

**Save the Children/UNHCR
Separated Children in Europe Programme
A Process of Evaluation and Review
Report**

**Susan Elliott
June 2002**

Table of Contents

	Page
Executive Summary	4
Recommendations	7
Introduction	9
Methodology	9
The Programme	10
1. Programme Achievements and Strengths	12
1.1 Programme Materials	13
1.2 Partnership	14
1.3 NGO Network	15
1.4 Addressing Burnout	16
2. Programme Weaknesses and Constraints	17
2.1 The Partnership	17
2.1.1 Negotiating the Partnership	18
2.1.2 Partnership at a National Level	22
2.1.3 Different Mandates	23
2.2 Lack of Resources	23
2.3 Capacity at a National Level	24
2.4 Including Government Officials	24
2.5 Children's Participation	25
2.6 Meeting Structure	25
2.7 International Links	26
2.8 Public Awareness and Use of the Media	27
2.9 Follow Up	27
2.10 Coordination with Similar Programmes	27
3. Programme Mechanisms	28
3.1 Partnership	28
3.2 The NGO Network	28
3.3 UNHCR Mainstreaming	30
3.4 Capacity Building	32
4. Influencing Policy	35
4.1 EU	35
4.2 National Level	36
5. Future	39
5.1 Context and Trends	39
5.2 Future Planning	40
5.2.1 Structure	40
5.2.2 Transferability	44
5.3 Form	44
5.4 Content	45
5.5 Where to with the Partnership	46
Appendix 1: Separated Children in Europe Programme – Terms of reference for a process of evaluation and review	48
Appendix 2: Separated Children in Europe Programme – Questionnaire for a process of evaluation and review	52
Appendix 3: Those Interviewed	54

ACRONYMS

APR	Annual Protection Report
CEBS	Central Europe and Baltic States
COPs	Country Operations Plans
EC	European Commission
EU	European Union
HQ	Head Quarters
NGO	Non governmental organisation
RSD	Refugee Status Determination
SCEP	Separated Children in Europe Programme
TOR	Terms of Reference
TOT	Training of Trainers
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

Executive Summary

The main mechanisms used to achieve the Separated Children in Europe programme's objectives are the Save the Children/UNHCR partnership, a NGO network, and UNHCR mainstreaming (which includes a network of focal points) and capacity building. Although it was the partnership which gave the programme its impetus and momentum, the review finds that whilst a significant amount of work has been achieved on behalf of separated children at an operational level, the partnership aspect of the programme has been less successful. This has resulted in a feeling among a number of programme members that there are now two parallel programmes running concurrently.

The programme's strengths lie in its scope, structure, focus, timeliness and the importance of the task. Successful programme activities build on each other and continuously update knowledge of the dynamics and scale of the issue. The programme has produced high quality materials, which are widely used within Europe and elsewhere. The Statement of Good Practice in particular, but also the training guide, country assessments and the sub-regional studies are highly valued. The programme also supports a well-used website. At an operational level, the partnership has achieved a great deal, with UNHCR and NGOs learning from each other and working together successfully to host joint events.

These achievements would not have been reached without the strong leadership of programme staff, which fanned out from the crucial foundation work by David Wright as the Save the Children Adviser.

Establishing and maintaining an NGO network across 28 European countries, is a strength in its own right. The network enables information sharing, gives the people involved a sense of belonging and often eases relationships between NGOs at a national level.

The main constraints on the programme are the organisational issues around the Save the Children/UNHCR partnership, the lack of resources at a national level, the differential capacity between NGO members, very little child participation and to a lesser degree the structure of programme meetings, the lack of follow up of activities and agreements, few linkages made with other parts of the organisations' work, the involvement of government officials, low media profile and the lack of coordination with other agencies and programmes with similar objectives.

In terms of capacity building, the programme has produced high quality training materials and run very successful training events. Capacity building implies more than training however, and programme members have learned as much through 'doing' as through training.

Inroads have begun into mainstreaming separated children's issues in UNHCR. At a country level this has been achieved through the appointment of focal points. However given the lack of mainstreaming of children's issues in general there is a long way to go. To progress this further will require focal points, the involvement of all UNHCR functions at a country level, the retention of a policy advisor in order to provide guidance on the issues and increased managerial support at all levels. However most fundamental is the development of an organisation-wide child-protection policy and strategy.

At the EU level, programme staff have had significant input and influence in the drafting of EU Directives concerning asylum harmonisation, although these were not achieved through the partnership. In most countries the programme has influenced changes in law and/or practice and raised awareness of the issues significantly.

There is a need and intention in both organisations to continue working with the increasing number of Separated Children arriving in Europe. The main parameters of EU level policy will be the continued processes of asylum harmonisation and the concurrent enlargement. This will require on going advocacy at both the EU and country level and continued capacity building interventions to ensure this can occur.

At a country level, there is likely to continue to be a decrease in the number of social-democrat governments along with an increase in the number of right wing populist politicians and parties.

There will also be an increase in the number of separated children arriving; both as asylum seekers and children who have been trafficked for other reasons. Programmes will be needed to increase the level of care and protection for both groups.

How these needs are addressed at an organisational level is subject to ongoing discussion within both of the organisations. UNHCR intends amalgamating the current Senior Regional Adviser's post with the Children's Adviser post in Ankara and siting it in Geneva in the Europe Bureau. However there are internal concerns about this.

Save the Children intends to continue with the current organisational arrangements, but with a rebalancing of staff roles and responsibilities. The NGO network will expand to include the Balkan states. Again, there are some internal debates as to whether this is the best way to proceed.

Programme members support an ongoing programme, and at a national level would support a continuation of the current arrangements. Organisationally, both partners in the current programme want and need ongoing collaboration but probably at the level of joint activities rather than through overall programme linkages. Save the Children also intends to enter collaborative arrangements (as opposed to partnerships) with other organisations sharing the new programme's aims and objectives.

In restructuring the programme, more activity needs to occur at a sub regional level, and more attention needs to be given to organising material and focus in a thematic way. The issues seen as needing greatest attention are tracing and family reunification, return as a real durable solution, reliable age assessment methods, information and research on child specific forms of persecution and RSD, guardianship, integration-particularly including education and health care, reception conditions and the disappearance of children from reception centres.

In order to learn from the programme, both organisations will need to find more effective ways of sharing information and better systems for accessing and disseminating learning.

Future organisational partnerships between UNHCR and Save the Children will need to be worked through carefully, and for UNHCR this programme has highlighted internal

impediments to engaging in partnerships outside the traditional contract for service arrangements.

Recommendations

Future Partnerships

Save the Children and UNHCR both need and want some ongoing collaboration with each other in their work with separated children.

If future partnerships are formed at a similar level between UNHCR and Save the Children, the following issues will need careful attention:

- Organisations are clear as to how the partnership may benefit them and their beneficiaries
- Adequate time is spent scanning future possible scenarios
- Programmes have joint strategies and activity plans.
- How organisational cultures, decision-making and mandates will fit together.
- Negotiations are clear, transparent and yet assertive and result in a clear definition of what any partnership involves.
- Any agreements are structurally embedded in each organisation but retain flexibility in order to respond to emergent issues.
- Ensuring the process of forming the partnership does not drag on so that momentum is not lost
- Issues of ego do not get in the way

Organisational Issues

Both organisations need to

- Better integrate the learning from this programme into their wider organisations.
- Better integrate the international links implied in the programme into their wider organisational work.
- Support research into the situation of separated children
- Pay more attention in future to; involving the media, following up agreements and coordinating the programme with other similar programmes; both within each organisation and externally.

Save the Children needs to:

- Debate fully the employment structure of programme staff to ensure the programme is properly embedded in the broader work of Save the Children internationally.
- continue to base their programme on an NGO network, but consider carefully what objectives are being achieved in broadening this network to include the Balkan states
- Proceed with caution in relation to collaboration with IOM.

UNHCR needs to:

- Ensure an ongoing, adequately resourced programme commitment to separated children.
- Continue mainstreaming the issues of separated children through
 1. Ensuring child protection is mainstreamed through the organisation by ensuring a child protection policy and strategy is developed across the whole organisation.
 2. Management at all levels providing support to separated children and staff responsible for mainstreaming the issue.
 3. The appointment of focal points in country, local and branch offices
 4. The appointment of a Senior Regional Policy Advisor who can provide advice and support to staff

5. Ensuring all UNHCR functionaries take up responsibility for the issue
 6. Including separated children in COPs and APRs.
- Provide more guidance to staff on dealing with non-asylum seeking children as they are undoubtedly in need of international protection.
 - Continue and extend discussions with IOM and UNICEF regarding separated children in Europe as soon as possible.

Future Programme Structure

- That the programme rebalance its focus to include the care and protection of non-asylum seeking children, while continuing efforts in support of asylum seeking children.
- More attention should be given to the international links implied in the programme;
- More programme work should take place at a sub-regional level
- More structured attention should be given to developing good practice in the following key areas:
 1. tracing and family reunification,
 2. return as a real durable solution,
 3. reliable age assessment methods,
 4. information and research on child specific forms of persecution and RSD,
 5. guardianship,
 6. integration-particularly including education and health care,
 7. reception conditions and
 8. The disappearance of children from reception centres.
- Material and information about each of these areas, within existing programme literature and documentation should be drawn together to enable planning to occur.

Future Programme Form

- That a way be found in the programme to address sensitive personalised issues regarding international linkages and staff burnout.
- That increased resources are found for work at a national level, especially in CEBS countries.
- That the programme retain lobbying and advocacy at the EU and national level in its objectives.
- That the programme incorporates governments in its work or activities.
- Capacity building remains as a programme objective, with attention being paid to
 1. capacity building work in CEBS,
 2. advocacy and increased child participation in all countries
 3. capacity building interventions involving more than training.
- That the programme continues to produce materials for translation and wide dissemination. These should include:
 1. Updates of the country reports and sub-regional summaries.
 2. Revised guidelines or a Statement of Good Practice for the treatment of separated children outside the asylum system.
 3. Papers covering the key issues listed above.
- That the programme aims to increase children's participation, starting with the national level. Children's participation should be included in programme activities, to ensure programme strategies and activities cover this aim.

Introduction

1. This Evaluation and Review Report of the Separated Children in Europe (SCEP) is made up of an overview and five chapters. The Overview gives an outline description of the programme, including how it was established, as this is important for the learning of the two main agencies involved. Chapter 1 discusses the programme's successes, both in terms of activities and factors determining this success. Chapter 2 looks at constraints on the programme, both at operational and organisational levels. Chapter 3 reviews the mechanisms the programme used to achieve objectives; the Save the Children/UNHCR partnership, capacity building, and mainstreaming within UNHCR. How policy has been influenced is reviewed in Chapter 4. The final Chapter brings together suggestions for both the future form and content of the programme.
2. Quotes, usually semi-attributed, included in italics in the report, come from questionnaire responses or interviews with programme stakeholders. They are indicative of the opinion of a number of programme members.

Methodology

3. The brief for the evaluation and review of the programme asks that the methodology include a process involving the key programme stakeholders. In this, it is more a process review. The evaluation did not seek to measure the impact of the programme on the lives of individual children (although this is the overriding concern of many involved in the programme) rather it is oriented to the future and focuses on the legal, policy, procedural and occasionally the political maze in which the children find themselves. Carried out over 30 days between March and May 2002 the review used a number of methods. A review of background literature: programme concept papers, objectives, review reports and meeting minutes, work plans and progress reports, agreements and research projects - covering the three years of the programme, along with issues raised in the TOR led to the development of an email questionnaire. This was sent to 65 programme stakeholders- members of the Steering Committee, members of the NGO network, the UNHCR focal points, the Save the Children Programme Co-ordinator, the UNHCR Senior Regional Policy Advisor and the Save the Children Programme Advisor. Out of 65 questionnaires posted, 28 were sent to UNHCR staff and 37 to Save the Children staff or NGO network members. Overall, there was a 72% response rate with 64% of UNHCR staff replying¹ and a 78% NGO response. (A copy of the TOR can be found in Appendix 1 and the email questionnaire makes up Appendix 2).
4. On the basis of the key issues emerging from the questionnaire and literature review, 26 telephone or face-to-face interviews were carried out with a sample of seven NGO network members, six UNHCR focal points, all Steering Committee members and the key programme staff. In selecting which NGO network and UNHCR focal points to interview, attempts were made to include both Save the Children and other NGOs (for NGO network members) from a range of size and type of organisation across the region. Some of the interviews were carried out during the Programme Network Meeting held in Madrid 11-13 April. Attendance at the meeting also allowed for observation of programme discussions. In addition, interviews were carried out

¹ Although the questionnaire was sent to the UNHCR Steering Committee members they did not reply stating that their focus is on managerial and policy issues, whereas the questionnaire focused mainly on operational concerns. If they are excluded from the sample, the response rate from UNHCR rises to 75%.

with two European Commission Justice and Home Affairs staff members. (See Appendix 3 for a list of those interviewed).

5. The strength of this sort of stakeholder review is that it provides insights into the programme from a wide range of people, from organisations of different types and sizes. However, as they all come from different managerial levels, their perceptions can vary markedly.
6. A draft report was presented to the Programme Steering committee meeting held in Geneva in late May. After a further three-week period for clarification and the provision of any outstanding information, a final report was submitted to Save the Children as the evaluation commissioners.

The Programme

7. The Separated Children in Europe Programme began in 1997 and was planned as a three-year initiative and innovative partnership between UNHCR and members of Save the Children Alliance². The programme aims to ensure that the principles and standards regarding separated children's rights are upheld, through the promotion of a common policy and commitment to good practices at national and European levels. It is built on the complementary mandates and areas of expertise of the two organisations. UNHCR's responsibility is to ensure international protection of refugee children and those seeking asylum; Save the Children is concerned to see the full realisation of the rights of all children. This way of working was intended to build linkages, decentralise responsibility, promote sustainability, and empower those within it through shared decision making.
8. At an operational level the objective of the programme focuses on capacity building to ensure international protection of Separated Children occurs throughout Europe. This is achieved through the following sub-objectives:
 - Dissemination of information and training on rights of separated children in Europe.
 - Collection and production of information about the situation of separated children in Europe
 - Promotion of long term solutions and preventive action
 - Promotion of adequate protection of separated children in Europe
 - Advocacy on behalf of separated children at both European Union and national levels
 - Development and enhancement of the Separated Children in Europe Programme.
9. The same consultant externally reviewed the programme in 1999/2000. After this review, the programme removed the objectives of helping to prevent problems of separation through rapid responses to emergencies and emergency preparedness. Whilst still aiming to ensure long-term solutions for separated children, it recognised these could be better achieved through the wider programmes of the sponsoring agencies. Until early 2000, the programme covered Western Europe. Since then it has included 28 countries; 17 in Western Europe, eight in Central Europe and the three Baltic States (CEBS).

² In the event the programme has run for five years. As UNHCR did not appoint a Senior Regional Policy Advisor until late 1999, Save the Children decided to extend the programme so that the planned three-year partnership could be completed.

10. The Norwegian government and the Odysseus Programme of the European Union have provided the majority of the funding for the programme. Substantial other funds come from UNHCR and Save the Children Norway, Sweden and UK-with contributions from the Save the Children organisations increasing over the past two years.
11. A Steering Group (made up of four UNHCR staff members, three from Head Quarters and one from the Regional Officer in Brussels and three Save the Children representatives, from Sweden, Norway and the UK) guides the Programme. Programme staff are a fulltime UNHCR Senior Regional Policy Advisor, appointed in September 1999, and her assistant who are based in the UNHCR Regional Office in Brussels, the (full time) Save the Children Programme Co-ordinator, appointed in November 2000 and based in Save the Children Denmark (which is the Save the Children Lead Agency for this Programme) and an independent part-time consultant working for Save the Children as a Programme Adviser who is largely responsible for the NGO network, who works from a base in the UK. From time to time the programme has also employed contract consultants to conduct training and carry out research.
12. The main programme activities have been the development of a Statement of Good Practice, development of a programme network including at least one NGO member and one UNHCR focal point being responsible for each country, national assessments on the policies and practices concerning separated children seeking asylum in all countries involved in the programme, the production of an *Advocacy Support Pack* and *Lobby Guide* to assist programme members in their lobbying and advocacy efforts at EU and national level, various training and Trainer of Trainer (TOT) events and seminars, six-monthly programme meetings and the creation of a website. Programme activities are included in a published annual plan, developed by Save the Children and UNHCR staff- although there does not seem to be joint reporting against these plans.
13. It is a complex programme, consisting of a network of networks operating at a number of levels, but for most involved, the programme is the work at national level, carried out everyday with children but in conjunction with other actors.

1. Programme Achievements and Strengths

14. There is almost a unanimous view that this programme has been successful in achieving its operational objectives.

*What's built up is remarkable.
UNHCR Senior staff member.*

*I can say this is the most successful programme I've seen within UNHCR. It gave ideas, tools to start with and pointers about where to start and how to do it, in a network. We really saw outputs from the meetings. Even if the programme ends in two or three years I believe you will still see the effect of the programme in offices. We will see outcomes.
UNHCR Focal Point.*

15. The very **scope of the programme, the number of countries it covers, the structure** (through a partnership by building on the complementary mandates of NGOs, especially Save the Children, and UNHCR) which provided **a clear focus, the timeliness of its establishment and the importance of the task** have given the programme its underlying strength and resulted in some tangible and intangible benefits. For some countries, without the programme, the issue would not have been addressed in such a focused way. The formation of national working groups or taskforces, which have been established in most programme countries, has greatly assisted this happening.

*Without the programme we would have had 95% of the partnership and 5% of the attention to the issue
UNHCR Focal Point*

16. Participation by UNHCR and NGOs provided an impetus for the programme's establishment and *provided a sense of motivation to work on a common struggle.* Somehow the programme *gave a sense of belonging to a wider group of people with a common interest.* Many believe being able to work together to generate high quality materials has assisted programme members to influence national agendas and enabled programme leaders, and the Save the Children office in Brussels, to possibly influence the EU agendas and definitely to engage with officials. This focus on EU level advocacy is seen as vital.

17. Strength also lies in the distinct, but diverse range of activities which built on each other and continuously updated knowledge of the dynamics and scale of the issue. The Statement of Good Practice provided a basis for the national assessments and thereby the basis for advocacy at a national and EU level. The crucial inputs by programme staff; advice, the meetings and trainings (which are considered vital by programme members) and strong leadership, complements all. Essentially, **these activities have raised the awareness of the issue** (often cast as a problem) **among a wide range of actors** including politicians, lawmakers, judges, practitioners, government officials, the media and thereby the public and increased the capacity of those involved in the programme itself through an iterative process. In fact it seems the general programme activities have built the capacity of programme members as much as the trainings.

18. By insisting on applying the terms 'separated children' (rather than the more traditional UNHCR 'unaccompanied minors') the programme included a wide based group of children in need of international protection.

1.1 Programme Materials

19. Undoubtedly, the materials produced by the programme are considered high quality and represent useful reference tools for the current situation and for the future. Among them the Statement of Good Practice is most widely used and mentioned. The Statement has not only been used by programme members at a national level, but UNHCR Steering Committee members have used it to guide their advice in other parts of the world. The Statement laid a strong theoretical foundation for the programme, complementing other available Guidelines

*it contains the whole programme and provides a way for NGOs and UNHCR to orient themselves to the issue
NGO network member.*

20. As mentioned in the 1999 review, "The Statement of Good Practice, has codified and laid out a well-structured and comprehensive set of principles providing a common standard for work across the programme. The way in which it was developed through a process of consultation has ensured it is also a very practice oriented tool. Translated, it provides all agencies involved in the programme with a foundation for planning, research development, public information and advocacy."

21. However the training guide, the country assessments and the sub-regional summaries (which give the first systematic collection of information on the situation of separated children seeking asylum in Europe and are especially useful in lobbying) are also valued highly. As is the regularly updated website which is hosted by the Centre for Europe's Children in Scotland.

22. The site posts all national assessments and summaries, programme publications, newsletters, programme member contact details, legislation and statistics along with a search facility and links to other relevant sites. Although it is not mentioned as frequently by programme members-perhaps because they have access to hard copies of many of the programme materials- it seems to help overcome communication shortfalls evident in the 2000 review. A review of the usage of the website after its first year of operation showed a continual increase in use, with 151,000 hits in the first year and user sessions, (which give a better measure of effective usage of the site), showing 12,033 sessions in the first year alone. In the 2001 calendar year there were 17,804 user sessions, an increase of 47.96%, with increases in users on all the language sites. Anecdotal evidence, and requests to the UNHCR Senior Regional Policy Advisor, show that the site has also been widely used internationally. E.g. the Australian Human Rights and Equal Opportunities Commission has used it in the inquiry into the detention of separated children in Australia, the New Zealand Authorities used the Statement of Good Practice (obtained from the web) to guide their provision to the boys from the *Tampa*³. All programme staff report a corresponding increase in the number of inquiries about separated children from the public, students, academics, journalists, international

³ The *Tampa* is a Norwegian registered ship which rescued a sinking boat carrying over 450 Afghan asylum seekers in the Indian Ocean in September 2001. About 130 Afghans, including 31 separated boys, were taken to New Zealand; the remainder went to Nauru Island for screening by UNHCR.

agencies such as IOM, and practitioners. Responding to these takes up a substantial amount of staff time. Some queries appear to be a direct result of the website; others are referred to the site for information. Less mention was made of the other research studies undertaken by the programme.

23. It would be wrong though to assume that the programme's strengths are attributable only to high quality materials. This can never be the case. The foresight of Save the Children in suggesting the establishment of the programme, (the idea of which was quickly picked up by UNHCR), the quality of the committed leadership, fanning out from the early work by David Wright, has invigorated the enthusiastic, strongly committed people involved at a national level.

24. Programme staff have been involved in a wide range of activities which are often very time consuming; commenting on legislation, providing general advice to programme members, speaking at conferences, publishing articles, replying to inquiries about the programme and the issue. Their work is highly regarded by their colleagues.

*The programme leadership took the best of us and helped each of us.
NGO network member.*

25. As mentioned, the structure and design of the programme has also given it strength. The single-issue focus, the partnership, the level of funding, the timing and ordering of activities and the formation of a stable network of networks has enabled the exchange of information and knowledge at meetings and through newsletters. This has furthered the capacity building potential of the programme. Skills learned have been used to strengthen work and for problem solving on a national level and for individual cases. But more, the skills are transferable to other situations, and the network has also enabled UNHCR staff members to use contacts to address other aspects of their work.

*The people involved strengthen me in everyday life, it shows me the problems and the solutions.
NGO network member*

1.2 Partnership

26. The possibility of joint NGO/UNHCR work through the partnership is a great strength. Establishing at least one NGO member and one UNHCR focal point in each country has been mutually beneficial to most of the organisations involved, surprising some that such a structure could be set up and maintained. This structure has enhanced local capacities and

allowed the programme to say things UNHCR would have shied away from.

UNHCR focal point

It was undoubtedly good to have UNHCR as a partner; we remained focused.

Save the Children Steering Committee Member

27. The partnership also secured the participation of government officials in TOT courses and allowed them to become engaged in the issue. UNHCR, through its relationship with governments, provided the programme with a comparative advantage in this.

*The programme pushes authorities, but through the structured guidelines and packages they can identify problems and it provides and promotes methods. It makes it easier to take them on.
UNHCR focal point.*

28. This contact with government has been critical for some NGOs.
*The partnership is very positive; it seems like we are one person walking; it allowed me to take more responsibility and allowed greater understanding of the legislation. The closeness was established as a result of this programme; and it enabled us to get wider government contacts.
NGO Network Member*
29. This is a recurring theme, with many NGOs, especially in CEBS valuing the increased credibility and access to the government the programme gave. It also helped government understand the position of NGOs and realise they had something to contribute thereby countering prevalent views of NGOs.
30. At the level of activities, the most successful joint action have been joint events; trainings, workshops, conferences and seminars, often with or for officials. However valuable work has been done during roundtables to discuss difficult or acute cases, the development of national action plans and preparation and presentation of country assessments.
31. Overall, the partnership has achieved a great deal at an operational level in a relatively short timeframe. Importantly there is a realisation that roles can be complementary and NGOs and UNHCR can be supportive of each other- this has been particularly important where UNHCR has small offices. But it requires each organisation to be clear and open about its goals and boundaries and requires in-depth and often detailed discussions. Where joint advocacy has occurred as a result of shared understanding of positions, some surprising results have been achieved.
*The government reaction and involvement was more positive than expected.
UNHCR Focal Point.*

As one key UNHCR staff member put it:

Overall the partnership is a success, more things have happened faster than if left to either of the agencies alone. We pull each other along; the NGOs act quickly, UNHCR might put brakes on but ensures things are done thoroughly.

Or

*UNHCR and NGO people are doing many things in many countries among the government and the public. I can't find another reason for this; it must be the programme.
UNHCR Steering Committee Member*

1.3 NGO Network

32. Setting up and maintaining the NGO network across all of Europe is seen as a programmatic strength in its own right. In part, this is attributable to being able to fully

fund NGO meeting participation costs and the effectiveness of the network management. The meetings have been unfettered with concerns of network governance, structure or membership; rather the focus is on the work at hand. This has enabled excellent discussions to occur and thereby further strengthening commitment to and the work of the network. Several members report this to be a more effective network than others they belong to. Some from both UNHCR and the NGOs believe that the NGOs' enthusiasm has strengthened UNHCR commitment to the issue and provided support to the UNHCR focal points.

33. The sense of belonging engendered by the SCEP has been crucial and shouldn't be underestimated. Many NGO network members work on the programme in a voluntary capacity, (adding that they are aware that some UNHCR staff have a similar level of commitment, working long hours to achieve the programme's aims).

Children are the icing on the cake, they are not the main issue in my job, I do most of it outside office hours. But the programme is a real shot in the arm a real energy booster, although it will require sustained input; I'm not sure how I'll manage that.

NGO network member.

34. Establishing national networks has also enabled better relations to be established between individuals and organisations in contexts where this is often rare. While network members have different levels of capacity, on the whole the membership has remained open and accepting of this, understanding why it occurs.

1.4 Addressing Burnout

35. Whilst raising questions of sustainability by relying so heavily on voluntary input from both UNHCR and NGOs and *NGO idealism* the programme has managed, perhaps inadvertently, to address the issue of staff burnout and the psychosocial impact of dealing with such stressful issues on a daily basis for people working in both organisations. Sorting out guardianship complications for a child whose leg needed to be amputated because of frost bite after being smuggled across a river in mid winter, children being dragged handcuffed to Embassies to verify their identity, children detained for lengthy periods with no one to trust but a visiting UNHCR staff member, responding to attempted suicides in a reception centre; are a few examples given during interviews. Such staff support, whilst vital for sustainability, is usually given little attention by either agency in Europe.

36. As often occurs with a successful programme; members want more from it. This is not so much an indication of weakness but provides an insight into issues to be addressed in the future.

2. Programme Weaknesses and Constraints

37. The programme's strengths and achievements are tempered by some quite deep-rooted concerns. The reported main constraints on the programme are the organisational issues around the partnership between Save the Children (and thereby the NGOs) and UNHCR, the lack of resources at a national level, especially for NGO members, the differential capacity between NGO members, very little child participation, and to a lesser degree the structure of network meetings, a lack of follow up of activities and the lack of coordination with other agencies and programmes with similar objectives.

2.1 The Partnership⁴

38. The partnership between UNHCR and Save the Children was intended to be dynamic and innovative. 'Partnerships' between organisations are complex. Each one develops in a different context in and they have both an organisational and relational dimension. There are no universal blueprints for a partnership and each must be seen through an analysis of characteristics such as the nature, purpose and aspiration associated with the concept. Further, it is often difficult to separate individual perceptions and behaviours from organisational perceptions and behaviours. Moreover, finding exact definitions of partnership to fit a particular case is difficult. Nevertheless, in the context of international development, definitions usually draw on two main themes. The first focuses on the exchange of resources between organisations and the second relates to trust-based definitions. As there was little or no resource exchange between the organisations involved (although as noted below, some NGOs are traditional UNHCR implementing partners), the trust-based notions became more important. As in any relationship, trust cannot be created; it emerges over time from shared work, expectations, values and commitment.

39. A remarkable consensus exists amongst writers on the key ingredients for effective partner relations; mutuality; clearly defined expectations, rights and responsibilities; accountability and transparency. Binding these together are the elusive principles of trust, respect, integrity, credibility and ownership. These principles emanate from concerns for the relational and institutional sustainability of the relationship. Maintaining partnerships requires budgeted resources; financial and time. This means partnerships are often time-intensive.

40. For NGOs, trust-based partnerships are the very basis of participatory development. This is Save the Children's tradition, and increasingly that of intergovernmental organisations also. However, it seems that UNHCR and Save the Children had very different expectations of the partnership, even if these were unvoiced. From UNHCR's point of view, developing such a partnership between two such different organizations is quite an achievement in itself. They consider it quite normal that given the general nature of the partnership agreement, the partnership would go through phases of development which involved sorting out difficulties and

⁴ For further debate on partnership see V Mancuso Brehm V (2001) *Promoting Effective North-South NGO Partnerships: A comparative Study of 10 European NGOs*. INTRAC Occasional Paper No 35. Oxford UK or Hailey, J (2000) *NGO Partners: The Characteristics of Effective Development Partnerships* in Osborne, S.P. (ed) *Managing Partnerships for Public Services: An International Perspective*. London Routledge.

disagreements. They feel the partnership should not be measured in terms of pre-conceived notions, but in terms of what the Program has achieved.

41. Although partnership was never fully defined, implied was a notion of partnership based on trust, as outlined above. It was forged between members of the Save the Children Steering Committee and the former UNHCR Senior Co-ordinator for Refugee Children and agreed by a former Director of the Bureau for Europe. Both moved from their positions before details of the programme were completely worked through. As a model, this partnership is outside UNHCR's usual way of working. Normally partnership involves some sort of contract for service arrangement with NGOs which are known as implementing or operational partners. Save the Children intended this to be a partnership of equals, quite separate from any contract for service obligations; they expected a contract for process.
42. From the beginning tensions began to develop. They centred on the way in which the partnership was formed, how it was placed structurally within UNHCR, the organisations' differing mandates (despite time being spent initially clarifying these) and cultures, the nature of relations with governments, working methods and a general lack of understanding and frustration among NGOs in regards to UNHCR's position. On the other hand UNHCR felt that the NGOs' expectations were unrealistic and they were unfair in their position. The tensions are further heightened in some countries by differences in the level of experience of the people involved and previous experience of partnership. UNHCR misgivings caused a very slow start to the partnership aspect of the programme; it took nearly two years for the Senior Regional Policy Adviser to begin work. This resulted in an imbalance in terms of SCEP's early leadership and scope of activity.
43. The different opinion on the issues were acknowledged and addressed at a Steering Committee meeting in November 2000 and an agreement made that the partnership should be loosened, but what this means in practice has not been followed up.
44. Over the last year there has been a significant disengagement by the two parties involved, making it difficult to describe the current arrangements in terms of what was originally intended. In effect, there are now two programmes, (albeit fairly well co-ordinated with continuing examples of joint work and information sharing) running in parallel.

2.1.1 Negotiating the Partnership

45. There is agreement now that the partnership was forged too quickly. The former Senior Co-ordinator for Children "*wanted it done*" and Save the Children *didn't realise the principles they'd have to deal with and didn't anticipate the problems which arose*. Neither party allowed enough time for early discussions focusing on how the organisations would work together to enable both to achieve more. Rather they focused on how to make staff roles fit together. This is a common stumbling block in the negotiation of how organisations work together. On the other hand, if negotiations are drawn out for too long, interest and momentum are lost. This could have resulted in the programme not getting off the ground.
46. The situation resulted in ambivalent commitment within some parts of UNHCR. The lack of embeddedness and some issues of ego, within UNHCR fed on themselves.

Many in UNHCR had misgivings about the programme; this was the reason for the delay in appointing Kate. In some ways this was because it was a new issue and we had never experienced a partnership like this. We often need and want to emphasise we are different from NGOs, if UNHCR is listed alongside NGOs many are outraged; there is a strong psychological aspect to this.

The nature of the agreement was controversial and unusual. The Norwegians gave money with strings attached regarding hiring- this is contrary to UN principles; others felt if we can get the money we should take it.

UNHCR Steering Committee Member

47. Moreover, as can be seen from the quote above, the programme also became entrapped in the politicisation of the UNHCR/donor relationship- a major debate in itself. Moreover from time to time debates centred around the tensions of a global organisation setting standards for local specificities, which in turn has ramifications for the replication of the programme model elsewhere.
48. The internal debate was not only at a level of principle. There were practical matters which made the arrangements difficult and therefore consumed a disproportionate amount of time. The arrangement didn't fit the UNHCR structure, making accounting for funds and hiring support staff difficult.
49. On the whole, Save the Children cooperation between members of the Alliance is based on members working together with a lead agency. The SCEP is one of the first projects with this approach. Save the Children's frustrations were also probably heightened as the Programme Adviser was employed as an external consultant and therefore flexible in his approaches to the issues. It was a conscious decision of Save the Children to keep the employment of the Programme Adviser outside any of the sponsoring agencies, in part at least, to avoid the sort of organisational impediments UNHCR faced. This worked very well in terms of generating the momentum needed to establish the programme and in implementing it up until now. However, this decision has consequences in the way in which the issues this programme addresses and raises are taken aboard by the wider Save the Children organisation and leaves programmatic decision making in an ambiguous position. (This will be returned to later).
50. The focus within UNHCR on administrative matters blurred their focus on the substantive issues of the programme. The delay in the appointment of a Senior Regional Policy Adviser meant that Save the Children took the initiative and in large part took the lead and determined the scope and to a great extent the type of activities and then carried out most of them. UNHCR were constantly in a catch-up position, for the first two years at least. This built up latent frustration within Save the Children and expectations which couldn't be met by UNHCR.
51. Until early 2000 the programme was very dependent upon the Save the Children Adviser although since then there has been a tremendous amount of activity independent of the Adviser. A minority, and mainly within UNHCR, still feel the NGO network in particular and to a certain extent the programme as a whole is still overly dependent on him.

The slow beginning built up insecurity, This was counterproductive, and it needed more time to sort out structures. And so the programme became dependent on David. The programme shouldn't be dependent on one person especially not at a national level, it should be able to stand on its own feet.

UNHCR Focal Point

52. Save the Children's frustration often focused on the length of time it took UNHCR to come to an agreement on an issue. Moreover, as outlined, above this was exacerbated by the Save the Children Adviser working largely independently of the Save the Children machinery. They were also disappointed by UNHCR not carrying through some agreements. E.g. it was agreed that UNHCR would organise a seminar on 'The Best Interest of Children' (as recommended in the 1999/2000 Review), but this never took place, even though it was planned for on several occasions. However UNHCR felt that sometimes (but not always) Save the Children were unrealistic in their expectations on how long it would take to get agreement. Or believed that Save the Children thought they were deliberately putting a brake on the programme. UNHCR is also aware that Save the Children has sometimes been disappointed by the results of internal deliberations.

The issues were being dealt with but the NGOs felt we didn't do anything, we thought the NGOs were unfair and this created a situation we need to move to a situation where we can develop things together.

UNHCR Steering Committee Member

UNHCR is a big, slow bureaucracy; we think they tried to put a brake on things.

NGO Network Member.

53. Structurally, the programme mechanisms have not allowed for ease of decision-making. E.g. decisions made at the Steering Committee can be taken directly by Save the Children members but need to go back to UNHCR for final approval and implementation. This has slowed project implementation down considerably, frustrating both parties, but Save the Children particularly.
54. The relationship was renegotiated in November 2000 and the partnership agreement was replaced by a collaboration agreement. Interestingly, the original partnership agreement only went until the end of 2001 and instead of renewing this agreement it was decided that Save the Children would draft a "letter of agreement" for 2002. This has not yet been signed, as it requires approval at several levels within UNHCR.
55. Both sides are aware that UNHCR was quite clear at the November 2000 meeting that it was not possible for them to work in the way envisaged – "*combining all efforts, all of the time in all activities*". This was because of the political sensitivities involved, their mandate and the nature of their activities. They agreed that UNHCR's limitations should not constrain Save the Children's wider remit. Save the Children felt at the time that the two organisations should influence each other's organisational practices and influence each other in terms of knowledge and expertise. I.e. the focus should not only be on the external aspect of the partnership. There was agreement on the type and nature of joint activities and resources but despite the discussions, a small minority in Save the Children wanted to continue as originally planned, even though that was clearly not possible.

56. Since then UNHCR has felt somewhat frustrated and feels that the loosening of the partnership was taken to an extreme, virtually ending the partnership in some fundamental ways. At an organisational level, no work has been done on what the agreement now means at the level of working relationships for staff. In recent months there has been markedly less contact between staff in each organisation and there is no joint work plan for 2002. This is noticed by programme members and has made the work of the programme staff more difficult.

It is difficult to understand partnership now. It's not fully explained. Why did we have separate meetings in Madrid? It makes it difficult for us to understand our role.

UNHCR Focal Point

The programme is now like two running in parallel, this constrains the potential for achieving more.

Save the Children Steering Committee Member

57. Other concrete examples of this dual track are the production of two newsletters, (which while avoiding difficulties over editorial matters confuse programme members), two lobbying/advocacy guides (although both are compatible) and the inability of the programme to jointly employ consultants, making ownership of contracted materials complex.

58. Coupled with an unfamiliar partnership some perceived the programme to be nebulous in terms of its identity. There is no joint letterhead; no one person can sign a letter on behalf of the programme.

59. Certainly, the tensions in the relationship have eroded trust, with scepticism being expressed by both sides and doubt at a number of levels as to whether there is a commitment to share information as freely as possible. Whether or not this is actually the case is not the point here. The perception that information is withheld has dented the relationship. It would be fair to say that Save the Children is now less trusting of arrangements with UNHCR, particularly at their inability to deliver answers and act on matters in a timely way. In turn, UNHCR is frustrated at their perception of Save the Children's lack of willingness or inability to understand their position and their continuing unrealistic level of expectation. Both parties however are quite aware of their own shortcomings, yet neither has found a way to overcome them-probably because they are deeply rooted in each organisational culture and the way in which the programme was established organisationally.

60. As the objectives of the partnership were never fully defined, it becomes difficult now to measure it. More importantly, and practically, it is difficult to know how and when this partnership should end or should have ended.

61. In effect the "partnership" as originally envisaged only worked, or was worked at, for two years of the planned three-year programme. Despite this disappointment, a lot has been achieved.

62. Future partnerships will need to be flexible in order to deal with emergent issues but also clearly enough defined organisationally and operationally to enable staff and others to work together in a constructive way.

2.1.2 Partnership at a National Level

63. Most frustrations within the partnership are at the Steering Committee level. The picture of the relationship is more varied the further you go from the centre of the programme.
64. Sometimes tensions are a result of NGOs being unaware of UNHCR's mandate (some reported that previously they did not know that UNHCR worked only on refugee and asylum matters) or how international issues are dealt with. In fact a number of NGO network members mentioned that their greatest learning from this programme has been about international cooperation and the dynamics of UN agencies.
65. In some countries the partnership appears one of equality as envisaged. In other countries the partnership is more traditional, building on existing relationships regarding provision of services to refugees through the mechanisms of implementing partnerships-with some UNHCR staff referring to the NGO network members as "our implementing partners" in a somewhat proprietorial way.⁵ These close ties because of funding arrangements also make NGO advocacy more difficult, and it is not clear how long current funding arrangements will last. Countering this imbalance however is the prevalence of national staff members in the offices of these countries. On the whole they are older and more experienced, with a very nuanced understanding of local conditions. Frequently they have been in their posts for a number of years, enabling long term relationships to be built up.
66. In some Western European countries the UNHCR focal points are or have been JPOs with far less knowledge and authority with national authorities than the NGOs. They are also dependent on support and decision making from management, and this is not consistent across the region. The issues of rotation discussed in the 1999/2000 review further exacerbate this.
67. In some countries, particularly in Scandinavia, there has been little contact between UNHCR and the NGOs, in part because the sub-region is served by one office in Stockholm and in part because on the whole the Save the Children agencies are strong and have direct contact with officials which does not need mediating by UNHCR. In addition, because of their size they are felt to be quite closed to outside collaboration, although there is frequent contact there are no joint programmes despite a number of attempts. Perhaps the situation will be revisited if refugee protection gains are lost, such as is currently occurring in Denmark.
68. In a few places the partnership has not worked because of personal differences and levels of commitment between the organisations concerned. In other places, albeit only one or two, there has been very little contact between NGOs and UNHCR and no joint work. With post cuts (there were five trained 'focal point' cuts or redefinitions in 2001), this has increased. The physical distance between NGOs and UNHCR also determines the nature of the relationship.

⁵ It should be noted however that in the majority of countries, the NGO Network members are not a main implementing partner of UNHCR.

69. As noted, one of the constraints on the programme has been the lack of resources and capacity in some CEBS NGOs. In these countries UNHCR has had to take the lead in the programme and do most of the work. All over the region there are examples of competition between the NGOs meaning there is no clear consensus around the issues within the sector, making it difficult for UNHCR to play a complementary role.

2.1.3 Different Mandates

70. At the outset, UNHCR and Save the Children acknowledged they had different, but complementary mandates.⁶ The differences in mandate are most clearly seen around the issue of non-asylum seeking children, of which there are increasing numbers. Although UNHCR is a UN agency first and foremost, and these matters obviously have to be addressed by the UN, there are ongoing debates as to how and when UNHCR should engage in issues outside their mandate. Whilst acknowledging the nexus of smuggling/trafficking, migration and asylum and the seriousness of the matters, the agency feels it must have the latitude to choose its own priorities outside the considerations of partnership, and this choice can't be made rapidly. Whereas increasingly Save the Children is concerned with the pressing issues of trafficking and non-asylum seeking children which require quick decision-making. The difference in speed of decision-making in this area, and the different approaches to the issue have created some tensions. These issues are discussed further below.

71. These difficulties should not overshadow what has been achieved through the relationship in operational terms and what each agency has learned from the experience.

2.2 Lack of Resources

72. Although well resourced as a whole, serious resource constraints exist at a national level. Some NGO network members work on a voluntary basis on the programme. Others work only part time and come from small under-resourced NGOs. Although acute in CEBS countries, NGOs and UNHCR in large western European countries are also restricted in their national networking because of the travel costs involved in meetings. This has meant the programme has been unable to achieve all it wants and needs to. Further, for some NGOs in the south of Europe separated children seeking asylum are not such an important issue, leading them to prioritise other work.

73. Scarce resources are not confined to NGOs, and NGOs acknowledge this. UNHCR has had a number of budget cuts effecting the region and during 1999 office were chronically understaffed because of the situation in Kosovo. Currently there are calls from some major donors for more cuts in the region. Given this situation and the way in which UNHCR sometimes uses partnership as a form of exit strategy, NGO partners will be expected to do more in the future, putting more pressure on their financial situation. Budget cuts are further compounded by the emergent nature of the issue. More has been learned as the programme has gone along, making planning difficult.

⁶ UNHCR's responsibility is to ensure protection of refugee children and those seeking asylum; Save the Children is concerned to see the full realization of the rights of all children.

In 1997/1998 little really known about the problem. The programme has grown to a size and scale that was not originally envisaged and time couldn't always be given to it.
UNHCR Steering Committee Member

2.3 Capacity at a National Level

74. NGO research has shown that strong organisations are often those which have relationships with others. With competition and a general lack of collaboration among NGOs the norm in some countries, it has been difficult for NGOs to work together to influence national policy. These working patterns are even more apparent in regards to the work needed to pursue an EU policy agenda.

This is too high for me, I know the basis of it, but not the detail and I feel too small for that. And as we're not members yet it's not so acute, getting the details of law making in other countries is enough.
NGO Network Member

75. The division in NGO capacity corresponds on the whole with the geographical differentiation of the region; with the newest programme members being from CEBS, the countries where NGO capacity is on the whole the weakest. Some feel these members are not yet fully integrated into the network and therefore the programme. Adding to this, some members all over Europe feel handicapped by all material being in English. This differentiation in capacity, manifested in the length of time it took to complete the national assessments, and the clear difference in the dynamics of the issues also reflecting sub-regional differences, lead many to think that in future the programme needs to pay more attention to work at this sub-regional level, with a strategy for each area of Europe.

2.4 Including Government Officials

76. The objectives of the programme focus on lobbying for legal and policy change. In this the programme has been fairly successful, and in some places the response was more positive than expected. Although present at some conferences, some feel that national policy would have been influenced to an even larger degree had government officials been more formally engaged in the programme; but not necessarily within the various networks. Some programme members cite the EU PHARE Horizontal Programme, which they believe, achieved a lot in the area of asylum because it involved politicians, and placed them in a situation which encouraged commitment. Further, with success in lobbying comes the challenge of moving to supporting officials to ...

do their job better and work with them on practical issues.
NGO Network Member

Further,

the government officials know that they have to carry out the international obligations. The "why" is not important, the "how" is important to them. These officials do not have to be persuaded. They just have to be informed and trained to do their job properly. Therefore they want to be assisted with neutral technical equipment, such as training guides for child friendly interviewing techniques for children in specific age groups. And techniques for the recognising of child specific issues.
UNHCR Focal Point

77. How to proceed to work with government officials in making changes or preventing negative developments will provide a challenge in the future.

2.5 Children's Participation

78. Children's participation is often considered one of the four fundamental principles underpinning the Convention on the Rights of the Child and therefore an objective implicit in this programme. Greater involvement by children was identified as needing greater attention in the 2000 review and it has been debated in a number of programme fora at all levels. But it is not overtly contained in the formal objectives, the original proposal, or annual workplans (although some plans for joint work have been discussed). Save the Children noted in an internal September 2001 review that this work needs a strategy for capacity building.

79. Limitations are seen on children's meaningful participation in political advocacy at an EU level. At a national level there has been some successful participative work with children but there is agreement that a lot more work needs to be done at a national level to ensure this continues to occur. At a very minimum children should be involved in the decisions which effect them; family tracing, guardianship. And the programme needs to know more to protect children; e.g. why do they disappear from reception centres in Western Europe? Participation does not mean children have to be present at every programme event, meeting, press conference, conference or seminar. As pointed out by nearly everyone, this is often tokenistic, making children merely show things. In addition there are practical issues involved in children travelling internationally; in Germany for example children can't move around the country without permission⁷, let alone leave it and in many Eastern European countries children disappear and move west relatively quickly. But there should be ways of including children's voices at a national level systematically in programme design and implementation. What issues concern children the most across all the countries of Europe?

2.6 Meeting Structure

80. The Programme network meetings have been invaluable, but the agendas have sometimes been too full and the meetings could have been better structured. Almost by definition networks function best in terms of cost benefit for members if they work at the level of information sharing. The numbers at the meetings mean that new ways need to be found to make this sharing relevant to everyone.

Everyone has a need to share, but I'm not sure how useful some discussions at the meetings are.

UNHCR Focal Point

Sometimes the way we share information is not useful. There's so much that some gets lost. It would be better to have regular summaries on a theme, which are updated. I think the information needs to be better organised around themes.

NGO Network Member

⁷ It should not be assumed that the inability to travel is counter to children's best interest. In Germany it is argued that a travel restriction can be a means of protection against the influence of traffickers and smugglers.

81. More minor weaknesses and constraints are the lack of international links, public awareness and involving the media, systematic follow up and coordination with other programmes with similar aims. Some of these issues will need to be addressed more fully in the future, but their impact on the current programme is discussed below.

2.7 International Links

82. While noting the nexus of asylum, migration, smuggling and trafficking, dealing with the international linkages in the programme is probably beyond the scope, and certainly the current and short-term future resource capacity, of the current programme. But it is crucial that the two sponsoring agencies find some way of picking them up within their broader organisational work. This will be a tall order for some smaller NGOs to tackle. Although they are well aware of the interconnectedness of the issues, they find them very complicated to deal with as the following example from one Eastern European country shows.

Save the Children does the social assessments of families for children returning from the West. And we have a programme with ISS Italy on return but it's so complicated to do both things at the same time, even though its helpful for us to do both as it gives both sides of the same picture.

NGO Network Member.

83. Taking these issues seriously probably implies an increased research capacity for the programme. Past studies, whilst important, were not seen as successful as other aspects of the programme, with members commenting further that they had not been used to full advantage.

84. International links also go to the heart of the constraints on both organisations. E.g. Discussions regarding the country of origin study revealed this; it was just too sensitive for UNHCR to undertake. Taking another example, Romanian or Czech Roma children move to other parts of Europe, while Romania and the Czech Republic are destination or transit countries for children from elsewhere. Examining these sorts of linkages highlights basic human rights issues and difficulties for UNHCR if they are perceived as curtailing children's attempts to seek asylum. Whilst being able to provide children, and other asylum seekers, with information about processes and counsel that they take such decisions very seriously, implying that they should not leave would breach a fundamental right. Despite these concerns, national level staff feel that the issues need addressing more comprehensively.

85. As discussed, for Save the Children there just don't seem to be the mechanisms to ensure learning across programme areas occurs, with little synergy emerging. The Care and Protection of Separated Children in Emergencies programme is a poignant example.

It's difficult to formulate a view about sending countries through this programme alone. But at the moment Save the children is not exploiting the work of this programme, the links must be made, and we must use Save the Children international knowledge better.

Save the Children Steering Committee Member.

86. The issues are not only politically sensitive. Several programme members mentioned their reluctance in bringing up issues in case the programme members from sending countries somehow felt personally responsible. Obviously this issue needs a frank

discussion within both organisations. Although complex, there is a feeling that this issue needs more attention in the future.

2.8 Public Awareness and Use of the Media

87. Public opinion is crucial in forming and influencing political and policy responses to refugee and migration issues. Some in the programme feel that the programme has not made enough use of the media in its work, and within UNHCR Public Information Officers need to be more involved (as discussed below in the section on mainstreaming).

2.9 Follow up

88. The need for better follow up of agreements made between the organizations involved is noted above. The need for better follow up threads through other aspects of the programme; how did advocacy efforts go? How have materials been used? What is the bottom line in terms of advocacy efforts? Are the national assessments still valid? These are some of the questions programme members have asked. And for both organisations the programme has highlighted a number of areas where internal policy is either absent or needs further development.

2.10 Coordination with Other Similar Programmes

89. There are not many programmes which focus on the situation of refugee children explicitly. However programme members in Finland, Ireland, Lithuania and Poland felt there could have been more coordination with the EU “Children First Training Programme” which aimed at collaboration between the four countries involved and focussed on training of government officials. Occasionally the messages of the two programmes were discordant, leading to confusion on behalf of the officials involved. On the other hand, the programmes reinforced each other at a general level.

3. Programme Mechanisms

3.1 Partnership

90. Overall, the main mechanism used by the programme to achieve its objectives was the partnership between Save the Children and UNHCR. The discussions earlier highlight some of the strengths and shortcomings of this arrangement. Using the principles spelt out in the 2000 review for effective partnership as a yardstick, the partnership can be considered moderately successful. Effective partnerships require clarity of purpose, mutual trust and respect, investment of time and resources, negotiation of roles and responsibilities and attention to long-term sustainability. As already discussed, the way in which the partnership was established did not allow for both organisations to work through what it meant for their organisations; the focus was on getting the work done, rather than why or how it would be done in an organisational sense. The difficulties encountered mean both organisations have lost some trust in the other. Positively however, people involved have maintained respect and understanding for their colleagues in other organisations. This has meant the issues have been dealt with in a relatively straightforward and open manner. But the effort to maintain the original level of engagement and respond at the level the emergent issues required has proved too much for either organisation. This year the programme appears to have lapsed into two parallel streams of activity. I.e. it has proved difficult to sustain the relationship over the medium term. However both organisations wish to continue some sort of collaboration with each other, and some in UNHCR see the model as transferable to other 'vulnerable groups'. But learning here must be picked up. For UNHCR there are deep-rooted issues which must be overcome if future partnerships with NGOs, other than those of a contract for service nature, are engaged in.
91. Given this situation at the centre of the programme, it also made it difficult to evaluate the programme as a comprehensive whole.
92. Save the Children intends pursuing collaboration with others in the rebalanced programme. In this they will seek to ensure there are clear limits on joint agency collaboration, ensuring they understand the agendas of partners and that collaborators can deliver. This will need greater in-depth exploration than was carried out in this partnership.

3.2 The NGO Network

93. The establishment of a network was considered an essential prerequisite for the programme to achieve its objectives. The programme has (at least one) lead NGO network member in every country and is valued as one of the most positive aspects of the programme. Membership, which is largely premised upon commitment to the programme's objectives, sought primarily to include child-rights organisations. Where this was not possible, universities or other child-rights related bodies were originally included, although currently all active members are NGOs. New members are added after consultation with the existing membership. This structure enables contacts to be made, information to be shared and comparisons to be made with others across all of Europe.
94. Information sharing covers not only material on the situation in each country but extends to ideas for advocacy and joint lobbying based on commonalities. Yet it also

enables autonomous action and preserves organisational independence whilst encouraging national coalitions. This is reflected in the lack of tension between Save the Children and other members, which was apparent in 2000, and a focus on the work at hand rather than structural and governance concerns. It is acknowledged that the same work cannot be expected from all network members.

95. To enhance the work of the network a lead member for each sub-region was appointed to act as a reference point for the Save the Children Adviser, who has responsibility for its functioning. Communication with the reference group is by telephone conferences and there have been occasional sub-regional meetings. As part of the advocacy strategy there were monthly telephone conference calls for a time to coordinate and share information among members whose governments are holding the current or future EU presidencies. This work now occurs at the level of the Save the Children Office in Brussels, as part of their wider programme although Save the Children SCEP leaders are concerned this arrangement does not meet current needs.
96. The generally committed, enthusiastic members' orientation is mainly to a hands-on approach, enabling a wide range of experience to be developed among organizations with broad ranging mandates. Again, the quality of the programme's leadership is essential for its success. So too is the programme's single focus, mirroring general NGO experience which shows that networks are often short lived and seem to work best when they deal with a single issue as this creates a unity between organisations.
97. Network members have varying levels of strength, resourcing and capacity. In some places, the NGO network member is weak and there is a small national pool of organisations to draw on to support them. Internal discussions highlight the need for the role of the national lead NGOs to be firmed up, especially if the model of the network as a network of national networks continues. This would imply that the programme network member was a lead agency at a national level and it is by no means clear that there would always be in-country support for this.
98. Lack of resources not only hampers the implementation of programmed activities, it has impeded the development of national mechanisms to do so. Establishing relationships with others takes time. Often organisations fail to budget for this and find that establishment is squeezed out of busy schedules. Time pressures also mean that members become recipients and translators of information rather than active providers. In most countries, obtaining funds in order to establish a national network has been difficult as has covering administrative and transactional costs. In a resource scarce environment, there is often increased competition for funds, mitigating against co-operative efforts. This is sometimes coupled with a low level of professional skill or knowledge base at a national level. And everywhere NGOs find it easier to access funds for service delivery rather than advocacy and lobbying. Resource issues at a network level could well become more acute if funds are not obtained for future network meetings in the next phase of the programme. Discussions have already begun of instigating twinning arrangements whereby richer members pay for the attendance costs of poorer organisational members. Working this mechanism through will take considerable work and devoted management time, but is nevertheless essential.

99. All this activity takes place in a highly politicised and increasingly negative public opinion atmosphere. It takes a great deal of sophistication to work with the media to change public opinion whilst working cooperatively with government on some issues and at the same time pressing for changes on the other. Many organisations simply don't have that ability.
100. Multilevel functioning will be of increasing importance in the future. Some members will be unable to implement the range of activities implied in the re-balanced programme and there is concern that some will flounder even in the current range without such close collaboration with UNHCR at a national level.
101. Much programme activity has hinged around the highly valued network meetings. But as mentioned their agendas are often too full making it difficult to go beyond superficial information sharing. More is needed, especially as the increasing complexity of the issues emerges. Although increasing amounts of collaboration between NGOs at a national level has increased, relatively little contact appears to take place between members outside programme meetings. Despite various attempts to establish member-only discussion sites and email groups, little use has been made of these.
102. Maintaining and extending the network will take considerable resources but as budgetary matters were beyond the TOR for this evaluation it is difficult to comment on sustainability of the current arrangements. However there is some concern that the network will cease to function without a relatively high level of external funding.

3.3 UNHCR Mainstreaming

103. Separated children are among the priorities in UNHCR's work with children and so it aimed to assist the mainstreaming of issues affecting these children through the programme. Including mainstreaming as a policy objective in a joint programme further highlighted difficulties for UNHCR in the partnership. Evidently, the statute of the High Commissioner states that policy directives are received from EXCOM and ECOSOC. Therefore some key UNHCR staff feel it was inappropriate that policy was being directed through this programme. Having said this, there is wide spread acknowledgement that the issues are of importance. They must be dealt with in their own right and the programme has rightly brought them forward and ensured children's issues are taken more seriously. But this is almost regarded as a by-product of the programme.
104. Overall, there also seems to be a creeping cynicism among UNHCR staff about the very notion of mainstreaming, with a lack of understanding evident among a number of field level staff. For them mainstreaming means carrying out the activities included in the programme, or prioritising these activities over others. For some this lack of understanding extends not only to mainstreaming concepts, but what was implied in making an issue a policy priority and then having the skills to carry out the work.

And now I have the competence to do the work, and can see its relevance. This is an important point. Sometimes we don't know why things are a priority. Then doing it becomes a matter of prioritisation in workload and lack of competence rather than idea of mainstreaming.
UNHCR Focal Point

105. Others point to the difficulty of mainstreaming separated children's issues when children's concerns are not central to the organisation's concerns. Despite them being a long stated policy priority, there is no clearly articulated child protection policy or strategy. This frustrates many.
106. UNHCR offices in Europe have been dealing with "unaccompanied minors" for a number of years, and whilst probably not such a conscious area of work, there has been a significant asylum-seeking caseload in some countries. As with any policy change, it is difficult to attribute change to one programme alone. But the programme has achieved some important gains. Introducing the programme and establishing a network of focal points crystallised this work by sending a strong signal of the value that needs to be put on it. 'The Children's Unit' at Head Quarters (HQ) including the SCEP in their planning and reporting has also raised awareness of the issue widely. And HQ memos requesting separated children be included in all Country Operations Plans (COPs) and Annual Protection Reports (APRs) have had significant results within a relatively short time; these will need to be sustained. Moreover, from the beginning of 2002, SCEP activities were included in UNHCR's regular budget and some offices now include separated children's issues in their monthly reports as a matter of course.
107. There is a strong feeling that the specialist staff and focal points have been important in catalysing and achieving this. But some staff are already focal points for other 'vulnerable groups' or issues, and this programme added to an already over-burgeoning workload. Further, if the focal point is too low in the UNHCR hierarchy, mainstreaming cannot occur.
108. However an individual focal point can cover only one function within an office. Further ways are needed in offices all across the region to include colleagues holding other functional posts and integrate concerns and knowledge about separate children to ensure the issues are systematically addressed.

*I'm a programme person and I don't usually do things with protection so I had to trick protection into it. We sent the national legal officer to the training, and he's also the training officer so he's interested now. Then when we carried out the national level TOT we ensured we included my group NGO of concern and his group of concern.
UNHCR Focal Point (Eastern Europe)*

*We need more cooperation with protection and the EU focal point. The programme could be promoted through their conferences.
UNHCR Focal Point (Northern Europe)*

*[Here] it's progressed at protection and reception, but more could be done with PI.
UNHCR Focal Point (Southern Europe)*

109. In offices where focal points have shown little interest, no one has had responsibility for the programme, or posts have been cut, little has occurred. However Focal Points are not the only ones who have worked on the issues; input into and lobbying for legislative change is generally done at quite a high level in Country and Branch offices. Given the numbers of countries including provisions for

separated children in new laws and in amendments, this input has also been important.

110. For policy development and commitment to continue, wider support and knowledge of the issue will undoubtedly be needed at a management level across a range of departments. Already staff are questioning how this process will continue in the future. Some see their role moving to that of monitoring, although nervous about the capacity of NGO colleagues to carry the bulk of the work. Others have planned for non-project activities to continue, but are aware that government willingness and capacity falls short of ensuring the issues will be addressed comprehensively. Here the establishment of national task forces is seen as an important mechanism for continued work on the issue at a field level.

3.4 Capacity Building

111. The operational objective of the programme is capacity building to ensure protection of children across Europe. Capacity building is seen to not only involve the strengthening of the individual capabilities of each of the project's partners, but also their ability to work together in a creative and forceful partnership. Within UNHCR, capacity building was envisaged through the inclusion of a Senior Regional Policy Adviser on Refugee Children to

- work with government officials at the state and European level,
- endeavour to integrate the issues into UNHCR's policies and programming, and
- network closely with NGOs.

Save the Children aimed to build the Alliance's capacities by initially funding an Adviser and later an additional programme coordinator. They aim

- to enhance collaboration amongst NGOs in Europe,
- encourage and conduct advocacy in national and international arenas,
- provide training,
- create networks,
- develop and implement partnership agreements within UNHCR and
- develop case studies.

Setting these sorts of parameters is important, and, although it should not be open ended, capacity building is a long-term process, with needs and results emerging over time. Any capacity building programme therefore needs to retain flexibility and should not be designed primarily as an exit strategy.

112. The strengths and weaknesses of the NGO network and the functioning of the partnership are discussed above. Of note in relation to capacity building are NGO weaknesses in terms of relational ability, financial and human resources, advocacy and research skills. UNHCR faces similar resource constraints, coupled with at times ambivalent managerial support for the programme. Yet experience shows, management support is crucial if organisational capacity is to be built.

113. At an individual level, many programme members report increased confidence, knowledge and competence to deal with the issues as a result of the partnership and programme. For many, these skills are transferable to other areas of their work. NGOs in particular, but not solely, have learned from the experience of dealing with the issues in other countries and increased their knowledge of EU processes and the

importance of engaging with the European Parliament; no matter how difficult that might be. As already mentioned, many have found the structure of the programme and the way in which it builds on itself has enhanced their learning, with individuals learning through doing as much as through training.

114. Overall however, organisational learning is reported to have occurred to a lesser degree. Yet it is this organisational capacity, which will be more sustainable. The system of network members and focal points, which has been successful in leveraging mainstreaming, has however been less successful in terms of organisational learning. There have been a number of post rotations and changes of focal point or network member recently, resulting in little knowledge of the programme being left in the country and branch offices. How to extend knowledge and commitment beyond individual members is the challenge of any future networked activity. Several NGOs are just too small to have others in the organisation knowledgeable of the programme or systems in place to be able to effectively give, receive and use information gathered.
115. There have been a number of very good quality training activities and training materials produced which have been very well received. The regional TOT events, which included NGOs, government officials and UNHCR staff, attract particular comment, and the programme has most definitely produced excellent reference material. But measuring the impact of individual training on organisational behaviour and change is difficult, especially as it takes time to become evident, and much training has been relatively recent. However in consolidating the programme, Save the Children are aware of the need to develop a training strategy at a national level. It might also be necessary to carry out a capacity assessment of the NGO network in order to support members more appropriately. The plan for self-assessment of capacity could enhance network development. UNHCR and Save the Children staff country visits when combined with seminars or media events have also been useful in both awareness raising and (for UNHCR) addressing protection needs and concerns.
116. There are widely accepted limitations on training, however it is usually an effective method of introducing issues and raising awareness. As this has been a large part of the programme's focus to date, these training events have been very appropriate. However as the programme evolves, other methods of learning, both at an individual and organisational level will need to occur. Save the Children has plans for a capacity building programme in CEBS. It is important that this involve more than training. The wider programme has the potential to explore other methods of capacity building; exchange and study visits by both staff and government officials, twinning arrangements, accompaniment and continued regular visits by programme staff will all be needed. Knowledge acquisition in networks is also often enhanced through conferences and sub groups (perhaps in this case at a sub-regional or thematic interest level) which enable members to develop shared meaning to account for experience. It is important that resources are available to support documentation of new perspectives. Save the Children and UNHCR will need to ensure that in the future this network learning continues to be widely available; especially at a management level within their respective organisations.
117. Important learning, or at least awareness raising, has occurred within UNHCR through the very use of programme terminology. The programme defines separated

children as ‘children under 18 years of age who are outside their country of origin and separated from both parents, or previous/legal customary caregivers’. This pushes out the concepts and has influenced thinking further than the traditional UNHCR use of ‘unaccompanied minor’. Adults might accompany unaccompanied minors, but they might not necessarily be able or suitable to assume responsibility for their care. (As one Save the Children staff member put it “*we’re tired of hearing that trafficked children are accompanied!*”) Although not originating from this programme, UNHCR using and promoting the term can largely be attributed to it.

117. Save the Children, as a broad Alliance, has not capitalised on learning particularly well, meaning organisational knowledge is underused at the level of child protection. In September 2001, Save the Children Europe Group identified mainstreaming the activity into Save the Children organisations as a priority and suggested this begin by drawing together the work of SCEP with that of the Daphne Programme and the Central and Eastern European Steering Group. With the planned geographical expansion of the programme, this must be followed up. Perhaps, greater use of and information flows in future between the programme and the SC Brussels and Geneva offices will also ensure wider organisational learning. Whatever avenues are explored programme staff need the continued support of other colleagues in their work. E.g. when involved in EU advocacy the Programme Adviser and Save the Children’s EU Policy Office in Brussels drew on the assistance of a lawyer in Save the Children Sweden in order to ensure legal issues were adequately covered.

4. Influencing Policy

118. One of the objectives of the programme was to promote the development of policies and regulations regarding separated children that are as consistent as possible throughout Europe and are in compliance with international standards. Work plans for the past three years include several activities aimed at building the capacity of programme members to be involved in advocacy and lobbying or for the direct involvement in policy advocacy and the provision of technical assistance by the programme leaders. Programme members are supported in their advocacy and lobbying work by the production of a UNHCR Lobbying Guide and a Save the Children Advocacy Support Pack. Although aimed at EU level advocacy and lobbying these resources are relevant at a national level as well, as EU applicants and associated countries policy development closely follows that of the EU states. At the EU level the programme has sought to influence the key areas of reception, minimum standards in asylum procedure, family reunification, the review of the Dublin Convention-specifically with family reunification in mind and complementary protection and refugee definition, (which are contained in the same instrument).
119. Policy advocacy is complex. It requires good analytical skills, extensive contacts and relational ability, knowledge of processes and content and flexibility in order to ensure responses are timely. Measuring the impact of policy advocacy is even more complex, especially given the length of the SCEP compared to the time scale of policy development, especially at the EU level. One of the main problems is attribution when policy results from several causes.

4.1 EU

120. Advocacy work at the EU level has largely been left to the UNHCR Regional Office in Brussels and the programme staff and Save the Children staff working on the issues through their Brussels office. This is largely because the policy-making processes within the EU are not followed closely by most programme members, who find them outside their ken and realm of possible influence. The laborious processes involved have further disheartened some programme members.
121. Refugee assisting NGOs are often good at coordinating national level advocacy campaigns, but falter when these move to an international level. Very few organisations are involved in lobbying at this level in support of refugee children in general, making the programme's contributions even more important. Most SCEP advocacy has been done with the European Parliament and the Commission. Little has been done or achieved with the European Council, which on the whole NGOs find impenetrable.
122. Although influencing EU policy was a stated aim of the programme; there is no indication in the objectives the extent to which this was to be achieved. This has made it difficult to judge success. However staff in the Save the Children office in Brussels feel the programme *shouldn't be disappointed as the results so far are more than what we expected.*
123. As a further measure, UNHCR has recently involved their Council liaison staff in Strasbourg more in the programme.

124. At the level of EU policy making there has been little joint work between UNHCR and Save the Children, although there is an agreement to share information and several joint meetings took place to share information and one to coordinate activity. While it is difficult to see evidence of the partnership at this level, this does not mean that either party overlooked meaningful and important work. But wider programme members are not aware of the efforts each has made. For UNHCR the programme was not so important in this area of work. The Regional Office in Brussels has almost daily contact with the staff responsible for drafting Directives. While concerned with children's issues they were not an explicit component of their input. Moreover the Commission did not ask UNHCR for explicit advice on children, having received high quality and timely information from Save the Children.

125. The Justice and Home Affairs Immigration and Asylum Unit considered material and opinions from both organisations during the extended stakeholder's consultations. Commission staff are positive however about the inputs from the programme, although they did not realise this was a joint UNHCR/ Save the Children programme, but thought it was a Save the Children programme which was funded by UNHCR. Officials are clear that the issues are already clearly within the framework of their daily work. The personal commitment of the Commissioner; the clear priority set by the European Parliament, especially the concerns of Scandinavian governments and various policy documents; the Vienna Action, the conclusions of the European Council Meeting in Tampere in October 1999 and the 'Scoreboard' set parameters for their work. Concerns regarding the best interest of children come from the Convention on the Rights of the Child. That is, the programme cannot be considered the main reason for the concerns of children being high on the Commission's agenda. But as a result of programme inputs, at least three draft directives contain specific provisions for separated children. All staff working on the directives have met with Save the Children during the process and found the meetings useful. The drafters of the refugee directives found the input by Save the Children excellent and concrete evidence of this can be seen in some wording being taken directly from material provided. Commission staff stress that **key in this influence has been input at the crucial drafting time and the high quality of written material provided in a timely manner.**

126. However there is a long way to go before the processes of asylum harmonisation are complete. This will require the remaining draft Directives to survive the political process and find acceptance at a national level. During the next period of the programme inputs at a national level will be even more important in influencing final policy at an EU level. It will be where the lack of capacity among some NGO network members will become more acute and the role of the Save the Children office in Brussels will need to be re-examined. Although valuable it seems the two lobbying/advocacy packs and the advocacy training are not sufficient to fill the capacity gap, especially at the NGO level. Here specific capacity building measures will be needed, coupled with increased funding and updated advocacy guides.

4.2 National Level

127. At a national level it is again difficult to attribute changes in laws and policies to this programme alone; nor is it easy to see immediate results in policy terms. Further *We can't assume that governments lacked awareness of the issue, but maybe they weren't so systematically aware. But they also didn't give*

space to it. The programme's influence has said this is an issue which must be dealt with in its own right.
UNHCR Steering Committee Member

The issue existed in all countries and it would have been addressed, but not with the solutions we would like to see.
Save the Children Steering Committee Member.

128. In some states, SCEP influence has resulted in fine tuned responses whereas in countries where there is little willingness or ability to put in place high-quality refugee protection measures, gains have been less. Elsewhere previous gains have been eroded. Obviously in countries where the programme has a low visibility e.g. Finland, few gains have been made and in others the dialogue on addressing the problem is just beginning.
129. Programme influence can however be seen at a number of levels. Most broadly the programme has provided a structure and basis for lobbying and **raised awareness**, focus and recognition of the issue and provided a momentum and interest at the highest level of government; both at a central and municipal or local level. The methods which have been used to do this have been widespread dissemination of (translated versions of) the Statement of Good Practice, conferences and roundtables, national training of trainers and carrying out the national assessments in conjunction with government officials. This has been particularly fruitful where the Ombudsman has been involved e.g. Italy and Romania.
130. Elsewhere lobbying has resulted in **improved governmental practice**. E.g.⁸. Training for officials in how to interview young children has occurred in at least eight countries; special care units for children have been established in order to avoid detention in Austria and Ireland ; administrative practice changed in a number of countries; age assessment practices have been changed to be more in line with the interest of the children, guardians are now appointed in Romania, Switzerland and Austria stopped using x-ray tests for age determination, children's claims are often prioritised, and separate statistics on asylum claims by separated children now being kept by officials in all countries. In Sweden because of the programme, the government convened a committee to look into the reception conditions for separated children following a number of attempted suicides.
131. **Positive changes in refugee law**, or in amendments have also occurred, especially in CEBS, although in most places there continue to be significant gaps between legal standards and implementation practices. Here UNHCR inputs have been crucial, with the Senior Regional Adviser commenting on virtually all the new laws put forward. E.g. In Lithuania on 15 January 2002, amendments to the Lithuanian Refugee Law were adopted by Lithuanian Parliament, which included provisions from the recommendations in the SCEP Country Assessment on Lithuania and in Poland UNHCR staff were asked to draft a special piece of legislation on separated children. In Germany, the Programme was a helpful support in the campaign for withdrawal of the German reservations against the CRC in its asylum law. In Bulgaria, the law was changed to align provisions to take into account the

⁸ The examples given are merely indicative of the changes that have occurred but they are not an exhaustive list; nor do they imply prioritisation or ranking of countries involved in the programme.

rights of children and European Conventions. In Romania, children are now given immediate access to the territory and in Poland, safeguards have been put in place regarding the deportation of children. Finally, in Hungary comprehensive provisions for separated children are now included in four pieces of legislation or government decrees.

132. In other sub-regions, policy gains have been patchy, and largely determined by the volatile political environment. It is thought that the programme has provided some resistance to the most negative forces or lessened the gap between policy standards and the reality of implementation. E.g. in Italy the situation has deteriorated a lot since 1998 when detention centres were introduced so the country could join the Schengen area. But, through the programme NGOs were able to point out and thereby counter misrepresentations of EU policy and provide examples of how matters have been dealt with elsewhere.

133. To be successful at a national level, advocacy for policy change has to be timely. This requires a certain degree of flexibility which is often easier for NGOs to achieve. Several NGOs comment that *UNHCR is not really an advocacy organisation, so working with them hasn't been easy*. Where there have been national task forces or forum e.g. in Romania, Croatia, Hungary and Germany, joint lobbying efforts seem to have been particularly effective. They also provide a mechanism for government consultation on the issues and to monitor changes and developments.

5. Future

5.1 Context and Trends

134. Most countries in the region report an increase in the number of separated children seeking asylum in recent years, with an estimated 20,000 applicants across the region in 2000, 2,018 applicants in 2001 in Hungary making up 21.5% of all claims, and the numbers doubling in Sweden alone this year. These figures do not include non-asylum seeking separated children, although there are many indications that this group will increase at an even greater rate. For the programme this means the group of concern will be significantly larger. The care and protection of separated children is therefore an issue which needs continued attention by both agencies and both have signaled their intention to work on it after 2002.
135. The children are entering an increasingly negative environment. At the EU level, in 1999 the Council conclusions stressed the importance of EU partnership with countries of origin to address the causes of migration and refugee flows. This conclusion also supported the work of the High Level Working Group, an inter-service group established in 1998 to focus on actions plans for cooperation in Albania, Afghanistan, Iraq, Morocco, Somalia and Sri Lanka albeit with a minimal development budget. All of these are countries of origin of a significant number of separated children in Europe. These moves were important as they signaled the addition of an external dimension to the work of the Commission of Justice and Home Affairs. For the programme, the policy focus heightens the need for both UNHCR and Save the Children to address international linkages more comprehensively.
136. However, implementation policies and funding remains largely at the level of containment and restrictions on refugee flows. There remains a focus on border control, policing and judicial measures within the EU.
137. EU internal policy making will largely be determined by the final phases of asylum harmonisation and concurrent enlargement. These processes will rise on agendas, but are unlikely to progress at a uniform rate. There are fears that 'meaningful harmonisation' will result in policies settling on the lowest common denominator, thereby corroding gains made in some states. Continued progress could well be in less controversial areas to stop 'illegal' immigration and trafficking as this is where cooperation between states has public support.
138. When the programme began, left-of-centre governments were governing all but four EU states. After the upcoming elections in Greece and Germany there could be only five or six social democratic governments. These governmental changes go hand in hand with the resurgence of rightwing, populist politicians and parties and the threat of a deteriorating economic position. Further, the situation is compounded by restrictive post 11 September security concerns and increased public awareness of these children.
139. At the country level, programme members predict a continued increase in children arriving, (especially those trafficked, although smugglers accompany most of them now). Eastern Europe will be the subject of increased transit movements, but it is also possible that an increasing number of children will remain in this region. Accession states in particular but not solely, will be influenced by legislative changes

at the EU level and in western and northern European states. At the level of practice, there is the possibility of authority for separated children moving to social agencies in some countries, but a retrenchment to care by immigration authorities in others. At the same time there is likely to be a greater contracting out of service provision to both NGOs and private security firms. Children between 15 and 18 years of age are increasingly likely to be treated as adults and likely to be returned to their country of origin. Indeed, there will be an increase in the number of return programmes and measures.

140. Coincidentally, the Senior Regional Adviser took up her post in 1999, the year in which UNHCR as a whole began to rethink its position in relation to broader, holistic approaches and started a return to focusing on protection issues. This resulted in some post and budget cuts, mentioned above. This policy environment will also determine the next phase of the programme. UNHCR notes with concern that there are continuing protection problems and gaps related to reception and care; the legal treatment related to asylum procedure and legal status and availability of long-term solutions. Currently, for the majority of separated children there does not seem to be any viable long-term solution available. This is partly due to many receiving a temporary legal status which is cancelled when they reach 18 years of age, and partly due to there being very few suitable return programmes for separated children.

5.2 Future Planning

141. **Future planning needs to focus on the structure, form and content of the programme.** Significant discussion has already occurred within both agencies regarding the future of the programme, although no joint discussions have taken place as yet. Lessons should be learned from how long it took to establish this programme and discussions need to start soon.

5.2.1 Structure

UNHCR

142. At a HQ level, UNHCR feels that the policy objectives of the programme have largely been met and that the present staffing arrangements at a meso level should not continue. The issue should now be mainstreamed through regular programme activities and planning. Crucially this will require some coordination mechanism at field level. With rotation there will be new (international) staff picking up the issues. As this phase has shown, even if committed to the ideals of the programme, **without guidance and support staff simply don't have the knowledge or competencies required to act on the issues.** I.e. to take the issue forward **there needs to be a focus on mainstreaming and the involvement of specialist staff** to provide advice and support in how this is done.
143. From January 2003, the post of the programme's Senior Regional Policy Adviser and the position of Children's Adviser currently based in Ankara will be amalgamated and moved to the Europe Bureau in Geneva. Positioning it in the Bureau will enable contact with the Senior Co-ordinator but will ensure closer contact with programming and protection issues in Europe. Although details of its geographical coverage etc have yet to be clarified, the post will need to be forward looking and will need an adequate activities budget to enable travel, meetings and joint activities with other organisations to occur.

144. Support for this move is not unanimous among UNHCR staff. There are serious concerns, based on experience, that the issues will be lost in prioritisation processes. Given what has been invested in this programme, the current post should be retained and based at a regional, not HQ level, as inroads into the disproportionate numbers of separated children seeking asylum have only just begun.
145. As of 2003 the focus will mainly be on country level activities aimed at the effective operationalisation of the tools and methodologies which have been developed and tested by SCEP. Advocacy and lobbying will remain central in 2003 along with recording trends in protection concerns for these children. Special note will be taken of the disappearance of separated children, the trafficking of children, detention of separated children, admissibility and accelerated procedures, the use of appropriate age assessment procedures, proper procedural systems being in place, increasing knowledge of Refugee Status Determination (RSD) procedures for separated children and return and reintegration programmes which are in the best interest of the child. In this UNHCR wants to encourage continued collaborative actions with the SCEP network and supports further cooperation with Save the Children and other NGOs, believing the programme should have some more time for consolidation. At this country level there will need to be adequate resources to cover the costs involved. Staff at this level however call for some form of sub-regional structure also; noting the gap between national, EU and HQ levels makes it difficult to deal with the issues coherently.
146. Branch and country level staff are quite clear that to continue the programme, each office must appoint a focal point to continue collaboration, although there also needs to be a mechanism to ensure all UNHCR functions mainstream the issues. Some are certainly concerned that the issue will not receive adequate management level attention and fear there will be inaction on behalf of children in Europe. Noting the nexus between trafficking and asylum issues, there are also calls for the agency to provide more support to staff on dealing with trafficked children as they are clearly in need of international protection, even if they are outside UNHCR's mandate.
147. Staff also point out it is crucial that IOM are engaged in some way because of their work with trafficking. Further the misunderstandings that have occurred in the past between the two agencies over other issues when there has not been adequate communication between them means that serious discussions relating to separated children must begin soon. Staff feel discussions with UNICEF should be extended.

Save the Children/NGOs

148. For Save the Children, the new phase of the programme roughly corresponds with a change in Programme Adviser. Some Save the Children members have mentioned that now could be the time to include the position within one of the Save the Children funding agencies so as to increase wider organisational ownership of the programme-this is definitely needed. However it is also acknowledged that this would be likely to slow things down and could lead to other Save the Children organisations disengaging from the programme. This decision requires serious discussion among the agencies concerned. Although Save the Children has a Europe group, it doesn't currently have a role in developing a European strategy for the Alliance. At the same time, the group for Central and Eastern Europe is working towards a more coherent strategy for all the Save the Children offices in the region. This leaves a policy lacuna, which is partly filled by individual Alliance members

having a strategy for their own work at a European level, but there is no mechanism to approach work together. The Steering Committee will have to act on this.

149. Save the Children has concrete plans afoot to rebalance the programme to address the situation of all separated children, in line with the programme's original definition but with slightly revised objectives. It will seek to continue some form of collaboration with UNHCR as well as other agencies that share the objectives of the new programme. To date initial discussions have taken place with ISS, IOM and UNICEF and are planned with the UNHCHR advisor on trafficking, International Catholic Migration Committee, IFRCRC, Council of Europe, Terre des Hommes and Enfant du Monde. NGO programme members interviewed who have had previous contact with IOM are cautious about its inclusion. As UNICEF has plans to establish a (somewhat contentious) child rights NGO network in this region very soon, discussions with them should be prioritised.
150. Geographically, the NGO network will expand to include the six Balkan countries. Seemingly the main rationale for this is Save the Children's programmatic presence there. However, national NGOs will become network members. Not everyone in the current network is supportive of this move. Some are cautious of losing focus, stretching relational and other capacity too far, and the increased complexity this expansion brings alongside apprehension that current concerns for refugee and asylum seeking children will be diluted.
- I'm nervous about this expansion in case it all becomes too complicated; we have to be careful that it doesn't compromise the aim of the programme. Until now success has been because we focussed on one issue.*
- NGO Network Member.*
151. Some find the criteria for expansion to these countries lacks transparency and clarity. They cite the situation in Ukraine, Russia, (around St Petersburg or Moscow), Belarus, or Turkey as equally as pressing and deserving of attention. Save the Children needs to think through exactly what objectives they are trying to fulfil in the proposed expansion and ensure the right sort of organisations are found in each country to join the network. This could be difficult in some countries where Save the Children is dominant in the sector. At the very least, discussions should occur with SEECRAN before plans go further.
152. This expansion will heighten the need for Save the Children to find some mechanisms to deal with the dynamics of countries sending and receiving children; of children leaving and arriving. They will also have to ensure that all members feel they can take part in decision-making and influence the development of the programme, especially in their area.
153. Depending on the balance of work struck between the two emergent strands of the programme there might be a need to change some national NGO network members. Widening the scope will mean the involvement of NGOs working with homeless children or those in the sex industry. Perhaps there will need to be several networks although the availability of funds is likely to determine this to a large degree.

154. Expansion therefore also implies more work for the programme's management. Once the way in which the next programme adviser is employed is resolved, time needs to be spent on rebalancing the roles of Adviser and Co-ordinator. Current thinking is to have one spend more time on strategy, policy and publications and the other more time visiting network members, especially in countries where there are large numbers of non-asylum seeking children.
155. More attention also needs to be given to the Steering Committee. Essentially it is the governing body of the programme and will need to be more involved, meet more often and provide more leadership in a new, Save the Children programme outside this partnership. There are plans to extend membership to Save the Children Italy, an organisation with significant experience and expertise in trafficking issues. This will mean that all four members of the Steering Committee come from organisations with programmes in sending countries. These discussions need to take place internally very soon, although members are confident about the next phase of the programme as this phase has built competence in all involved.
156. Many national level programme members would like the programme to continue as it is (or was planned to be) saying that it is impossible to achieve all of the objectives in a three-year period. Clearly this isn't going to happen. They also see an ongoing need for biannual meetings and an increase in the number of sub-regional meetings, with meeting aim's needing to be clearer and better followed up. The resource implications of this are quite heavy, but even if they can't be met, the call for ongoing structured contact between agencies should be heeded.
157. There are some calls for greater use of the internet and more email contact; how far these are taken up should remain the responsibility of programme members. Past indications are that while the website is well used, less use is made of programme discussions groups. The recently introduced NGO member email discussion group should be carefully monitored.
158. As the programme moves on and **adds to information sharing and advocacy**, members see merit in **restructuring it along two axes**. There needs to be more work and planning at a **sub-regional level** perhaps with attention paid to resource mobilisation at this level, and there needs to be **more attention paid to practical issues** of 'how to'- developing good practice in the priority areas listed below. Some also see the need to **better link the issues to children's countries of origin**- possibly with an aim to prevention. As discussed above this requires greater cross-functional learning in all the organisations concerned, and is probably beyond the scope of the programme as such, but links need to be taken up by the wider sponsoring agencies. Most also see a greater need to engage governments and officials in the programme in a more positive way and for some, greater public awareness is also important. Programming also needs to be flexible in order to respond to emergent issues and the demands of advocacy.
159. Many of the programme's network activities are based on information sharing. How organisations make use of this information lays the foundation for advocacy. To be able to continue with high-level advocacy interventions, better organisational learning structures will need to be in place. This will mean better systems for accessing, storing, transferring and disseminating information. This is everyone's concern. Experience shows that people value learning more when they see it as their

responsibility; when there is less of a distinction between those who 'do' and those who 'think'.

5.2.2 Transferability

160. Within UNHCR there have been discussions about how to extend this programme to other parts of the world. At the heart of some of the tensions in the partnership was how UNHCR, as a global agency, could balance its broad role against advocating for standards at a regional level to respond to local specificities. The Statement of Good Practice, although focussed on Europe, provides clear standards for work in other countries where the problem of separated children is growing. These then are transferable.

161. However, despite some feeling that the model of partnership could work elsewhere, others are more cautious stressing thought needs to be given to what is needed to make a programme viable. Thought could be given to minor modifications for a programme in New Zealand, Australia and possibly Canada. However key UNHCR staff do not see the current model and programme as transferable to the US. Some response to the issue by UNHCR is however needed everywhere.

5.3 Form

162. It has become obvious to everyone involved that the programme needs to be rebalanced to take better account of the rights and protection needs of non-asylum seeking separated children; particularly children who have been trafficked. At the same time it is important that asylum-seeking children are *not forgotten* but kept high on the agenda, as the dynamics and scale of the problem are only just emerging in their entirety. Other issues which need focused attention (in order of members' priority) are;

- tracing and family reunification,
- return as a real durable solution,
- reliable age assessment methods,
- information and research on child specific forms of persecution and RSD,
- guardianship,
- integration-particularly including education and health care,
- reception conditions and
- the disappearance of children from reception centres.

163. In order to achieve advocacy targets in these areas, capacity-building initiatives will also need to continue. It must be remembered that capacity building does not take place simply through training, but is also an on-going participative approach to decision-making and advocacy. The programme will need to maintain these dual approaches at the level of objectives. These objectives will then have to be measured through appropriate indicators which operate at different levels; process, building participation of programme members and children and impact.

164. Thus the programme will become more complex; conceptually, normatively and practically. It is beyond the scope of this report to debate these complexities. Nevertheless, throughout the programme literature, and in various programme minutes each is elaborated. It would serve the future programme well if these elements of documentation were brought together to underpin the planning and work

of the next phase. UNHCR has started this process, although this would be better as a joint exercise.

5.4 Content

165. Some specific initiatives regarding decisions on content have begun. The ongoing involvement of both organisations' Brussels offices will be crucial in ensuring EU policy work continues. Both offices will need to ensure their wider organisational processes deal with the issues in sufficient depth. In addition, Save the Children will need to decide what advocacy targets should be set for the broadened focus of the programme and how advocacy will be done. Here advocacy issues are likely to need to be independent of UNHCR as, aside from mandate concerns, NGOs are generally able and willing to address ethical and moral concerns when UN agencies can't or won't.
166. There are some suggestions that programme wide involvement of children in research to determine the key themes which concern them, and well co-ordinated advocacy campaigns occurring in all countries at the same time could be planned.
167. Also at the level of policy advocacy, further consideration could be given to promoting children's rights in readmission agreements-and their need for safeguards during and after return.
168. Whatever approach is taken to advocacy at the EU level, more attention will need to be given to work at a national level as this in large part will determine the final outcomes of the harmonisation process and it is where capacity weaknesses are most apparent.
169. Currently, there is very little information available about the link between trafficking and separated children. But as programme complexity increases there will be a greater need for accurate information, sharp and timely analysis and an increased research capacity to understand the intrinsic links encapsulated in the programme. Both sponsoring agencies have a research capacity and component to their current work, but this is likely to need supplementing by contracted research studies. These must be seen as relevant to the programme, and well managed by some sort of steering group. Some programme leaders have mixed feeling about this sort of research. Agreeing a joint agenda has proved difficult in the past, and there is concern that often such programme level research needs to rely on input from network members, many of which do not have the capacity to carry out even basic data collection.
170. However, the input of programme members should not be dismissed. Often issues which need a deep level of analysis require the viewpoints of people with different backgrounds and expertise as they provide the sort of broad focus which is essential for grasping the essence of core issues, particularly in changing contexts such as exist in Europe.
171. To meet this need UNHCR has had discussions about a comparative research study by Harvard University on RSD procedures covering 14 countries across Europe, but also including North America and Australia.

172. The TOR for the evaluation do not ask for comment on budgeting or resourcing; but this is the concern of a number of programme members. It goes without saying that without adequate resources the programme will flounder. Currently SCEP is one of 30 projects funded by the EU Odysseus Fund. Save the Children in its broad organisational form has received repeat funding because the programme is seen as successful, and because it has included action in third countries in its broader organisational applications; i.e. countries of origin through the return and integration projects. It seems that even if Save the Children has not drawn explicit links between this programme and others within the Alliance, the major donor has. It seems the Commission will follow results carefully.

173. The Odysseus funding line has now finished. Save the Children intend applying to the European Refugee Fund in order to continue. Securing these funds will be vital. But early indications are that as other EU funding instruments don't allow for such a sharp focus on this vital cross border issue, the application will be well received.

174. If children's participation is to be taken seriously in future, and it should be, the issue needs to be included overtly within programme objectives. Members involved will need support in developing appropriate skills so some form of capacity building will be essential.

*There is a lot that can be done at national level, but we have to think this through, it's time consuming and a new way of working.
NGO network member.*

175. Examples of ideas considered already at a national level are a pilot programme with three Save the Children organisations, a video project to help share children's experiences across the region, a programme wide semi-formal survey of children covering common areas of concern, pulling together examples of best practice at a national level and disseminating them widely throughout the programme or hosting an exhibition. The programme can then build on these at sub-regional and regional level. As already mentioned, to be effective in advocacy, children's participation in the wider programme will probably need to increase if advocacy efforts are to be seen as having wide spread legitimacy.

5.5 Where to with the Partnership?

176. Each organisation wants, and needs, some sort of future collaboration on this issue.

*HCR must absolutely continue, this has shown what can be done if there is a clear focus on one issue; you can really succeed.
UNHCR Focal Point.*

176. There now needs to be some serious internal reflection and then frank discussions between the two organisations as to the form this should take. Programme members deserve and are waiting to hear what concrete plans there are. Most suggest that the next phase of the programme has a partnership for joint events or activities rather than overall cohesion and planning. In effect this is what is happening at present. If there continues to be the negative changes predicted in Europe's political climate, then protection concerns for this group of children could well become more acute, requiring

even more joint action. But some see preserving space for NGO advocacy aimed at UNHCR policies as important also.

*We need cooperation with UNHCR as it gives us credibility and it shows we **can** cooperate with a UN agency. But we need to be able to be critical of them as well. That's also our role.
NGO Network Member.*

177. Given the waning contact in the current programme, and the loose arrangements come to at the meeting in November 2000 not being followed up, any future arrangements will need to be actively managed and thought through seriously. Currently, Save the Children seem clear that they wish to see the next phase of the programme owned by them, whereas some in UNHCR comment on the partnership as a form of complementarity. Often this seems to mean NGOs carrying out the programme where there is a shortage of UNHCR staff. The NGO network does not see things this way, preferring to view the programme in terms of joint ownership, even when acknowledging they need UNHCR's support because of capacity constraints. Intentions will therefore have to be spelled out clearly, but it seems each agency needs the input of the other.

178. Whatever structural form future collaboration takes, there are some practical issues which remain. What will happen to the publications and material on the website? How will it be updated? Who will be responsible for this? When will these discussions take place?

Appendix 1

SEPARATED CHILDREN IN EUROPE PROGRAMME

Terms of reference for a process of evaluation and review

Introduction

The end of 2002 coincides with the finalisation Separated Children in Europe Programme in its actual form and shape as well with the end of the EU and Save the children financial support to it.

At the programme's Steering Committee Meeting held in Bratislava in October 2001 was agreed that an evaluation of the programme should be carried out during 2002 and that this should cover both the Save the children and the UNHCR part of it

During the Steering Committee Meeting it was also decided that Save the children will commission the evaluation to an independent consultant and that before hiring this person Save the children should consult with the Head of the UNHCR evaluation unit concerning the ToR.

Background

The Separated Children in Europe Programme was established in October 1997 as a partnership between Save the Children and UNHCR. The original proposal that includes the Programme aims and objectives was drafted during 1997 and is attached to these Terms of Reference.

The Programme was reviewed using an external consultant in 1999, the findings and the consultant's report being considered at a review meeting in February 2000. This review process resulted in amendment of the original objectives of the Programme, and agreement on changes that would be made in the delivery of the Programme. The consultant's report and the minutes of the meeting held in February 2000 are attached to these Terms of Reference.

In November 2000, a meeting was held to consider the nature of the Programme's partnership between Save the Children and UNHCR. In general, the outcome of this meeting was to agree to a loosening of the partnership in order to allow both parties to operate without the constraints imposed by the partnership. The minutes of this meeting are attached to these Terms of Reference.

There is a commitment on the part of Save the Children to fund their side of the Programme until the end of 2002, to coincide with the funding timetable for the UNHCR Policy Officer post from the Norwegian Government.

The evaluation and review brief

The following is the brief for the evaluation and review of the programme:

- To revisit the rationale for the establishment of the programme and its focus vis-à-vis EU and activities at the national level
- To consider lessons for both agencies from the partnership and to make recommendations for the future. Here the focus should be on the kind and level of activities at the national level as a means to strengthening the partnership between NGO and UNHCR. Special attention should be putted in (a) levels of engagement; (b) hurdles; (c) sharing of information and collaboration; (d) achievements.
- To revisit the conclusions and recommendations from the Programme review meeting held on 2-3 February 2000 and from the evaluation report prepared for that meeting so as to assess progress over the last two years and to make further recommendations as appropriate
- To revisit the minutes of the Geneva meeting held in November 2000 and to assess progress to date.
- To assess progress made against original objectives and to identify learning points for the future. In other words: has the programme influenced EU and national policy?
- To identify the success factors and their impact on the Programme and its achievements
- To consider any changes in the external environment which should be taken into account in establishing objectives for the future work of both agencies
- To assess the NGO network specially regarding: (a) membership; (b) roles; (c) management; (d) involvement and levels of participation; (c) effectiveness to contribute to achieve the goals of the programme.

The evaluation and review process

Stakeholders

It is envisaged that the consultant will involve all key stakeholders in the evaluation process. These stakeholders are:

- Save the Children members of the Steering Committee
- UNHCR members of the Steering Committee
- The members of the NGO network
- The focal points in UNHCR offices
- The Programme co-ordinator
- The Senior UNHCR Policy Officer
- The Save the Children Advisor

Methods

Much of the data collection will be conducted either through telephone interviews or by e-mail. However, a meeting of the Programme network will take place in mid-April and there may be benefit in the consultant attending some of that meeting.

Review meeting

The evaluation report will be considered at a review meeting of the Programme's Steering Committee. It is anticipated that this meeting will take place in early June. The evaluator will be expected to be present at this meeting in order to present and discuss the report and its recommendations.

Action following the review

The conclusions of the review will inform action planning by Save the Children and UNHCR from 2003 onwards following the conclusion of the Separated Children in Europe Programme.

Status of the review evaluation report

The evaluation report will be a public document in order that it may be shared openly with the Programme's partners.

Any issues that are internal to the organisation and management of the Programme should be contained in a separate document that would be confidential to the Programme Steering Committee.

Timetable and time requirement

It is anticipated that the evaluation report will be commissioned by the end of January 2002 and that the majority of the work will be undertaken during March and April.

Taking into account the whole day meeting of the Steering Committee to consider the report, it is likely that a consultant will be required for a total of 20 days.

14.1.2002

Appendix 2

Separated Children in Europe Programme Questionnaire for a process of evaluation and review

The Separated Children in Europe Programme was established in October 1997 as a partnership between Save the Children and UNHCR. Just over two years ago, I worked with many of you reviewing the programme and am very pleased to be working with the Programme again leading this evaluation and review.

This questionnaire is being sent to all the

- Save the Children members of the Steering Committee.
- UNHCR members of the Steering Committee.
- The members of the NGO network.
- The focal points in UNHCR offices.
- The Programme Co-ordinator, the Senior Regional Policy Officer and the Programme Advisor.

Replies to the questionnaire will help form the basis of telephone interviews to be carried out during April and early May, although I hope to have the opportunity to meet and interview some of you at the Programme Network meeting in Madrid next month.

Your reply will be confidential to me.

If you need any further information about the programme to help you answer the questions below please don't hesitate to email me.

Please send your replies to Sue Elliott, by email on sjelliott@xtra.co.nz by Wednesday the 27th March.

1. The Programme's strengths and weaknesses

What do you think the Programme's greatest strengths have been?

What do you think its major weaknesses have been?

How has the Programme helped you in your work?

2. Influencing Policy and action

The SCE Programme set out to promote the development of consistent policies and regulations regarding separated children and adolescents throughout Europe, and to ensure these met international standards.

What do you think the programme has achieved at an EU level?

What has it achieved at a national level?

(Can you give specific examples from your own country?)

3. Partnership between NGOs and UNHCR

The Programme aimed to create a dynamic partnership between NGOs and UNHCR that would foster capacity building in international protection.

What kinds and levels of activity at a national level have strengthened the partnership?

What has your organisation learned through the partnership?

4. NGO Network.

*The NGO network is a key component of the programme for Save the Children.
What do you think are the strengths and weaknesses of the NGO network?*

for national partners:

What is the biggest constraint on your work at national level?

5. UNHCR

UNHCR has aimed to assist the mainstreaming of issues affecting separated children through the programme.

How well do you think this has occurred?

Can you give any examples of mainstreaming at either a country or HQ level?

6. External Environment

The current programme will end in 2002. Most associated with it would like to see it continue in some form.

What changes or trends in the environment do you think will influence the programme over the next five years?

a) in your country?

And/or

b) in Europe?

7. Other Issues and Future of the Programme

What issues should the programme address in future?

What form do you think the programme should take in future?

Should this evaluation/review address any other issues?

*Thank you for your time. Your contribution is important for the evaluation and the future of the programme. Please email your response to me by 27th March.
I look forward to meeting you in Madrid.*

Best wishes

Sue Elliott

Appendix 3

Those Interviewed

NGOs

NGO Network Members

Benoit van Keirsbilck
Bela Hejna
Taina Martiskainen
Thomas Gittrich
Elena Rossi
Birute Jureviciene
Gabriella Drobu

Save the Children Steering Committee Members (present and former)

Madeleine Tearse
Soren Petersen
Eva Larsson-Bellander
Diana Sutton

Programme Staff

Sergio Kristensen

David Wright

DCI, Belgium
Czech Helsinki Committee
Central Union for Child Welfare, Finland
Bundesfachverband UMF, Germany
Save the Children, Italy
Save the Children, Lithuania
Salvati Copiii

Save the Children, UK.
Save the Children, Norway.
Save the Children, Sweden
European Officer, Save the Children

Programme Co-ordinator; Save the Children
Denmark
Programme Adviser

UNHCR

Focal Points

Emmy Takahashi
Anna Bullesbach
Kristina Rodriguez
Liliana Ionescu
Wojciech Trojan
Lyra Vysockiene
Sabine Racketseder

BO, Athens
SO, Nuremberg
RO, Stockholm
BO, Bucharest
BO, Warsaw
Lithuania
RO, Vienna

Steering Committee Members

Damtew Dessalegne
Antonio Fortin
Christina Linner
Patrick Tigere

HQ, Europe Bureau
RO, Brussels
HQ, Senior Co-ordinator for Refugee Children
HQ

Programme Staff

Kate Halvoresen

Senior Regional Policy Advisor.

European Commission

Patrick Lefevre
Friso Roscam Abbing

Immigration and Asylum Unit
Immigration and Asylum Unit