiwan produced.
- A pilot project was implemented in a violent community in Medellin, Colombia. The objective is to investigate how to support families, communities and authorities, at all levels, so that they can ensure safer living conditions for young children. The pilot was implemented by CINDE, Colombia, the International Institute for Child Rights and Development of the Centre for Global Studies of the University of Victoria in British Columbia, Canada. In cooperation with local and international NGOs a project to address the same issues will be implemented in 10 other communities

The Childwatch Website (www.childwatch.uio.no)
An increasing number of UN agencies, NGOs and research centres are using the website to access information and to publish information about their work, publications and conferences.

Some figures from the activity on the website in 2011:
- More than 170.000 visits
- On average, 470 visits per day
- Information about and links to 55 journals presenting child research
- 43 conferences and workshops announced

2.2   In case predefined goals were not reached, please name what factors (internal and/ or external) were hindrances.

The most serious challenge Childwatch faced in 2011 was the cut back in the budget available and the fact that it was made clear that this was a one year funding agreement that would not be extended. Since all the institutions and people active in a network like Childwatch have to plan networking activities with a long term perspective, serious cut back in the funding and very little predictability on what resources that will be available in the future makes efficient and effective networking impossible. What we achieved in 2011 is largely a result of work done earlier, in some cases many years back.

2.3   Has the realisation of the programme contributed to, or resulted in any unanticipated consequences (positive or negative)?

The international recognition of our initiative related to the Ethics of Child research goes beyond what we expected and even hoped for. The fact that we in 2011 managed to get a commitment from Unicef to take on the responsibility to develop ethics **Guidelines** that could be applied within and across different international (research, policy, practice) contexts is a major achievement. The fact that Norad has decided to stop funding Childwatch is of course a major obstacle for all efforts to make sure that these guidelines really becomes a mechanism respected and used by all agencies conducting research on and with children.

2.4   What has the organisation's value- added been? Summarize what the organisation's contribution to the partner was, in addition to the financial assistance.

Childwatch is a network of partners in the academic sector that support each other as well as a wide range of partners in other sectors. It is through documentation and analysis of a high academic standard

that NGOs and policy makers can make sure that policies and practices are robust and relevant to the child rights context. With very few resources, Childwatch has since the inception in 1993 provided an opportunity for further development of academic studies and institutions with a special focus on capacity building on child rights research in developing countries. It has also established much needed contact and dialogue between child research, civil society and authorities.

2.5   To what degree was the programme carried out in cooperation with other donors, national or local? To what extent did they follow plans of the local authorities?

The programme is totally dependent on cooperation with other donors. Childwatch does not fund the actual research, but only some of the cost related to networking with other academics, civil society, international and national authorities. So networking can only take place if a wide range of intuitions are funding the basic activities. As child research centres, the member centres of Childwatch are totally dependent on dialogue with local authorities. It is through this dialogue that they get their mandate and obtain their basic funding.

2.6   Outline briefly how the programmes have contributed to strengthen civil society.

"The Childwatch International Research Network is a global, non-profit, nongovernmental network of institutions that collaborate in child research for the purpose of promoting child rights and improving children's well-being around the world. It was founded in 1993 as a response from the research community to the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, an instrument for changing the focus of research and for ensuring that the perspectives of children are heard. The Convention is the basis for the Network's common agenda."

This is a mandate that makes links to civil society crucial. It is through solid analysis of the child rights situation and continuous monitoring and evaluation of their activities that civil society can be relevant in the development process. This makes the civil society equally dependent on a dialogue with child research.

In all our work we are constantly considering how to facilitate a productive dialogue between research and civil society. The members of the network are in the same position in their communities.

Examples from the work in 2011:
- The Child Friendly Community Assessment Tools are developed to give civil society an active role in the decision making process in their local communities.
- The pilot project on how to build safe communities in Columbia is done in close cooperation with civil society.
- In the work on research ethics, the **training /capacity building** is targeting civil society as well as the academic sector.

2.7   What are the most important lessons learnt from the running of the programme, and what parts should be changed and/ or adjusted before any new agreement is entered into?

The network has since the beginning in 1993, constantly revised the networking priorities and adjusted the mode of operation to be as relevant as at all possible for the dialogue between policy makers, civil society and local authorities. During the Board meeting in 2011, it was decided that if resources could be made available the network would initiate studies on:

- The relationship between the global agendas for child rights and child research.
- Models for research capacity building that effectively could build stronger child research institutions in low- and middle income countries.

Towards the end of 2011, Childwatch managed to get some funding from Norad for doing limited work in these areas. The funding is just enough for some case studies that will be finalised before October 2012.

2.8   On gender, climate and environmental issues
While gender awareness has been underpinning all child rights work, and also academic research, the issues of climate and environment have received increasing attention from child researchers over the last years.

The shift of focus from child protection to Protective Environments and from child participation to Governance is not just a change of terminology, but reflects an academic sector that in collaboration with civil society aims to further advance the civil rights of children.

More specifically, *The Child Friendly Community Assessment Tools* and *Child Friendly Governance Assessment Tools* developed in the Child friendly Community Project are perhaps the best examples on how child research have included these perspectives, and produced planning tools in close cooperation with civil society.

Date: Oslo 31.05.12

Signed:

Jon-Kristian Johnsen

Title: Director