**INTER – AGENCY STANDING COMMITTEE – WORKING GROUP
48th MEETING**

**13-14 March 2002
at
WFP Headquarters, Rome
Green Tower, Room 6G19**

**Humanitarian Advocacy: Proposal for an Advocacy Campaign on the Protection of
Civilians in Armed Conflict**

Circulated 6 March 2002

Background and Justification:

Over the past decade protecting civilians in conflict areas has emerged as one of the
cardinal principles of humanitarian action. Major milestones that underscore the
international community's concern over the issue include: the Secretary General's report
(S/1999/957) of 8 September 1999 followed by Security Council Resolutions 1265
(1999) and 1296 (2000) which largely endorsed the Secretary-General's findings; the
Secretary-General's second report of 30 March 2001 (S/2001/331); the Millennium
Declaration (A/RES/55/2) of September 2000 that pledged to "expand and strengthen the
protection of civilians in complex emergencies, in conformity with international
humanitarian law."

The ERC's submissions to the Security Councils in March and Nov 2001 as well as his
June 2001 keynote speech (titled "Towards a Culture of Protection") to the International
Symposium on "The UN and Japan: What is the Role of Japan in 21st Century UN"
highlighted the axes of protection addressed in the Secretary General's report. These
include: humanitarian access to vulnerable populations; special protection needs of
women and children; safety, protection and security of IDPs; the use of media and
information; engagement with armed groups for access negotiations; civil and military
relations in the delivery of humanitarian aid, separation of civilians and combatants in
IDP and refugee camps; security and safety of humanitarian personnel.

The international humanitarian community has adopted the core principles of protection
of civilians and sought to incorporate them in its work. While progress has been made in
some areas, it is clear that assuring protection of vulnerable civilian populations remains
major challenge and concern.   A process of debate and dialogue on this topic is ongoing,
orchestrated by OCHA/PDSB through a series of round table discussions organized on
various aspects of the topics.

The need for an advocacy track to accompany and propel these and other actions is self-
evident. Advocacy for the protection of civilians must operate at all levels, ranging from
the high councils of the UN and other international organizations to regional, sub-
regional, national and community fora. Advocacy must engage different stakeholders –

governmental and non-state actors, NGOs and civil society, media and academia. Vulnerable civilian populations must be targeted directly and empowered to use dialogue, negotiation and other advocacy techniques to safeguard their own protection and rights.

As the tentacles of protection reach into humanitarian work everywhere, humanitarian actors of all stripes are engaged in various forms of advocacy to foster protection and promote the rights of civilians. But such actions are largely uncoordinated. Based on the premise that advocacy is best carried out in concert, it is proposed that a coordinated global advocacy campaign should be implemented to achieve maximum effectiveness and impact. The IASC provides an appropriate forum and platform for developing and carrying out such a concerted campaign.

Goal

To harness the resources of IASC partners to heighten awareness, institute and promote the application of policies and programs at regional/sub-regional, national and community levels designed to increase the protection of vulnerable civilian populations and victims of armed conflict.

Expected results/outcomes and indicators

Result/Outcome	*Indicators*
Institution of policies and programs at regional/sub-regional, country and community levels designed to foster implementation of UN and other international agreements on the protection of civilians	• Regional/sub-regional bodies, national governments and local authorities institute legislation and policies specifically designed to protect and promote the rights of vulnerable civilian populations, in line with UN and international conventions. • Programs are in place (including sanctions for violators) in conflict affected countries that effectively protect vulnerable civilian populations • Legislation, policies and programs are applied and their effectiveness monitored and assessed.
Effective involvement of vulnerable populations in assuring their own protection and rights through peaceful means	• Groups of vulnerable civilian populations form associations to engage in dialogue and negotiation with combatants and other conflict parties • Such groups gain clout and respectability as viable partners (with international humanitarian agencies) in implementing protection measures.
Increased engagement of local advocacy groups (NGOs, CBOs, civil society entities…) in promoting protection and human rights measures	• Local advocacy groups improve their skills in dialoguing, negotiation and other essential advocacy skills. • Local advocacy groups establish best-practice protection measures in conflict zones
Enhanced partnership with local and international	• Media partnership networks are formed or strengthened in countries or (sub) regions dedicated

media in promoting issues of protection.	to increasing awareness and fostering dialogue and debate on protection issues.
	• Local and international media focus increasing attention on protection issues

Key Partners in implementation of campaign.

Three categories: (a) Within OCHA: AERIMB, PDSB, IDP Unit, IRIN; (b) IASC partners; (c) Non-IASC partners: G-77, national and regional NGO and media networks, etc.

Campaign management

It is proposed that OCHA serve as orchestrator/facilitator of the campaign. A campaign task team, comprising members from partner agencies, would be set up to coordinate campaign preparation and implementation as well as manage specific aspects of campaign development, planning, M&E.

We envisage an advocacy campaign that follows a full-blown strategic plan, with clearly defined and measurable outputs/outcomes, time lines and responsibilities of various actors. Monitoring and evaluation would be built into the campaign strategic plan. Specific process and output indicators would be developed for measuring the progress and impact of the campaign.

Campaign implementation itself would be decentralized. Individual agencies would buy into specific portions (theme, geographical location) of the campaign and run them largely independently, in accordance with their mandate and ongoing programs.

Funding of the campaign would be guided by principles of cost sharing and cost participation. OCHA, as the coordinator, may fund some key events related to campaign development, M&E. Implementation costs are expected to be borne by partners.

Issues for IASC Consideration

1.	Next steps. It is expected that a follow up consultation process will clarify outstanding issues and lead to a revised, full-blown proposal to be presented to the WG meeting in June.
2.	Funding: It is expected that IASC members will propose specific mechanisms for funding the campaign