

Advocating to End Violence Against Children in the post-2015 Process & Beyond

**October 13, 2014
Jonathan C. Rich
President, JCR Communications, Inc.**

Table of Contents

1) Executive Summary	3
2) Methodology	7
3) Overview of Post-2015 Process.....	8
4) Overview of the Advocacy Landscape to Date on Violence Against Children.....	11
6. Recommendations and Opportunities Ahead	27
Annex: List of Interviewees	36

1) Executive Summary

The year 2015 presents the international community with historic opportunity. In the international climate change negotiations, governments have pledged to forge a new agreement at the United Nations talks in Paris in December. In September 2015, Heads of State and Government will convene in New York, at the United Nations, for a summit to announce the successor framework to the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). The new framework will have poverty eradication at its core, and serve as a new sustainable development agenda for the world.

This is also an important time for efforts to end violence against children (VaC) worldwide.¹ In May, the World Health Assembly passed a historic resolution, which called on the World Health Organization (WHO) to prepare its first ever global plan of action designed to ensure that the health system addresses interpersonal violence, particularly violence against women and children. Then, in July of this year, the Open Working Group on Sustainable Development Goals (OWG), a group of 70 UN Member States, released its report proposing goals and targets for the new post-2015 development agenda. Unlike when the MDGs were created, the OWG report devoted relatively significant attention to ending VaC.

Now, roughly two-thirds of the way through the post-2015 process, as the effort to develop a new sustainable development agenda is known, and the process is in a transitional phase. The release of the OWG report was a watershed moment. It is the only time in the post-2015 discussions when so many UN Member States agreed on recommendations for specific goals and targets for after 2015. Yet the full intergovernmental negotiations, including all UN Member States, to formally agree on goals and targets, and the rest of the post-2015 agenda, have not yet begun. Therefore, despite having proposed goals and targets from the OWG as a basis for the negotiations, the process shifts and continues. This shift in the process requires a shift in approach to advocacy efforts.

It is in this context that the Elevate Children Funders Group, and the NGO, Without Violence decided to undertake an advocacy “scan” of the post-2015 landscape from the perspective of the issue of VaC. This scan was largely based on conversations with 51 individuals from virtually all relevant sectors including the United Nations, governments, NGO’s, foundations and the private sector. These conversations, combined with online research, led to a small number of key conclusions;

¹ “If Not Now, When? Ending Violence Against the World’s Children” by David Steven, Center on International Cooperation, NYU

- 1) The language on VaC within the OWG report, the main basis for the intergovernmental negotiations to come, is generally good (though of course it could be improved).
- 2) The issue of VaC, in the context of the negotiations within the OWG, was not controversial, or particularly high profile.
- 3) Effective advocacy has been, and continues to be carried out by a number of key actors in the field, including, but not limited to, members of the so-called Group of Six Child Focused Agencies, the Secretary-General's Special Representative on Violence Against Children and others.

While acknowledging the many risks and challenges ahead, with approximately one year remaining in the post-2015 process, the issue of VaC appears to be in a relatively good place.

However, given that the process is at a new stage, on the eve of the intergovernmental negotiations, where should advocacy efforts be focused going forward?

- 1) Protect gains: Participates in the post-2015 process do not agree on many things, but most do agree that it is extremely unlikely, at this stage of the process, that additional goals and targets (in addition to those in the OWG report) will be agreed. Also, there are powerful UN Member States advocating for an overall reduction in the number of goals and targets from the current set proposed by the OWG. This situation, combined with good language on VaC already existing in the OWG report, means that advocates and supporters of ending violence against children should focus on protecting the current gains, in terms of VaC language, when the intergovernmental negotiations begin in early 2015.
- 2) Implementation: As 2016 approaches, governments will be increasingly focused on the eventual need to implement any new global development agenda. Advocates and supporters of ending VaC should work with a select number of governments, ideally in multi-sectoral partnerships, to begin to assist and enable them in preparing for the implementation of the new agenda, and specifically targets related to VaC. In addition to the benefit of enabling better planning, this effort will also have the effect of showcasing for governments how implementable VaC targets could be. During the intergovernmental negotiations, the more implementable a target or goal is perceived to be, the more likely it is to survive the pressure to reduce the overall number of goals and targets.

The efforts described above are mutually reinforcing. Planning for and demonstrating (where possible) how VaC targets could be implemented helps convince UN Member States that the targets are practical, achievable and contribute to the advancement of other goals and targets, strengthening the argument for keeping them in the eventual post-2015 framework. Continuing

to advocate that the targets remain in any final post-2015 development agenda ensures that governments have strong VaC targets to plan around in the first place, laying the groundwork for more progress in addressing VaC after 2015.

There are a number of tactics which funders, and others supporters of addressing VaC, might engage in or support, all designed to further either or both of the two tracks mentioned above. These could include;

- a) **Improve Language:** There is essentially no space remaining within the post-2015 process to add new goals or targets. But there may be opportunities to slightly improve language around VaC and they should be taken. Those opportunities include the Secretary-General's Synthesis Report, the process to develop indicators and the international negotiations themselves in 2015.
- b) **Prepare for Implementation:** Either establish, or join multi-sectoral efforts to work with a select group of key countries to begin to establish how those countries would implement relevant VaC targets in the new agenda. This project might be considered as part of larger post-2015 implementation convenings being considered by other organizations, or as a stand alone effort focused solely on addressing VaC.
- c) **Convening:** Helping to convene partners, different sectors and/or UN Member States is one proven tactic which funders are often well placed to support. Gatherings such as this can create space which fosters agreement between UN Member States on key issues, be used to help bring allied organizations more directly into the post-2015 process, recruit new allies, or to foster greater cooperation between organizations and Member States working on implementation, for example.
- d) **Engaging Other Sectors:** Collaborating with other, closely related sectors, can often provide a substantial boost to advocacy efforts, lead to additional advocacy opportunities and help to demonstrate to UN Member States that VaC is a cross-cutting issue affecting progress on much of the post-2015 agenda. Collaboration opportunities should be developed with organizations working on women and girls issues, and potentially others such as education.
- e) **Communications:** The development of a top line narrative for VaC in the post-2015 process and related efforts, such as the development of a suite of unbranded communications materials and tools which can be used by any organization advocating on behalf of ending VaC in the post-2015 process should be undertaken.
- f) **Increasing Staff Capacity:** Providing outside support, such as funding, to increase the staffing capacity of key institutions and organizations engaged in post-2015 is a tactic which has been utilized on various issues at and around the United Nations and could be better employed by supporters and advocates of ending VaC.
- g) **Engaging WHO More on post-2015:** More platforms and opportunities should be organized which provide relevant WHO staff with direct opportunities to engage in VaC discussions in the post-2015 context. WHO staff are not able to engage in direct advocacy, but could be provided with additional opportunities to provide expert inputs to UN Member States specifically on the issue of ending VaC.

- h) **Research:** Given the need to transition to a focus on implementation over the coming year, combined with the ongoing need to substantiate advocacy arguments to protect the current gains achieved with the OWG report, additional research, particularly focused on other elements of the post-2015 framework such as finance and means of implementation, might enhance advocacy efforts. This work could build on efforts already underway by some advocates.
- i) **Engaging High-level Champions:** A small number of very high-level advocates could be engaged around targeted opportunities in the coming year to help advance or defend VaC language in the negotiations. Simultaneously, planning could begin and opportunities could be identified to either establish a small group of high-level advocates on addressing VaC after 2015, or to “seed” existing or newly created high-level groups with members willing to focus on addressing VaC as a significant part of their contribution.
- j) **A Pooled Fund:** A fund which could provide relatively small grants to support advocacy and communications related work should be established. This fund could be used to help pay for the costs of items such as travel, organization of events, translation, development of communications materials and so forth, many of the basic tools and tactics necessary to undertake basic advocacy work.

2) Methodology

To assess the advocacy landscape to date and provide recommendations for consideration with regard to VaC and the post-2015 agenda, interviews were conducted with a wide range of stakeholders and desk-based, online research was undertaken. In total, interviews were conducted with 51 people from a variety of sectors and organizations (see detailed list in the annex). These included individuals from foundations, UN Member States, UN offices and/or agencies, the private sector, the members of the Group of Six Child Focused Agencies, other NGO's which work on VaC issues but are not part of the Group of Six and NGO's from closely related fields.

3) Overview of Post-2015 Process

Efforts to develop a new sustainable development agenda for the world, commonly referred to as the post-2015 process, are entering the final phase. As an almost three year long process enters its last year, it is worth taking stock of of the process and where it stands.

This project comes at an interesting time in the post-2015 process. In many ways, the period of August through November 2014 is one of transition and preparation, at least from the standpoint of the official post-2015 process. This is because it is the period after the release of the OWG report, but before the release of the UN Secretary-General's Synthesis Report and the start of the intergovernmental negotiations.

July 2014 saw perhaps the most significant development of the post-2015 process thus far with the adoption of the Report of the Open Working Group on Sustainable Development Goals (OWG). This report, which proposes 17 sustainable development goals and 169 accompanying targets, is significant in that of all of the many contributions to the post-2015 process during the past two years, the report of the OWG is the first where so many (70) UN Member States agreed on a specific set of proposed goals and targets for the post-2015 agenda. In addition to the 70 Member States who were members of the OWG, all of the OWG meetings were open to all Member States, enabling them to contribute to the process, if not serve as full members. As will be addressed later in this report, a number of the OWG report's proposed targets contain strong language relative to the issue of VaC

As the process continues, there will be further debate over goals and targets, using the OWG's report as the main basis for the intergovernmental negotiations and including other inputs as well, such as the Secretary-General's Synthesis Report. But goals and targets alone will not define a new sustainable development agenda for the world. Much work remains to be done on other key elements of the new agenda, including:

1. Developing indicators;
2. Means of implementation, which covers a large set of challenging issues including capacity building, transfer of technology, financing, trade and regional integration;
3. Financing for development (FfD), essentially the process to determine how any new development agenda will be financed;
4. And the development of an overarching narrative which enables more effective communications about the new agenda.

October through December 2014:

During this period of time in the post-2015 process, there are many uncertainties. However, in advance of the start of intergovernmental negotiations, which are likely to begin in early 2015 some key contributions and elements are already known. They include;

1. The UN Secretary-General's Independent Expert Advisory Group on the Data Revolution for Sustainable Development: This group, which was formally announced at the end of August 2014, is meant to provide the Secretary-General with advice which can help shape "an ambitious and achievable vision" for a future development agenda beyond 2015 and on the data revolution and its implications for sustainable development. The group will, among other things, look at measures to close the data gaps and strengthen national statistical capacities.

The advisory group held its first meetings on September 25th and 26th in New York and produced a first draft of the report, available online, on October 24th. The group will then produce a final draft by the week of November 3rd. The accelerated timeline is primarily due to the fact that the Secretary-General would like to have the option to incorporate the group's inputs into his Synthesis Report.

2. 25th anniversary to the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC): On November 20th there will be an event at UN Headquarters to celebrate the 25th anniversary of the Convention on the Rights of the Child. While this event differs from the others on this list in that it is not explicitly a post-2015 related activity, it does provide advocates on the issue of VaC with an opportunity to remind UN Member States of their obligations to the CRC and that those obligations are a key to fulfilling any post-2015 agenda.
3. UN Secretary-General's Synthesis Report: By the end of this year (possibly as early as November 30th) the Secretary-General will produce a synthesis report. This report, requested of him by UN Member States, will seek to synthesize major elements of the post-2015 process thus far, including the OWG report, the report of his advisory group on the data revolution and the report of the Intergovernmental Committee of Experts on Sustainable Development Financing (ICESDF), among other inputs. Though not settled, one point of debate among many key stakeholders is whether or not the Secretary-General will attempt to significantly alter the work of the OWG. Most observers would say no, that he is very unlikely to do that. 70 UN Member States, plus many others, worked very hard to negotiate the OWG report, and the Secretary-General may not think he can suggest major revisions to their work. The Secretary-General may use his synthesis report as an opportunity to suggest small changes in language of the proposed goals and targets which might be useful, use

his report as an opportunity to address other elements of the post-2015 agenda (such as finance, means of implementation, etc.) and begin the process of working to communicate these proposed goals and targets more effectively. Many have raised the concern that with so many goals and targets, communicating them effectively will be challenging, and the Secretary-General may use his report as an opportunity to begin to make recommendations for addressing that concern.

4. Negotiations Among Member States over the Modalities of the Intergovernmental Negotiations and the Post-2015 Summit:

Governments are using this time, after the release of the OWG report and before the end of 2014 to negotiate and agree on two key procedural elements of the post-2015 process. First, governments are close to agreeing on how the post-2015 summit for Heads of State and Government, in September 2015, will be organized and structured. This will be the summit when Heads of State will meet in New York and officially release to the world a new, global sustainable development agenda.

Secondly, but importantly, governments continue to negotiate over the modalities of the actual intergovernmental negotiations over the post-2015 framework, which are likely to begin as early as January or February 2015. Despite all of the attention and engagement the post-2015 process has received thus far, the actual negotiations, among all UN Member States, have not yet begun. The negotiations over these modalities are important in that they will determine when and how the intergovernmental negotiations will take place and how open or not they will be to non-UN Member States, among other issues.

January through September 2015:

1. Start of Intergovernmental Negotiations on the post-2015 Sustainable Development Agenda: The intergovernmental negotiations, among all UN Member States, over a new sustainable development agenda for the world will likely begin in either January or February of 2015 and last until at least late July, or perhaps as late as the eve of the opening of the post-2015 Summit in September 2015. However, this timeframe is still not agreed. In September 2014, UN Member States formally agreed that the report of the OWG would serve as the main basis for these negotiations, but also that other inputs, such as the Secretary-General's Synthesis Report, and others, would be considered as well.
2. The President of the General Assembly's (PGA) Thematic Debates: In order to continue to foster discussion and debate around key themes within the post-2015 process, the PGA will hold several high-level dialogues from February to June 2015. These will focus on means of implementation (February), gender equality and women's empowerment (March), peaceful settlement of disputes and strengthening cooperation between the UN and regional organizations (April/May) and combatting

climate change (June).

3. Financing for Development (FfD): The Financing for Development Conference in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia will take place July 13–16 and serve as a significant contribution to the post–2015 process. Focus is now shifting substantially to the critical issue of financing any new global development agenda. The ICESDF report released in July 2014 provided more input and recommendations for Member States on the different options to finance sustainable development. A key conclusion was that the world’s economy has the resources to do it, but they need to be unlocked and redirected. During the UNGA session from October to December 2014, there will be 7 substantive informal sessions on the financing for development process. Beginning in January 2015 and running through at least June, informal consultations will continue, as well as the negotiated drafting of the outcome document for the conference in Addis.
4. High-Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development (HLPF): The HLPF, like the OWG, the ICESDF and some other elements of the post–2015 process was created out of the Rio+20 Conference in June 2012. The HLPF is meant to serve as the main UN platform for sustainable development. It could also be described as the place where the monitoring and evaluation for the new development agenda will take place from 2016 on. The HLPF will meet from June 26 through July 8th under the heading, “Strengthening integration, implementation and review – the HLPF after 2015”.
5. post–2015 Summit for Heads of State and Government: The summit, at United Nations headquarters in New York, to formally adopt a new, global sustainable development agenda will be held on September 21–23 (dates to be confirmed).

Taken together, the above-mentioned activities represent the key moments and elements which remain in the post–2015 process. They will also undoubtedly provide advocates of addressing VaC with both opportunities and challenges in the year ahead.

4) Overview of the Advocacy Landscape to Date on Violence Against Children

After speaking with 51 people from a broad range of organizations and entities, one might say that there is close to a general consensus with regard to the current status of VaC language within the post–2015 process;

1. While it could be improved in several respects, the language in the OWG report on VaC is broadly good, and represents significant progress for the sector and;
2. that given the challenging post–2015 dynamics, and expected efforts by

some Member States to reduce the overall number of goals and targets, efforts to protect the current language on VaC should be prioritized. This of course does not preclude opportunistic efforts to improve the language when possible, but protecting the current gains should be the priority.

Though VaC does not have its own goal, it is present across five of the 17 goals and eight of the 169 targets, or 14% of the total. The VaC language in the OWG report is as follows²:

Target 4.a:	build and upgrade education facilities that are child, disability and gender sensitive and provide safe, non-violent, inclusive and effective learning environments for all
Target 5.2:	end all forms of violence against women and girls in public and private spheres, including trafficking and sexual and other types of exploitation
Target 5.3:	eliminate all harmful practices, such as child, early and forced marriage and female genital mutilations
Target 8.7:	take immediate and effective measures to secure the prohibition and elimination of the worst forms of child labor, eradicate forced labor, and by 2025 end child labor in all its forms including recruitment and use of child soldiers
Target 11.7:	by 2030, provide universal access to safe, inclusive and accessible, green and public spaces, particularly for women and children, older persons and persons with disabilities
Target 16.1:	significantly reduce all forms of violence and related deaths everywhere
Target 16.2:	end abuse, exploitation, trafficking and all forms of violence and torture against children
Target 16.9:	by 2030 provide legal identity for all including birth registration

Interviews with individuals from a broad array of organizations also highlighted some concerns regarding language around VaC in the OWG report. Though there are likely additional ways in which language on VaC could be improved, three key areas of concern stood out:

- Goal 16 is home to much of the strong VaC language in the OWG report, but is also widely seen as one of the most at risk goals overall, should efforts to reduce the overall number of goals prove successful. In theory, this puts the VaC targets currently under Goal 16 at risk;
- Several interviewed also pointed to the need for better language to be added to Target 5.2, specifically the inclusion of ‘boys’ as well as women and girls and;
- It was noted by several that it is very unfortunate not to have any VaC language under the Goal 3: Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being

² “A Mid-2014 Stocktake on VAC and the Post-2015 Process”, Bill Bell, Save the Children

for all at all ages.

One view, which came through in the interviews, including from some UN Member States, was that, generally speaking, in the OWG negotiations, VaC was not seen as a high profile issue. It was not considered an issue which received a tremendous amount of attention in large part because it was not viewed as controversial, unlike, for example, climate change or rule of law. Because of this lack of attention, however, there is also a risk that some of the language could be changed or dropped as pressure to shrink the number of goals increases. In other words, it is one thing for Member States to broadly agree on the need to address violence against children, but quite another to have Member States for whom addressing VaC is a clear priority and an issue prominently pushed or defended by them in the coming intergovernmental negotiations.

Examples of concern about elements relating to VaC in the OWG report³ are detailed in the box below:

Target 5.2:	Some wanted to include ‘boys’ as well as girls; some governments wanted to see a reference to conflict, crisis and disasters.
Target 5.3:	Some governments proposed to remove the reference to early marriage from this target because of differences in definition.
Target 8.7:	Discussion included debate on whether 2020 or 2025 should be the date to end child labor in all its forms.
Targets 16.1 and 16.2:	There was a very broad debate about whether or not there should be a goal at all on peace, the rule of law and governance. Member States were very divided on if there should be a goal and what should be in it. For some governments these issues were not part of a sustainable development agenda and should be the responsibility of the UN Security Council. Others objected to the inclusion of references to the rule of law which they argued had no agreed definition and could result in interference in a government’s sovereign affairs. Resolution was reached through the replacement of reference to ‘rule of law’ in the goal by a narrower reference to ‘access to justice for all’ and by other changes to the targets.
Target 16.1:	(specific to violence) Discussion included concern that reference to ‘violence’ could potentially be seen as including conflict-related violence. Questions were raised about the definition of violence and about its measurability.
Target 16.2:	(specific to violence) There was a suggestion that the reference to ‘children’ in this target should be deleted – whereas others proposed that ‘women and other vulnerable groups’ should be added. There was also a proposal that this target should be moved to the goal on gender equality.

³A Mid-2014 Stocktake on VAC and the Post-2015 Process”, Bill Bell, Save the Children

Target 16.9:	There was some discussion about whether the provision of legal identify should be based on citizenship or should be given irrespective the person's status. There was also a suggestion that this target could be moved into Goal 10 on inequality within and among countries.
--------------	--

Alternative Home for Goal 16 Targets if Goal 16 is Dropped:

While Goal 16 is one of the most at risk of all 17 goals, it is important to note that this is not because of VaC related targets. The controversies surrounding Goal 16 have to do with, broadly speaking (and in more detail in the table above) concerns some Member States have relating the inclusion of peace, the rule of law, and governance issues in the new development agenda. For example, even the Brazilian Government, one of the governments most opposed to Goal 16, generally supports the VaC language in the targets.

At this stage however, there was no consensus among the Group of Six, and other advocates and experts, on where the targets on VaC might instead be included if Goal 16 were to be dropped by negotiators. When pressed, however, some interviewed thought that the most appropriate places would likely be some combination of targets under the inequalities and gender goals.

Lastly, it is worth noting that some consulted argued quite strongly that now is not the time to be making alternative plans for the VaC related targets under Goal 16. The most compelling example for this point of view is the Canadian Government. The Canadians are generally viewed as one of the strongest backers of addressing VaC, and also one of the strongest proponents of the need to retain Goal 16. The Canadians would presumably not appreciate learning that their allies in the VaC field were making plans to “save” their issue while leaving the remainder of Goal 16 even more vulnerable to opponents (by stripping out the VaC language which is among the least contentious under the goal). Those who share this general concern argue for taking a wait and see approach to whether or not a new home will be needed for VaC targets under Goal 16.

An Overview of Key post-2015 & VaC Actors:

There are many key actors in a process as complex and virtually all encompassing as the post-2015 process. This section only seeks to provide a very top line overview of some of those key actors and their contributions.

At the UN level, there are several important partners, including the **Special Representative of the Secretary-General (SRSG) on Violence Against Children, Marta Santos Pais**. One of her key inputs during the work of the OWG, the Global Survey on Violence Against Children⁴, was released in October

⁴http://srsg.violenceagainstchildren.org/sites/default/files/publications_final/toward_a_world_free_from_violence.pdf

2013. The key findings in the report show that the recommendations made in the 2006 UN Study on Violence against Children are as urgent and relevant as they were at the time of the Study's release⁵ but also that violence against children is gaining traction in the post-2015 process. The report also lays out the progress made, and presents 8 imperatives.

Going forward, the SRSG on VaC is focusing on keeping the wishes of young people in the mix by creating platforms for their engagement⁶. She also believes that the language is good in the OWG report, and needs to be protected. On September 25, 2014, she issued a report to the UNGA and expressed on the post-2015 agenda: "First, it is crucial to mobilize the voice and support of leaders in all areas, and secure sound resources to safeguard protection of children from violence. Secondly, building upon the significant efforts promoted within and beyond the United Nations system, it is indispensable to promote sound monitoring tools and indicators to accelerate and monitor progress in children's protection from violence. Thirdly, it is imperative to include in this process those who are most affected."⁷

A priority for her work is also around the need for research, data and international cooperation forums where common concerns could be addressed regarding the opportunities and risks associated with information and communication technologies⁸.

The SRSG has participated in several VaC focused side events at the UN, attended OWG meetings, generally advocated for VaC issues in the post-2015 agenda and actively lobbied governments for the inclusion of strong language on VaC in the OWG report.

Amina J. Mohammed, the UN Secretary-General's Special Adviser on post-2015 Development Planning is a central UN actor on all things post-2015. She has also participated as a panelist at VaC events. In relation to the OWG Ms. Mohammed shared that the SG will likely "respect the work of the OWG"⁹, while using his Synthesis Report as an opportunity to begin addressing a broader narrative for the post-2015 agenda and otherwise contributing to efforts to determine how to communicate the eventual agenda more effectively.

Ms. Mohammed is presently focused on, in addition to the preparation for the SG's Synthesis Report, the SG's Data Revolution for Sustainable Development¹⁰. She was appointed an ex-officio member of the data advisory group in September 2014.

⁵ Page xiv: <http://srsg.violenceagainstchildren.org/page/920>

⁶ Interview with SRSG on VaC, Marta Santos Pais, August 6, 2014

⁷ http://srsg.violenceagainstchildren.org/sites/default/files/documents/docs/A-69-264_EN.pdf, page 12

⁸ Ibid, page 14

⁹ Interview with Amina Mohammed, SG's Office, September 9, 2014

¹⁰ <http://post2015.org/2014/01/30/data-revolution-for-sustainable-development/>

UNDP (often in partnership with the Department of Economic and Social Affairs, or DESA) has been central to the post-2015 agenda work and the development of the SDGs. A significant focus of their work has been to help organize, convene and sometimes co-host numerous national, regional and thematic consultations that were held in preparation of the post-2015 development agenda. “My World”, the United Nations global survey for a better world, shows that protection against violence ranks high among all population groups in all regions.

UNDP take a holistic view on the issue of children including many other aspects aside from only violence. They co-chair the “One Secretariat”, along with DESA, which is the Secretariat of UN staff working to support the various parts of the post-2015 process, including previously the work of the OWG. When interviewed, Anne-Laure Jeanvoine of UNDP, commented that advocates for addressing VaC should consider more joint lobbying with the gender community, perhaps in a more cross-cutting and holistic manner, as well as doing side events with UNICEF because of their well-known work and name.¹¹

The WHO is heavily engaged in the post-2015 process on the issue of universal health coverage, which of course has a strong preventive impact on violence against children. But WHO has essentially not engaged directly on the issue of VaC in the post-2015 process to date.

The WHO technical unit, the prevention of violence team, does work with partners on the importance of retaining targets around the prevention of violence against children and on targets relevant to risk factors for such violence. They also work with UNICEF on the development of programs to enhance parenting so as to prevent child maltreatment and promote positive development, and on the integration of programs for early childhood development and child maltreatment prevention.

On 24 May 2014, the 67th World Health Assembly (WHA) adopted a resolution entitled “Strengthening the role of the health system in addressing violence, in particular against women and girls, and against children”. Through the resolution, which was co-sponsored by 24 governments, the WHA notes that violence persists in every country of the world as a major challenge to public health. WHO is requested to prepare its first ever global plan of action on strengthening the role of the health system in addressing interpersonal violence, in particular against women and girls, and against children; and finalize its global status report in 2014. Member States are urged to ensure that all people affected by violence have timely, effective and affordable access to health services¹².

This resolution, and the supporters behind it, could be used more effectively for advocacy to strengthen the importance of including VaC in the post-2015

¹¹ Interview with Anne-Laure Jeanvoine, UNDP, September 11, 2014

¹² http://www.who.int/violence_injury_prevention/media/news/2014/24_05/en/

agenda and in Goal 16.

In several interviews, it was made clear that having the WHO more involved on VaC issues in the post-2015 agenda would help significantly, but they do not have any plans to prioritize the VaC issues with regard to the post-2015 process. However, the WHO-UNDP-UNODC global status report on violence prevention 2014 will be published on 15 December 2014. There is also currently no language in the Health Goal on VaC.

Engagement with **regional organizations** on VaC could be improved upon going forward. **The African Union** which developed a Common African Position (CAP) on the post-2015 agenda, mentions violence against children several times, always linked with other issues including gender, education and health. The CAP addresses the issue of VaC holistically¹³. The chair of the AU High Level Committee of Heads of States and Governments on the Post-2015 Development Agenda, which drafted the CAP, is the President of Liberia, Ellen Johnson Sirleaf, someone generally well respected by VaC advocates.

The **European Union (EU) and the group of Latin American and Caribbean countries (GRULAC)** co-hosted an event in at the end of September 2014 during the UNGA and Paraguay has been a key supporter thus far in the post-2015 process. In Latin America, there is a fair amount of work being done through the Global Movement for Children (GMC), and at present the GMC is led by a coalition of organizations and networks focused on children composed at a global level of ENDA Tiers Monde, Plan International, REDLAMYC, Save the Children, UNICEF and World Vision, which together make up the Convening Committee. ChildFund Alliance is currently not a member of the GMC, but at one point was the Chair.

Engagement with regional groups could perhaps benefit from more attention by advocates and supporters going forward. Often, agreements made by governments in regional organizations can be quite useful in advancing advocacy with those missions in New York. As with capitals and missions however, there are often disconnects between what the regional groups have done/adopted and where their member states stand on related issues at the UN.

The Group of Six Child Focused Agencies:

This loose consortium of allied organizations which have come together to advocate on children's issues, including VaC, includes **Save the Children, UNICEF, Child Fund Alliance, SOS Children's Villages, Plan International and World Vision**. Among them, the ChildFund Alliance is the only one which, as an organization, focuses solely on VaC. Underpinning their collaboration, is an agreement on four broad priority areas;

1. Ending extreme poverty,
2. Tackling inequalities head on,

¹³ <http://www.nepad.org/sites/default/files/Common%20African%20Position-%20ENG%20final.pdf>

3. Protecting children from violence and harm: Survival is not enough,
4. Ensuring accountability: Towards a culture and practice of locally-led monitoring.

Having developed a common advocacy plan, these organizations participated throughout the OWG process (and before that, during the High-level Panel on post-2015) to advocate primarily with UN Missions. A prime example of this collaboration was agreeing on and proposing specific suggested amendments to the OWG's proposed goals and targets on sustainable development. The group worked together, although not all members always signed on to all documents, to organize high-level side events, develop joint policy statements, deliver open letters to the OWG co-Chairs and OWG Members, and target key member states for advocacy on behalf of addressing VaC issues.

Just a few highlights of the group's activities include:

- The Group of Six regularly suggested specific amendments to the OWG proposed goals and targets on sustainable development. They would propose alternative language for consideration and other specific language recommendations and inputs after each new draft of the OWG report became available.
- The Group of Six, without SOS, produced a statement in response to the release of the HLP report on May 30, 2013.
- The Group of Six has an advocacy plan "Proposal for joint advocacy on Violence against Children"—which contains useful information about the post-2015 process, highlights where VaC has been mentioned in the process and by what agencies or organizations.
- During the OWG process, there were regular update emails that assessed and analyzed where the VaC issue stood in the post-2015 agenda, by both the Group of Six and its members individually. In such a convoluted process as post-2015, sharing information among and with partners, including partners outside the Group of Six, was an important service the Group provided to the broader VaC community.
- The Group also regularly engaged key governments through direct lobbying of their UN Missions, and sometimes in capitols, and otherwise provided platforms to advance VaC advocacy through organization of high-level side events, along with UN Member States co-hosts.

It was a clear benefit for the Group of Six to advocate together. Despite the challenges of operating in a consortium, UN Member States accepted and valued their inputs and prioritized them more than if it were only the input of an individual organization. By joining together, they were able to advocate more effectively and to a greater number of member states. Also, because the common asks are agreed a top level, the Group of Six was able to be flexible about the advocacy individually in addition to their collaborative efforts. The fact that the group was only 6 members added to the flexibility and the ability to be more nimble with their advocacy. Having UNICEF as part of the group was also beneficial, as UN Member States will typically prioritize UN expert agency inputs over those of NGO's alone. UNICEF, as a UN agency was not able to lobby

Member States however, but could participate in discussions and events and serve as a highly respected expert voice on children from within the UN system.

UNICEF, as the UN Agency working across all children's issues is a fairly unique case in that it often participated in the Group of 6, but also is the UN agency most closely associated with virtually all issues affecting children. It has released numerous reports which have contributed significantly to the post-2015 process. In September 2014, UNICEF's Division of Data, Research and Policy, released a report, "Hidden in Plain Sight" which received significant attention, including coverage from the New York Times¹⁴. Another report, "A review of the open Working Group report on sustainable development Goals from a Child rights Perspective"¹⁵ examines the outcome of the OWG. UNICEF also has a significant campaign, the "End Violence" campaign, started in 2013. In September of this year, UNICEF also published a report on the "Ending Violence Against Children: Six Strategies for Action"¹⁶. Currently, UNICEF and other partners are working to develop VaC indicators and recommendations for implementation¹⁷.

Challenges and Opportunities Ahead:

Currently, the Group of Six does not appear to have an updated workplan now that the OWG has ended. Some of the organizations are working on different aspects of what is to come (means of implementation, development of indicators, finance, etc.) but in terms of a group strategy, there does not appear to be an updated version yet.

Another challenge for some in the Group of Six, and frankly for many groups working in New York, is ensuring effective communication between the New York based people and elsewhere in order to keep the advocacy asks and strategic development and implementation consistent. Also, as in any network or coalition, obtaining agreement from all members can be slow. This sometimes prevented the group from moving quickly to take advantage of opportunities which arose or communicating more effectively.

One possible missed opportunity is the relative lack of regular engagement and coordination with other organizations which work on VaC or related issues but do not have a regular presence in New York. This again is a challenge many organizations in other sectors face as well and not unique to the VaC community, but it remains a challenge non-the-less. Another example is that post-2015 advocacy would be enhanced via better engagement with closely related sectors including gender, health and education.

¹⁴ http://files.unicef.org/publications/files/Hidden_in_plain_sight_statistical_analysis_EN_3_Sept_2014.pdf

¹⁵ http://www.unicef.org/post2015/files/Post_2015_OWG_review_CR_FINAL.pdf

¹⁶ http://www.unicef.org/publications/files/Ending_Violence_Against_Children_Six_strategies_for_action_EN_2_Sept_2014.pdf

¹⁷ Interview with Karin Heissler, UNICEF, July 18, 2014; Interview with Brigette DeLay, Oak Foundation, late July.

Generally, the efforts put forth by these key players and allies resulted in fairly good results and language in the OWG. Some of these efforts could be bolstered with additional resources and relationships. It is also worth noting that people outside of the VaC field, but who are otherwise quite active in the post-2015 process are not generally very aware of advocacy efforts around VaC. This could be for several reasons and, as mentioned above, the politics on the issue were generally uncontroversial throughout the OWG sessions. Furthermore, this could have been because the joint advocacy efforts put forward were effective, but somewhat limited in scope.

Missions and Member States Engagement:

Overall, UN Missions are heavily engaged in the post-2015 process, but only a few are engaged on VaC specifically. This is not however, a straightforward challenge. While conducting this review it became clear that how Missions engage in the post-2015 process varies by government. This is true not only on VaC, but virtually any issue at the UN. For example, in some missions, the delegates based in New York often have the ability to make decisions on their government's behalf. For other missions, often the larger governments, the delegates in New York can do very little without the explicit agreement from their capitals.

There are several governments who are strong allies in general on the issue of VaC. These include, but are not limited to, Canada, the Nordic countries (especially Norway and Sweden), Paraguay, Benin, Liberia, Rwanda, the United Kingdom, Chile and Colombia.

However, broadly speaking, and at least relative to some other issues on the UN agenda, these allies were not generally seen as proactive and vocal champions for addressing VaC within the OWG negotiations, and were not seen to have addressing VaC as a top priority for their government. This of course does not mean they are not a supporter of the issue, but simply means that being a supporter is not the same as being a champion of an issue.

Although there was no clear champion, per se, key member states were engaged. Working with these allies will be the most fertile ground for developing "champions", going forward, and especially on Goal 16. The chart below provides some insight into some Member State positions on Goal 16.

There was also a set of countries that did not explicitly oppose VaC issues, but presented roadblocks at times to making progress on VaC for a variety of generally unrelated reasons. Generally speaking they were;

- a select group of conservative Middle Eastern states that seemed to oppose language that encroaches on what they might perceive as family issues or corporal punishment.
- Brazil opposed many things in the post-2015 agenda, including Goal 16, but not because of VaC issues or the language on VaC.

- Other so-called BRICs generally oppose Goal 16, which, as with the Brazilians, sometimes caused challenges for the inclusion of VaC language.

For more information on how some UN Member States approached VaC language in target 16.2 (ending violence against children) see below:

Member States	Position on 16.2
Austria	including child soldiers
UK/Australia/NL	
Congo	should be merged with 16.7 and include other vulnerable and marginalized groups
Portugal	with addition of women and reference to sexual and human-based trafficking in post-conflict situations
Liechtenstein	
Brazil	but in terms of “promote and improve violence prevention programs...” suggested there is no consensual definition of violence
Colombia/Guatemala	
China	in terms of mainstreaming
Republic of Korea	Merge 16.1 and 16.2 with language “...including eliminating of all forms of violence against children”
Vietnam	strongly supports
Peru/Mexico	didn’t list it as a top priority but said it needed to be brought to the attention of the agenda
South Africa	supported it but thought the target was “out of place” and should be moved to the Gender Equality goal
Finland	“eliminate all forms of violence against women and children”
Liberia on behalf of the African Group	suggested merging it with Target 16.1 and thus the defacto language of “reducing” would apply, joined call to clarify what “violence” means
United States/Canada/Israel	strongly supports and suggested addition of reference to human trafficking; also considering possible consolidations
Germany/France/Switzerland	supports including with reference to “women” and “ending impunity”
CARICOM (14 countries)	strongly supports (Note CARICOM doesn’t support a stand-alone Goal 16)
India	didn’t say they were directly supportive but queried why women wouldn’t also be included
Japan	Strongly supports
Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania	didn’t state direct support but didn’t recommend adding women under the target for fear of diluting it (based on private discussions)
Costa Rica	but flexibility to merge with 16.7 on creating a culture of non-violence
Montenegro/Slovenia	supports

Sierra Leone	supports in its entirety
Turkey/Spain/Italy	Supports “by 2020 end abuse, exploitation and violence against children and people with disabilities including during conflicts and other humanitarian crises”
Sweden	strongly supported with NO date since countries are obligated to fulfil this under the CRC (I commended Sweden afterwards for their statement)
Palau	but merge with 16.1 and include references to women and people with disabilities
Belgium	
UAE/Singapore/Cyprus	supports with addition of “women” and “in particular in conflict situations”
Denmark/Ireland/Norway	
PNG/Palau/Nauru	on behalf of Pacific Island SIDS (9 countries total) – supports merging with 16.1 and referred to this as “building blocks”
Thailand	

As mentioned previously, Paraguay was a key player in several of the side events and in advocating during the post-2015 process thus far and could be considered among those states closest to being a true champion of the issue. They will continue to be focused to some extent on VaC in the post-2015 agenda but when asked in an interview, would not explicitly say that VaC was going to be a particular priority of theirs in the coming intergovernmental negotiations¹⁸.

Tanzania was raised by UNICEF’s Therese Kilbane as being a good government¹⁹ on these issues. SRSG Marta Santos Pais also recommended them as having a good system of data, public discussions and engagement on VaC and that approximately 20 countries used the Tanzanian model of data.²⁰ The SRSG made the point that this could be another way to approach the issue of engaging and enabling “champions”, working with a state like Tanzania which has good work and progress to report and helping them take more leadership of these issues within the intergovernmental negotiations.

Chile and Rwanda were also specifically mentioned as having hosted an event with UNICEF, and as having very strong national work on VaC, but not being very vocal on the issue in the negotiations.

Capitols:

¹⁸ Interviews with Enrique Carrillo and Ana Sandoval, Paraguay Mission, October 1, 2014

¹⁹ Interview with Therese Kilbane, UNICEF, July 22, 2014

²⁰ Interview with Marta Santos Pais, SRSG, August 6, 2014

Engagement in capitols, from an advocacy standpoint, on VaC, would seem to be a gap based on this advocacy scan. ChildFund has conducted lobby visits to to capitals, has an office in Paraguay and partnership with the government to address VaC. And of course UNICEF is present in virtually every country, and other Group of Six members also have extensive in country representations, but the majority of the advocacy work on post-2015 to date has been in New York.

This relative lack of engagement in capitols (which is true on many issues, beyond VaC) has left a large gap which could be used to inform decision makers at the highest level including Heads of State and Ministers. Amina Mohammed recommended²¹ that when engaging governments in capitols, the highest levels must be briefed, including the office of the Head of State, Finance Minister, Foreign Affairs Minister and the heads of Parliaments, in addition to relevant sector specific ministers.

Communications Approach:

Individually, not many of the Group of Six organizations seem to have significant public communications work specific to VaC. As noted previously, UNICEF has a social media strategy and campaign with the #EndViolence hashtag that they developed in 2013 and recently published a report in September 2014 on that tagline, called “Ending Violence Against Children: Six Strategies for Action”.

There is also a common campaign, “A world without violence against Children” with the following members: SOS, Child Fund, Butterflies: Program with Street and Working Children, Child Link, Challenging Heights, EveryChild, Family for Every Child, Pendekezo Letu, Partnership for Every Child, Movimiento Mundial por la Infancia de Latinoamerica y El Caribe, Plan International, Save, Solwodi (K), Terra dos Homens, UNICEF and World Vision.

Together For Girls²² (also mentioned below in the Other Voices section), has done a modest amount of communications work and public outreach to engage people on the VaC issue, though not often directly related to post-2015. They launched a digital magazine on VaC issues which focuses on survivors of violence and their stories and also highlights heroes, both well-known and not, i.e. Hillary Clinton and also a local person in South Africa. They also write opeds, blogs, and articles. Despite the name, Together for Girls is now making a specific effort to focus on violence against boys as well.

ChildFund however has engaged in a fairly substantial communications related activities on VaC in the post-2015 agenda, namely through its “Free from Violence”²³ effort. Otherwise, the majority of what might be considered communications work was really focused on negotiated text in the OWG and

²¹ Interview with Amina Mohammed, SG’s Office, September 9, 2014

²² <http://www.togetherforgirls.org/about.php>

²³ <http://freefromviolence.org>

related declarations, sign-ons, and public side events.

Generally, there are many materials that address VaC issues, including but not limited to, Save the Children's work on the exploitation of children (labor, trafficking, etc)²⁴, Plan International's work on child violence and female genital mutilation²⁵, and their "Because I am a Girl" campaign²⁶ that could be used in order to advocate for more attention on VaC issues in the post-2015 agenda.

Overall, though this is admittedly based on a top-line scan, the VaC issue would seem to benefit from more common communication/campaign materials, especially those that are unbranded.

Other Voices:

There are other voices in the post-2015 process who work on VaC, or closely related issues, or have lessons to share about how to advocate successfully for other issues within the post-2015 process even if on largely non-related issues. Below are just a few examples:

The **Girl Declaration** developed from The Girl Effect movement. The movement is based on leveraging the unique potential of adolescent girls to end poverty for themselves, their families, their communities, their countries and the world²⁷. In 2013, Nike, the UN Foundation (UNF), NoVo Foundation, and Coalition for Adolescent Girls came together to create the Declaration, which has 5 goals and guiding principles for girls. They did a significant amount of lobbying during the High Level Panel work, the OWG, and other high level forums such as the World Economic Forum in Davos, the AU Summit, and the annual meeting of the Commission on the Status of Women at the UN. They also have many high level champions including Oprah Winfrey, Richard Branson, Malala Yousafzai, Raji Shah, Graca Machel, and others. The Declaration is based on a shared vision to make sure that girls are represented in a holistic way. The Declaration explicitly calls to eliminate violence²⁸.

Together for Girls works primarily on VaC issues and through partnerships has broadened its focus to both boys and girls. Their key focus is to collect data on VaC through, for example, country-level surveys, and mobilizing the results into action. They do not engage with the post-2015 process very directly at present, typically only engaging through a joint advocacy group led by the Girl Declaration. They explained that this is purely a resource question at this point however. Meaning, their board and their supporters have explicitly asked them

²⁴ <http://www.savethechildren.org>

²⁵ <http://plan-international.org>

²⁶ <http://plan-international.org/girls/>

²⁷ <http://www.girleffect.org/about/>

²⁸ http://www.girleffect.org/media/154319/declaration_high_res.pdf

to engage more in the post-2015 process on violence against both girls and boys, but they do not at present have the resources to do so.

Given how high profile and influential many of Together's key partners are, their Board's desire to engage more in the post-2015 agenda and their focus now on boys as much as girls, this organization provides very interesting collaboration possibilities.

The European Foundation Center (EFC) collaborated on the work that successfully led to the Urban SDG in the OWG and shared some of their lessons learned. During the fight for the Goal, they established an advisory group, and involved key organizations including UN Habitat, Communicas Coalition, and foundations including Ford and Charles Leopold Mayer. Their advocacy approach overall employed fairly standard tactics and strategies. Their events were many, and strategic, including roundtable policy dinners to put influential and targeted people together in smaller settings, often hosted by the Ford Foundation. Now that their goal has made it into the OWG, they have begun to work on how the goal will be implemented in 2016 in order to give it bit more grounding and action.

The High-Level Task Force for the International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD) is co-chaired by former Presidents Joaquim Chissano of Mozambique and Tarja Halonen of Finland and includes a number of influential figures internationally among its members. It holds youth as a priority and they are very engaged in ensuring that their priorities are included in the post-2015 agenda. The Task Force has held five regional conferences and ensured that good language on key issues is featured in the outcomes of those regional conferences and then fed into the official post-2015 process. The ICPD did an extensive assessment of where various countries stand on their issues at their Missions versus in capitols and noted that this effort is a time consuming one and constantly shifting, yet extremely useful.

Advice they offered included that it might be too late to set up a task force of high-level champions at this stage, in order to be effective by the time of the summit in September 2015. Instead they suggested that advocates and supporters of addressing VaC might consider establishing a high-level task force force on possible areas such as means of implementation and finance for 2016 and beyond.

Donors and the post-2015 Agenda:

The Gates Foundation has been a fairly significant donor in the post-2015 space, but primarily by focusing their support on enabling the process itself, rather than on a particular issue. They have supported other organizations involved in post-2015 by boosting their capacity to track issues in New York, or sometimes to enable better links between the New York process and regional organizations, again, often by supporting additional staff capacity. They also have provided funding to New York based partners to support organizing events and activities which convene key post-2015 actors outside of the official

negotiations. These convenings can sometimes serve as a neutral space for governments or groups of governments to focus on particularly contentious issues in the negotiations in an attempt to make progress in resolving differences. Though not in a significant way yet, the Gates Foundation has recently begun to explore the possibility of supporting organizations engaged in public campaigning work focused on post-2015.

The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation decided to get involved in the post-2015 agenda because they see it as important to their core issues: education; women's economic empowerment and better data on women's work; SRHR and transparency, accountability and governance. Hewlett's grant making generally in the post-2015 process is focused on these issue areas, but they also work extensively to support efforts designed to strengthen the overall post-2015 framework. Interestingly they also provide funding for general operating support to NGOs and others. They also focus on enabling southern participation by supporting the engagement of southern based think tanks in the post-2015 process. Hewlett has also given grants to southern based institutions to enable work at the country level with national think tanks to look at what implementation of the post-2015 agenda might entail. Gates and Hewlett have also at times provided capacity support to key institutions and organizations involved in the post-2015 process, often via additional staffing, in order to boost those entities contributions to the process.

Gates and Hewlett staff interviewed for this project also confirmed that one of the biggest challenges in the post-2015 process has been efforts to keep capitals and missions linked, as many others have reported as well.

Rockefeller Philanthropy Advisors, along with, Hilton, UNDP, MasterCard, and the Ford Foundation are collaborating on their engagement in the post-2015 process. This is a unique collaboration and partnership and is working on women's rights, SHRH and health. They are embracing the new opportunities for philanthropy, which involves a new partnership models and includes new actors such as private sector and civil society. This work is in part aimed at ensuring that the philanthropic sector is, as a sector, more engaged in post-2015 than it may have been in development previously, at least in a collaborative way. This effort may provide engagement opportunities going forward for funders in the VaC field and could benefit from further consideration.

The **United Nations Foundation** (UNF) is engaged organization-wide in the post-2015 process. Each of their programmatic areas engage substantively in the process, and work to enable and support their NGO allies in areas such as SRSH, women and children's health, climate change, sustainable energy and others. UNF also plays a substantial and prominent role in supporting and facilitating the process itself. For example, they provide support to Amina Mohammed's office and worked closely in support of the secretariat for the Secretary-General's High-level Panel on post-2015. UNF also had several of its board members on the HLP, including Mrs. Graca Machel and Queen Rania of Jordan, enabling the foundation to also engage in the panel's work via support for their

board members. Throughout the OWG portion of the post-2015 process UNF convened groups, large and small, of Member States to address some of the most contentious issues under discussion.

UNF is also working closely with Unilever and others to better engage the private sector in the process, and also increasingly engaged in Action/2015, the large civil society coalition focused on increasing public mobilization efforts in support of a strong, new sustainable development agenda as well as a new international climate change agreement, both in 2015.

UNF, along with Save the Children, are beginning to consider how to engage with governments with regard to the implementation phase, in preparation for 2016.

Unilever is probably more engaged in the post-2015 process than any other company in the world. Unilever engages in many ways, both in terms of supporting the process itself, and also substantively on issues it has some expertise on, such as water, sanitation and hygiene issues. Their CEO, Paul Poleman was a member of the Secretary-General's HLP and personally is quite engaged in the process, regularly participating in events and activities as well as lobbying governments on the new agenda. Much of the company's engagement now is via various coalitions of business, such as the World Business Council on Sustainable Development and the Global Compact's LEAD program, both focused broadly on sustainability. Unilever has also drafted a post-2015 manifesto for companies and is working to recruit signatories. They are asking companies to commit to; 1) joint advocacy/lobbying, using the manifesto as the substantive underpinning for that advocacy work and 2) exploring areas for joint public campaigning. They hope to launch their manifesto in Davos in early 2015.²⁹

6. Recommendations and Opportunities Ahead

For all its challenges, the post-2015 process provides a historic opportunity to firmly establish the need to address violence against children issues at the heart of the new global development agenda.

David Steven, a Senior Fellow with the Center for International Cooperation at New York University argues compellingly that now is a key moment for efforts to end violence against the world's children.³⁰

- 1) 2014 marks the 25th anniversary of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, which guarantees the protection of children from "all forms of physical or mental violence, injury or abuse, neglect or negligent treatment, maltreatment or exploitation." This important anniversary happens to fall during a critical time in the post-2015 process.

²⁹ Interview with Anouk De-Goede, Unilever, October 7, 2014

³⁰ Interview with David Steven, CIC at NYU, October 9, 2014

- 2) Relatively strong language, as discussed elsewhere in this paper, can be found in several targets in the report of the OWG, giving a prominence to the issue of VaC in the new global development agenda which was not the case with the MDGs.
- 3) On May 24, 2014 the World Health Assembly adopted a resolution entitled, “Strengthening the role of the health system in addressing violence, in particular against women and girls, and against children.” The resolution was co-sponsored by 24 governments and adopted by consensus. Notably, the resolution requests the WHO to prepare its first ever global plan of action on “strengthening the role of the health system in addressing interpersonal violence, in particular against women and girls, and against children.” The plan is expected to be presented in spring 2016, a time when many governments will be focused on how to implement the new development agenda.

Enhanced advocacy efforts on the issue of VaC in the context of post-2015 can help to bolster each of the above mentioned opportunities, and vice versa.

Recommended Approach:

In order to take advantage of the opportunities identified above and use this unique moment in time to substantially advance efforts to address violence against children, funders and others engaging in the post-2015 process should consider two, mutually reinforcing and complementary tracks.

Track 1: The post-2015 Process from Now through September 2015:

For track 1, engagement in post-2015 means direct engagement in the intergovernmental negotiations and related post-2015 processes in order to help shape and influence the best possible outcome of the process by September 2015. This effort would be a natural extension of, compliment and build upon the advocacy efforts already underway.

Track 2: Preparation for the Implementation of the New Agenda, from January 1, 2016 and Beyond:

By January 1, 2016, governments will have to determine how to implement the new, global development agenda. What policies might be required, how will they pay for them, how will they monitor, evaluate and track their progress, do they have the data or technology they need? Track 2 is focused on working closely with a small number of governments, in-country, and when relevant, in New York, to help prepare for the work of delivering on the new agenda.

These elements are mutually reinforcing. At this stage in the post-2015 process, as stated previously, possibly the greatest risk to VaC related targets is an effort by some to reduce the overall number of goals and targets. Engaging in a robust effort focused on preparing for and/or enabling the implementation of the new agenda will bolster advocacy efforts. It will enable greater engagement by key governments (those participating in this implementation

related effort), begin to provide more information and examples for what implementing VaC targets could look like and further develop multi-sectoral partnerships which can be effective in both advocacy now and future implementation. Simply put, targets which are viewed as implementable, measurable, financeable and have strong, multi-sectoral partnerships behind them will be seen by many governments as much stronger, and therefore at less risk, than targets which are seen as only aspirational.

Finally, when engaging in the post-2015 process and advocating for an implementable agenda with strong VaC related targets, it may sometimes benefit the overall effort to engage in issues more broadly than VaC alone.

Supporters and advocates of addressing VaC should consider that very often, to non-experts on VaC, a focus on VaC only can seem narrow. This feedback came from almost every person interviewed for this project who is not a VaC expert. This is an important consideration for many reasons, not least that governments, in negotiations such as these, where many issues are under consideration, will often give more attention and support to what they see as broader, more cross-cutting issues, rather than issues they perceive as narrow, correctly or not.

Also, some attention should be paid to supporting the overall framework and new agenda. Meaning, some would argue that VaC experts could end up with strong language in key targets, but if the overall post-2015 framework is weak, or the agenda is deeply flawed, efforts to address VaC will suffer for it, as will other issues. Those making this argument would propose that in addition of course to a specific focus on advocacy around ending VaC, parallel efforts should also be made to support already existing activities aimed at strengthening the overall framework for post-2015.

Advancing the Two Tracks:

Support and/or direct engagement by funders and other supporters of addressing VaC in any of the areas outlined below would contribute to advancing either, or possibly both of the two broad tracks outlined above. These options are meant to serve as a starting point for the further discussions which would be required by any organization considering these avenues for engagement in post-2015. In other words, this project was meant to, among other things, identify possible areas for support, but the list below should not be mistaken for a strategy.

Improve Language: As stated earlier, there is essentially no space remaining within the post-2015 process to add new goals or targets. But there may be opportunities to slightly improve language around VaC and they should be taken. These opportunities include;

- The SG's Synthesis Report: A very concise paper (two pages or less) should be sent to Amina Mohammed as soon as possible which briefly highlights the current VaC language in the OWG report which is strong, and identifies which small improvements could be made to the existing language.

– Indicators: The issue of developing VaC related indicators for the OWG report targets is already being addressed in parallel discussions by UNICEF and others, but this process provides supporters additional opportunities to address gaps in the current language via proposed indicators. It is also an opportunity to introduce VaC language under targets and goals where currently no, or insufficient, VaC language is.

– Negotiations: And of course, while protecting the current language should remain the priority, opportunities may arise over the course of the intergovernmental negotiations to slightly improve upon the current VaC language. By closely monitoring and engaging in the negotiations, advocates will be present and able to engage when these opportunities arise.

Establish or Join Efforts Designed to Prepare for/Enable the Implementation Phase:

Supporters and advocates for addressing VaC should either establish, or join, an effort to work with a select, yet diverse group of key countries to begin to establish, enable and lay the groundwork for how those countries would implement relevant VaC targets in the new agenda. As the new sustainable development agenda is meant to be universal, this small coalition of countries must include both rich and poor, developed and developing.

This work could be established on its own, or as part of a larger initiative. For example, the UN Foundation and Save the Children are already discussing possible ways to foster greater discussion of implementation³¹ of the new agenda in key countries and a VaC focused effort might build on and/or compliment theirs. David Steven, in his recent paper³², also argues for engagement in a select number of key countries aimed at accelerating progress to eliminate violence against children.

The question of which countries is one that will require more consultation among the experts, but an ideal mix would include;

- a northern government which would be willing to look at implementation at home, as well ideally as serving as one possible donor for the effort. Norway, Sweden or Canada might be possible options.
- a government already committed to these issues, with progress and experiences to share could also make a good partner. Tanzania might be an example.
- The small pool of countries should also include one government from Asia and one from Latin America, perhaps Paraguay.

As stated earlier, establishing this core group of countries would also potentially provide the effort with more vocal/proactive Member States champions. Having at least two Member States (one is often northern and the other southern)

³¹ Interview with Susan Myers and Minh–Thu Pham, UN Foundation, October 8, 2014

³² “If Not Now, When? Ending Violence Against the World’s Children” by David Steven, Center on International Cooperation, NYU

prioritize, promote and defend the need to address VaC issues could be critical in the negotiations if pressure mounts to decrease the overall number of goals and targets. Those goals and targets with the softest support will be the most vulnerable.

Work on the ground focused on implementation in a small group of countries would also provide opportunities to engage partners from other sectors, which would presumably benefit the work in country, as well as possibly providing multi-sectoral advocacy opportunities.

Lastly, depending on the country, this work might help advocates to address persistent challenges in linking work in capitols to the UN Missions in New York and the advocacy already being undertaken there.

Convening:

Helping to convene various partners, different sectors and/or UN Member States is one proven tactic which funders are often well placed to support.

Supporters of addressing VaC could support a variety of convening opportunities, with partners or without, which could help to advance track 1 and track 2 approaches. Some initial options might include;

- 1) partnering with an established UN convener in New York, such as UNF, to organize small gatherings of key UN Member State allies in order to help foster alliances and efforts to turn some of those allies into more proactive champions within the negotiations.
- 2) convening larger groups of UN Member States, perhaps by regional grouping, at opportune times in the negotiations to help address challenges in the negotiations. These kinds of meetings, often held off UN premises and off the record, can sometimes help negotiators find common ground which has been more elusive in the formal negotiations. While a convening like this would probably not be focused only on VaC, co-hosting these kinds of gatherings can often help build/strengthen relationships with key Member States and negotiators.
- 3) Convene other sectoral stakeholders, such as those from the gender and education communities, in order to develop or strengthen greater collaboration and identify opportunities to collaborate directly in advocacy during the intergovernmental negotiations.
- 4) Convene key partners in capitols to enable and or assist locally based advocates to lobby key leaders in-country and to help address the disconnect sometimes found between Missions in New York and capitols.
- 5) And convene key international, and national partners in order to establish and/or carry forward work which contributes to the implementation of the eventual post-2015 agenda.

Engaging Other Sectors:

Collaborating with other, closely related sectors, can often provide a substantial

boost to advocacy efforts, and sometimes lead to other opportunities which may not arise when only working within one sector. While collaboration with other sectors beyond those mentioned below, should be explored further, the ones below are recommended because they are interested in potential collaboration and because they come from a sector (women, girls/gender) which has arguably been very effective in the post-2015 process thus far.

Together for Girls was launched as a Clinton Global Initiative and is a public-private partnership which includes several UN agencies, including UNICEF and WHO, as well as U.S. institutions and offices such as the Center for Disease Control (CDC) and the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) and private sector actors. Given their focus on VaC (including boys), focus on data, influential group of partners and stated desire to engage more in the post-2015 process, funders might consider some level of support for Together to enable their post-2015 engagement and create a new partnership for other allies in the VaC community.

Girl Declaration also provides a useful potential platform for advocates of addressing VaC. Joining and/or collaborating with the Girl Declaration would be another way to expand collaboration opportunities for the VaC sector. This movement has gained a lot of traction, has an impressive campaign and high-level champions. They also often organize high profile events and activities not only in New York, but also at other gatherings of world leaders such as Davos, G20 meetings and elsewhere.

Communications:

Effective communications work will be essential to every aspect of advancing the case for eliminating VaC. At present, as discussed elsewhere in this paper, some joint communications work is done by the Group of Six, but the bulk of the communications work is undertaken by individual organizations. As also noted elsewhere in this paper, UN Member States (targets of the advocacy efforts) are more likely to respond when approached by coalitions of groups advocating together, rather than individual organizations lobbying them. For this, and other reasons, there would seem to be use for developing and providing a suite of unbranded communications materials. These materials would be useful in advocacy work in New York between now and September 2015, as well as work in countries to communicate success and lessons learned from the implementation focused effort.

It has been specifically recommended by several in this project that the issue of VaC continues to need a compelling, overarching narrative, and that working to address that need, in the context of post-2015, could be a tremendous added value. In the post-2015 context, this might entail helping to develop messaging which better, or more succinctly communicates the importance of addressing VaC to improving societies and to sustainable development broadly.

Lastly, while some of this messaging may well also be of use when communicating to the broader public, the current need is probably greater with respect to communicating effectively with governments, policy makers and

public opinion elite.

Increasing Staff Capacity:

Providing outside support, such as funding, to increase the capacity of key institutions, UN Missions, UN agencies or other relevant organizations is a tactic which has been utilized previously at and around the United Nations. Its appeal can often be in how concrete it is. Examples include providing funding for additional staff to better enable allies to effectively contribute to the post-2015 process. This approach can apply in several areas, including support for NGO partners, support for allied UN Missions and support to UN institutions or other relevant bodies (such as High-level panels and the like). This additional capacity can help give more voice to like-minded allies and provide opportunities for under-resourced partners or governments to engage more effectively as champions of addressing VaC. This can be a sensitive form of support however, particularly when governments or UN agencies are involved, so it should be approached carefully.

Further Engaging WHO on VaC in post-2015:

As stated previously, the WHO is focused primarily on the issue of universal health care and their VaC team is relatively small. Also, WHO staff are constrained in terms of advocacy, as the WHO is governed by its Member States. However, WHO is well placed to serve as a respected, expert voice with regard to addressing VaC in the post-2015 agenda and the implementation phase. Therefore, supporters of addressing VaC could consider, as part of their advocacy, organizing more events which provide WHO with a platform to address VaC issues, not as a fellow advocate, but as an expert voice. Advocates for addressing VaC already hold various high-level events, and perhaps more could be organized in the future with an explicit health focus, or which simply seek to recruit and include a senior WHO speaker.

Research:

Research can often be used to underpin effective advocacy. Member States will now focus increasingly on finance, means of implementation and other elements of the post-2015 agenda, and short research papers, case studies and other forms of additional research could continue to provide a useful boost to advocacy efforts. In addition to the excellent reports produced recently by the SRSG on VaC and UNICEF, Child Fund Alliance and Save the Children are currently working on finance related reports as well. There will undoubtedly continue to be a need for informative research as this process continues, and resources to support it.

Engaging/Recruiting High-Level Champions:

High-level champions can be very effective advocates. The type of champion being referred to here includes former Heads of State and/or other internationally known and respected figures such as former high-level diplomats, former Nobel Peace Prize winners and the like. As proven by the likes of Ms. Graca Machel, Professor Muhammed Yunus, Kofi Annan and others, highly respected international figures can be very effective advocates.

However, properly engaging and supporting these kinds of champions takes time, experience and resources and individuals at this level are often associated with multiple issues. It is probably too late in the post-2015 process to establish a high-level advisory group or task force on VaC if the sole purpose is aimed at supporting a strong outcome in September next year.

Therefore, one might consider in the short term looking to begin developing relationships (or strengthening existing ones) with just one or two such high-level advocates, approaching them with a select number of very specific asks, only at key moments in the coming year. This work may lay the groundwork for longer term engagement focused on the implementation of the new development agenda.

One example of a longer term area of potential opportunity could be, **but this is speculation at this point**, that the UN may want to establish a successor group to the Secretary-General's MDG Advocacy Group³³. This group of high-level advocates, co-chaired by the Prime Minister of Norway and the President of Rwanda, was established to advocate for the achievement of the MDGs. The Office of the Secretary-General may consider how to transition such a group, after 2015. VaC advocates may consider seeking to engage an existing member of this group, or promote a new, post-2015 member who is effective on VaC issues. At present though, the primary focus of this group remains the achievement of the MDGs.

Alternatively, and linked with the implementation focus and related efforts, the VaC community may wish to establish its own high-level task force, perhaps akin to the High-Level Task Force on ICPD³⁴.

Some names of high-level advocates which have been recommended include Ms. Graca Machel, Queen Rania, Queen Silvia of Sweden and Julio Frenk, the former Minister of Health from Mexico and current head of Harvard's School of Public Health.

Small Grants Fund:

Funders interested in supporting track 1 and/or track 2 might consider establishing a modest pooled fund to support advocacy. This fund would focus primarily on smaller grants and be used to support general operating work and related items. As most funders are no doubt aware, the most difficult money for advocacy groups to raise is often money for general operating support and other logistics. Paying to organize and host meetings, funding travel, translation of materials, creation and dissemination of communications materials and potentially for new research and/or the development of useful case studies is all very expensive. Providing access to funds via small grant requests and as "light touch" an approach to administration as possible (in order to provide quick access to funds and necessitate at little additional staffing to oversee the fund as possible) could provide seed money to create and advance

³³<http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/advocates/>

³⁴<http://icpdtaskforce.org/>

new advocacy efforts and boost existing ones. There may obviously be some overlap between what this fund could support and some of the other ideas outlined in the recommendations section.

Conclusion:

The post-2015 process is at times complicated and difficult to engage in, but it is also an historic opportunity to make progress in eliminating violence against children. By design it is virtually all encompassing, meant to result in a new sustainable development agenda for the world. In that breadth there are numerous opportunities to fill gaps left by others and otherwise have a considered, and meaningful impact and, in the process of doing so, set the stage for the elimination of all forms of violence against children in the coming decades.

Annex: List of Interviewees

Name of Interviewee	Affiliation/Organization
Joan Lombardi	BVL Advisor and Former U.S. Deputy Assistant Secretary in Department of Health and Human Services
Anar Mamdani	Government of Canada
Simon Collard-Wexler	Government of Canada
David Stevens	Center on International Cooperation, NYU
Andrew Johnson	ChildFund Alliance
Sevdalina Rukanova	European Foundation Center
Neil Boothby	Former Special Advisor to USAID & U.S. State Department
Adrien Pinelli	Government of France
Carol Welch	Gates Foundation
Rachel Quint	Hewlett Foundation
Eva Schafer	Government of Hungary (OWG co-Chair)
Catarina Sofia Carvalho	High-Level Task Force on ICPD
Hiro Yoshikawa	NYU and Sustainable Solutions Development Network
Brigitte DeLay	Oak Foundation
Ana Sandoval	Government of Paraguay
Enrique Carrillo	Government of Paraguay
Lori Henninger	Plan International
Gary Barker	Promundo
Heather Grady	Rockefeller Philanthropy Advisors
Joanna Rubenstein	Chief of Staff to Jeff Sachs, Columbia University Earth Institute
Bill Bell	Save the Children
Debra Jones	Save the Children
Richard Morgan	Save the Children
Amina Mohammed	UN Secretary-General's Office
Sophia Garcia-Garcia	SOS
Magdalena Robert	Special Advisor to Graca Machel
Maud de Boer-Buquicchio	Special Rapporteur on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography
Marta Santos Pais	SRSG on VaC
Ignacio Parker	Terre des Hommes
Sandra Taylor	Together for Girls

Matt Jackson	Government of the United Kingdom
Minh–Thu Pham	UN Foundation
Susan Meyers	UN Foundation
Anne–Laure Jeanvoine	UNDP
Michelle Milford Morse	Girl Declaration
Rebecca Furst–Nichols	Girl Declaration
Karin Heissler	UNICEF
Pia Britto	UNICEF
Shannon O'Shea	UNICEF
Susan Bissel	UNICEF
Teresa Kilbane	UNICEF
Anouk De–Goede	Unilever
Jorge Dotta	Government of Uruguay
Camilla ??	Government of Uruguay
Alexander Butchart	WHO
Tarun Dua	WHO
Joanna Mikulski	Without Violence
Nadja Nickel	Without Violence
Bill Forbes	World Vision
Areylys Bellorini	World Vision
Tamara Tutnjevic	World Vision