Background and rationale
In the discussion paper ‘Global trends and their Implications for Children of the 21st Century’ (UNICEF June, 2013) the following question is posed: “how can UNICEF build resilience in a world characterised by more shocks, both climate-induced as well as human-made?” Similarly UNICEF’s draft Strategic Plan 2014 – 2017, referencing the end of cycle (2006 – 2013) review1, highlights ‘the importance of developing innovative programming to reach children living in fragile situations and to build resilience of communities to better withstand and recuperate from conflict, disaster and economic crisis’.

Both within UNICEF and among its partners, programming that contributes to the resilience of children, communities and systems in contexts of increasing shocks and stresses (disaster risk, climate change, persistent conflict/violence, epidemics and global fuel and food price hikes) including in regions of high vulnerability, has in recent years gained much attention. This in part is due to increasing evidence that shocks are impeding and reversing development gains and creating greater vulnerability particularly amongst the already marginalised and excluded (e.g. girls, children with disabilities, children in indigenous communities). Moreover there is recognition of the costly and ineffective cyclical humanitarian action especially in Horn/Sahel.

UNICEF definition of resilience (draft)2

‘The ability of children, communities and systems to withstand, adapt to, and recover from stresses and shocks advancing the rights of every child, especially the most disadvantaged.’

At the global level the post 2015 agenda process has given prominence to addressing shocks and stress as well as fragility. The General Assembly Open Working on Sustainable Development Goals has identified ‘conflict prevention, post conflict peacebuilding and promotion durable of peace’ as well as ‘climate change and disaster risk reduction’ as key thematic areas, while the High Level Panel (HLP) of eminent persons in its report to the UN Secretary General in its illustrative goals and targets recognizes disaster risk reduction as an important issue in the context of poverty alleviation efforts3 and establishes conflict and violence reduction as one of the 12 goals: ‘Ensure stable and peaceful societies’. Donor interest too has increased notably through the Political Champions for Disaster Resilience4 as well as the Global Alliance for Resilience Initiative Sahel (AGIR) and the Global Alliance for Drought Resilience supporting IGAD in Eastern Africa. Resilience may also provide an opportunity to access the 100 billion ‘Green Climate Fund’.

UNICEF is not starting from scratch in terms of resilience; it has long programmed for children in the context of shocks and stress. What has been missing however has been a deliberate and consistent effort to strengthen the resilience of children, communities and systems by understanding the nature of risk, including vulnerability, capacity and exposure, and harnessing both its humanitarian action and development work to achieve this common goal. In this regard, in recent years UNICEF has developed programme guidance or technical notes for ‘risk informed programming’, DRR, CCA,

1 Please visit www.unicef.org for a more comprehensive summary of the lessons learned from the end-of-cycle review.
2 Nairobi Resilience Workshop, June 2013
3 For a more detailed commentary on the place of disaster issues in HLP report see Tom Mitchell’s Blog How did disasters fare in the post-2015 panel report?
4 A group made up of DFID, USAID
peace-building and social protection and is advancing this work to varying degrees in most regions. Moreover, in the Horn and the Sahel, a UNICEF cross-regional position paper on resilience has been drafted and programme planning, strategies and implementation are steadily being adjusted.

As noted above, UNICEF’s draft Strategic Plan (2014 – 2017) also gives prominence to programming in the context of shocks, stress and fragility. While including specific indicators under various outcomes areas, including social inclusion, the Strategic Plan notes ‘that communities and families must be supported to increase their resilience so that achievements for girls and boys can be sustained even when families are confronted with volatility and shocks, whether caused by economic shift, climate change, natural disaster, disease or violent conflict’.

### Resilience and the Strategic Plan 2014 to 2017
#### Some Relevant Outputs/Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• ‘Strengthened political commitment and national capacity to legislate, plan and budget for inclusive social policies &amp; social protection measures, including in risk prone and fragile contexts’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ‘Countries that incorporate risk and vulnerability analysis with UNICEF support as part of situation analyses’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ‘Countries with planning and monitoring processes at national and/or subnational level supported by UNICEF that explicitly address risks, child poverty and discrimination’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ‘Countries with an education sector plan/policy that includes risk assessment and risk management developed or revised with the support of UNICEF’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In June 2013, sixty UNICEF staff from country offices, ESARO, WCARO, TACRO, MENARO, ROSA and EAPRO, and headquarters (Geneva, Florence and New York) joined a workshop ‘Resilia 1’ in Nairobi with the following objective ‘to reach an understanding on how UNICEF will advance programming for resilience with a focus on Sub-Saharan Africa’. The work resulted in a first draft of a global position paper on resilience for UNICEF, revisions to the ESARO/WCARO position paper as well as an Action Plan and detailed workshop report. As identified in the draft position paper (established on the basis of what has proven to work and key lessons in programming) UNICEF’s proposed two main approaches to advancing resilience are as follows:

1. **Programming informed by risk and a wider context analysis:** This means a strengthened and holistic analysis of risk and conflict, including of related vulnerabilities and capacities, promoting common/joint inter-agency assessment and analysis and investing in research. It also means supporting sector and governance capacity, especially sub-nationally in planning and monitoring processes that explicitly address risks (as well as child poverty and discrimination).

2. **Aligning development and humanitarian action:** This means more flexible programmes, policies and funding mechanisms as well as more effective coordination and sequencing between humanitarian and development work. It also means development focused on the most vulnerable informed by a robust analysis of risk (including the wider context) and humanitarian action cognizant of the drivers of vulnerability and risk with a focus on capacity development.

To ensure these approaches and UNICEF’s overall position on resilience reflects all regions and risk typologies and benefits from CO experience beyond the Horn and Sahel, a second workshop will take place in Kathmandu in November.
Workshop Objective

The Kathmandu workshop (‘Resilia 2’), tentatively scheduled for the 3rd week in November, comes at a critical time with the Strategic Plan being finalized by the Board in September and just ahead of UNICEF’s strategic reflection on humanitarian action, ‘Martigny III’ planned for the first quarter of 2014. The overall objective of the workshop will be:

To reach a consensus on how UNICEF will advance programming for resilience in line with the Strategic Plan 2014-2017.

The workshop will have three specific outputs:

1. A final UNICEF position paper on resilience shaped by typology of risks, nature of resilience and CO experience in all regions (beyond and including the Horn and Sahel).
2. Good practice, a mapping of partnerships and engagements, gaps in knowledge, skills and capacities to advance UNICEF’s approach to resilience identified.
3. Draft consolidated results, targets and means to establish baselines to monitor and report on resilience outputs and indicators including those set out in the Strategic Plan.

These outputs will form the basis of a resilience strategy for UNICEF

Workshop Structure

The workshop structure is guided by the expected outputs as well as lesson learned from Nairobi. Day One will include a short session by UNICEF partners, CO presentations and an in-depth review leading to the finalisations of the draft global Position Paper. Day Two through presentations by CO, RO and HQ staff as well as group work will unpack output 2 while Day Three will, by consolidating SP outputs and indicators with those in the draft Position Paper, establish a clear hierarchy of results against which to monitor and evaluate success.

Proposed Participants List

Given the global focus of UNICEF’s work on resilience as well as its cross cutting nature, participants will represent a range of regions, sectors, planning and monitoring as well as CO management as appropriate. However, given the Nairobi workshop focused on the Sahel and Horn, emphasis will be given to CO staff from other regions and especially from middle income countries and those with conflict and disaster risk typologies. Participants from EMOPS, PD and DPS will work with the ROSA team to organize the workshop.

External participants from the Asia region, and possibly from Kathmandu including the Nepal Risk Reduction Consortium, ADB or indeed the RC’s office, will be approached for the day One session to set the scene. A seasoned facilitator with subject matter expertise and knowledge of the region will also be selected. A total of 45 UNICEF participants are expected.

Budget

It is assumed that all participants will pay for their own travel and accommodation. It is expected that the supporting HQ Divisions will cover the conference package and facilitator which amount to approximately USD 35,000 in Nairobi.

---

The draft Strategic Plan notes that ‘UNICEF is committed to developing appropriate tools to measure community resilience as an enabling factor as well as a comprehensive measure of equity that is appropriate for each context but is also internationally comparable to the extent possible and practical’.