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# Section 1: Introduction

## The problem of military use of schools during armed conflict

Schools and universities have been used for military purposes during armed conflict in at least 25 countries experiencing conflict between 2005 and 2014[[1]](#footnote-1). During times of armed conflict, the military use of schools and universities can compromise their civilian status, transforming places of learning into lawful military targets, potentially placing students and staff at risk of retaliatory action. The presence of armed actors on school grounds also increases the likelihood of recruitment or use of children for combat or support roles and it disproportionately affects girls and young women, as it also exposes them to sexual violence and harassment. Damage or destruction of buildings, displacement of teachers and students and protection concerns can result in school drop-out and disrupt access to education for prolonged periods. This not only exacerbates the psychosocial toll that conflict has on children and youth, but also hampers post-conflict reconstruction and the prospects of a durable peace.

## The Guidelines for Protecting Schools and Universities from Military Use during Armed Conflict

The [Guidelines for Protecting Schools and Universities from Military Use during Armed Conflict](http://www.protectingeducation.org/guidelines), formerly known as “Lucens Guidelines”,(hereafter referred to as the *Guidelines*) were developed over several years of discussions involving governments, armed forces, civil society actors and international organizations. The process was spearheaded by GCPEA, following the launch of its report [*Lessons in War:* *Military Use of Schools and Other Education Institutions during Conflict*](http://protectingeducation.org/sites/default/files/documents/lessons_in_war.pdf)*,* in 2012. In June 2014, the Norwegian government announced its commitment to lead states in finalizing, endorsing, and implementing the Guidelines. On December 16, 2014, the final *Guidelines* were unveiled at a meeting hosted by the Missions of Norway and Argentina at the UN in Geneva. At this meeting, Norway and Argentina also initiated discussions on the idea of a “**Safe Schools Declaration**”, which would place the Guidelines in a broader thematic framework and constitute the formal basis for states to endorse and commit to implement the Guidelines. The Declaration is being negotiated in Geneva under the leadership of Norway and Argentina and the support of a core group of interested states[[2]](#footnote-2) and will be adopted at an international conference planned for mid-2015. In the meantime, and in support of these consultations, states are encouraged to start analyzing relevant domestic policies and military doctrine to enhance the protection of educational facilities from military use during armed conflict. Non-state armed groups are not involved in discussions on the “Safe Schools Declaration”. Outreach to non-state armed groups relies on the dissemination of the *Guidelines* through other mechanisms and channels. These include: the ICRC, Geneva Call, and the UN’s children and armed conflict mechanism, in particular through the Country Task Forces on Monitoring and Reporting.

The *Guidelines* offer concrete and realistic guidance to help parties to conflict exercise restraint with respect to the military use of educational facilities in armed conflict and to mitigate the impact the practice can have on students’ safety and education. They are non-binding, do not create new international legal obligations and draw on existing good practice already applied by parties to conflict.

The *Guidelines* are a practical tool to assist:

* **Officers and soldiers** in decision-making during battlefield situations and other military operations
* **Commanders and military planners** in preparing ahead to lessen the need to use and endanger schools;
* **Governments**, in particular ministries of education and defence, as they consider creating or bolstering provisions for the prevention of and response to military use of educational facilities in domestic policies, legislation, as well as military doctrine and contingency plans;
* **International and national organizations** in monitoring the conduct of armed actors, in engaging in dialogue with armed actors, and in working with governments to enhance policy and operational frameworks to mitigate the impact of military use of educational facilities for pupils, students and teachers in conflict zones.

## Purpose and scope of this strategy

This strategy is designed to act as a framework for GCPEA’s advocacy on the *Guidelines for Protecting Schools and Universities from Military Use in Armed Conflict* (hereafter referred to as the *Guidelines*) between January 2015 and the first half of 2016. The specific objectives of the strategy cover three distinct periods:

1. Phase one (January to June 2015): focuses on influencing the state endorsement process through the negotiation of the *Safe Schools Declaration*, which will constitute the formal basis for states to adopt and commitment to implement the *Guidelines.* This isthe primary focus of this document;
2. Phase two (July to December 2015): covers the period from commitment to actual implementation;
3. Phase three (January-June 2016): reflects a period for continued commitment to implementation, as well as evaluation of progress and future planning. [[3]](#footnote-3)

GCPEA’s membership includes organizations with various types of philosophies and approaches with respect to advocacy and this diversity within GCPEA is a strong asset that can be leveraged strategically to achieve common goals. These may include constructive *dialogue* (typically, but not always, in private) and a more *critical approach* (typically, but not always, public), each with their own set of strengths and weaknesses. The two approaches can be complementary. Based on an analysis of the context GCPEA recommends that country-specific action plans be developed, which determine the most appropriate approach.

For any questions regarding the implementation of this strategy, please contact GCPEA’s Coordinator on the Guidelines: Filipa Schmitz Guinote – [fguinote@protectingeducation.org](mailto:fguinote@protectingeducation.org)

# Section 2: Goals and Objectives

## 

## 2.1 Goal

The overarching goal of the strategy is to reduce military use of schools and universities during armed conflict, through the incorporation of the *Guidelines for Protecting Schools and Universities from Military Use during Armed Conflict* in military doctrine and practice worldwide.

## 

## 2.2 Specific Objectives

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Phase 1**  **Jan-June 2015**  **Focus:** political endorsement process (Safe Schools Declaration) | 1. By June 2015, ensure that GCPEA’s recommendations are integrated in the Safe Schools Declaration including a commitment to implement the Guidelines and a reference to the Guidelines in their entirety 2. At the June Conference, at least 30 countries commit to implementing the Guidelines by “endorsing” the Safe Schools Declaration. 3. A post-endorsement implementation monitoring process is tabled for discussion at the Oslo Conference in June 2015 4. By June, three countries begin taking steps towards implementing the *Guidelines.* |
| **Phase 2**  **Jul-Dec 2015**  **Focus:** implementation of the Guidelines and expansion of political buy-in | 1. By the end of 2015, five additional countries commit to implementing the Guidelines by “endorsing” the Safe Schools Declaration.[[4]](#footnote-4) 2. By December 2015, at least three additional countries begin incorporating the *Guidelines* into domestic policies, legislation and/or military doctrine. 3. By December 2015, the *Guidelines* are referenced in at least four global mechanisms and initiatives relating to education and protection of children and civilians in armed conflict as a means to enhance the dissemination of and global support for the *Guidelines*. |
| **Phase 3**  **Jan-June 2016**  **Focus:** strengthen implementation of the Guidelines | 1. Between January and June 2016 at least five additional countries begin incorporating the *Guidelines* into domestic policies, legislation and/or military doctrine. 2. By June 2016, at least two non-state armed groups begin incorporating the *Guidelines* in relevant operational and/or and strategic tools and practices.[[5]](#footnote-5) |

# Section 3: National Level Advocacy

## 

## 3.1 Advocacy with governments

To address the problem of the military use of schools and universities during conflict, change in policy and practice needs to happen at the national level. GCPEA members and partners will target governments all over the world to achieve this objective.

Countries targeted in the first phase of the advocacy were selected on the criteria of (i) strategic importance (ii) in-country capacity of GCPEA members and (iii) political willingness to cooperate.

As advocacy is undertaken, countries may shift from one category to the other as their position may evolve. E.g. a country initially in Category 2 that gets fully on board would be moved to category 1 and action adjusted accordingly. **As of January 2015**, GCPEA have identified the following categories of countries for advocacy, though this list may be subject to change[[6]](#footnote-6):

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Category:** | **Country:** | **Targeted advocacy objectives:** |
| **Category 1:** supportive states | Norway, Argentina, Austria, Cote D’Ivoire, Croatia, Ecuador, Finland, Jordan, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxemburg, New Zealand, Nigeria, Montenegro, Portugal, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Qatar. | * Maintain or increase their level of engagement on the Declaration * Maintain or increase their engagement in public support for the Guidelines in national, regional and global fora * Target them as “advocacy multipliers” to bring on other states * Target them for inclusion/safeguarding of strong language in Declaration * Ensure participation and endorsement of the Declaration at the June Conference * Advocate for support for the discussion on follow-up strategy at the June Conference * Advocate for them to explore/continue to explore ways to implement the Guidelines |
| **Category 2:** Undecided/unknown and fence-sitters | Algeria, Afghanistan, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Burma/Myanmar, Cambodia, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Denmark, DRC, El Salvador, Estonia, France, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, India, Italy, Ireland, Israel, Iraq, Japan, Kenya, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Malaysia, Mali, Mexico, Netherlands, Nepal, Pakistan, Palestine, Philippines, Somalia, South Africa, South Korea, South Sudan, Thailand, Turkey, Uganda, Uruguay, Yemen | * Advocate for full support to the Guidelines * Advocate for active participation in consultations on the Declaration * Advocate for participation at the June Conference |
| **Category 3:** non-supportive states | Colombia, Germany, UK, USA | * Neutralize impact on other states |

## 3.2. Advocacy with non-state armed groups:

[Geneva Call](http://www.genevacall.org), a non-governmental organization dedicated to promoting respect by armed non-state actors for international humanitarian norms, is actively promoting the protection of schools from military use through their [**Deed of Commitment**](http://www.genevacall.org/wp-content/uploads/dlm_uploads/2013/12/DoC-Protecting-children-in-armed-conflict.pdf) on child recruitment, signed by thirteen armed groups to date, and in their trainings to armed groups. Geneva Call is also looking to mainstream the Guidelines in their **trainings** on gender issues, humanitarian norms and landmines. Of the countries prioritized by GCPEA for advocacy on the Guidelines, Geneva Call is engaged in dialogues with armed groups in[[7]](#footnote-7):

* **Burma/Myanmar**
* Burundi
* Colombia\*

**Key:**

**Bold** = countries where armed groups have signed the Deed of Commitment of child protection

**\*** = countries where Geneva Call is engaging on dialogue on child protection.

* Georgia
* **India**
* Indonesia
* **Iran**
* Iraq
* Lebanon\*
* Mali
* Nepal
* Niger
* Philippines
* Senegal
* Somalia
* Sudan\*
* Sri Lanka
* **Syria**
* Turkey
* Yemen\*

The **1612 Monitoring and Reporting Mechanism (MRM)** is another potential avenue for outreach to armed groups. The mechanism created by Security Council Resolution 1612 (2005) monitors, reports and responds to six grave violations:

1. Killing and maiming of children
2. Recruitment and use of children
3. Rape and sexual violence against children
4. Attacks on schools and hospitals
5. Abduction of children
6. Denial of humanitarian access

The MRM is implemented in countries that have parties to conflict listed in the annexes of the Secretary-General’s annual reports on Children and Armed Conflict. Armed parties can be added to these annexes if they commit any of the four first violations (so-called “trigger violations”). Military use of schools is not a “trigger violation”, but the Security Council has requested the UN to enhance monitoring of such practices in the framework of the MRM[[8]](#footnote-8). The issue of military use of schools can be addressed through the lens of attacks on schools and it can also be **mainstreamed** in discussions and monitoring activities related to child recruitment and use, killing and maiming, abduction and sexual violence, given that military use of schools increases the risk that these violations occur. Alongside action plans on child recruitment, sexual violence and attacks on schools and hospitals, which can help frame dialogues with non-state actors, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict has developed an **operational strategy on the prevention of military use of schools**, which refers to and complements the Guidelines[[9]](#footnote-9).

Of the countries prioritized by GCPEA for advocacy around the Guidelines, the following have an MRM:

* Afghanistan
* Colombia
* CAR
* DRC
* Iraq
* Mali
* Nigeria
* Philippines
* Burma/Myanmar
* Somalia
* South Sudan
* Sudan
* Syria
* Yemen

**Targeted objectives in the outreach to armed groups:**

MRM Country Task Forces mainstream the Guidelines in their dialogue with armed groups on the issues of child recruitment, attacks on schools, sexual violence, killing and maiming;

Armed groups integrate safeguards to prevent and mitigate military use of schools in relevant internal documents and processes.

## 3.3. Development of country-specific advocacy plans

Country-specific advocacy plans will need to be developed by focal points (see Section 5. Coordination below) in consultation with other GCPEA members in each priority country. Elements to consider when developing these country-specific plans are:

**Context analysis:**

* Is the country affected by the problem? If so, to what extent (data available)?
* Are there policies, laws in place relating to military use of schools/universities? If so, are they actually implemented?
* Previous engagement/positioning/discussions on the Guidelines at capital and global level?
* Does the government have a political stake in being seen as supportive of the Guidelines (internally or externally)?
* Does the country play a strategic role in regional and/or global fora?

**Target identification:**

* Who are the government decision makers and who can you have access to? (e.g. President or Prime Minister, Ministry of Education, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Defence, Military, Parliament)
* Are there any armed groups in the country? If so, who has access to them?
* Who can help you, who are your strategic allies? (e.g. UN Organisations, MRM Task Forces, Geneva Call, ICRC, diplomatic representations, national civil society, teachers/student unions etc.)

**Mapping opportunities:**

* For securing political commitment or public support: e.g. election campaign, parliament discussions, engagement on global or regional agendas (Consider in particular events that have concrete outcome documents and/or follow-up processes) etc…
* Changing policies, laws and practices: upcoming policy, legal or doctrinal review processes, peace talks, dialogues/engagement with international mechanisms (MRM, UPR, CRC etc…);
* Raising awareness: any events or developments at national or global level that could be used as a “hook” for media outreach, or where you can disseminate information on the Guidelines?

**Identify possible influencing strategies:**

* Direct bilateral contact with decision-makers;
* Leveraging strategic allies (instead or in support of bilateral contacts);
* Public communication to raise awareness and mobilize public support.

**Develop clear and relevant messaging**

* Refer to the targeted objectives on the table above, according to the government’s position on the Guidelines;
* Refer to the core messages in annex;
* Coordinate with GCPEA through the relevant focal point to ensure strategic coherence with outreach and dynamics at Geneva or New York level.

# Section 4: Global and Regional Advocacy

Advocacy at the global and regional level has dual purpose to secure a specific reference to the Guidelines in important international documents and/or reports detailed in section 4.1 below; and to generate momentum and broad support for the Safe Schools Declaration and awareness of the *Guidelines* among the international protection and education communities detailed in section 4.2 below.

## 4.1: Targets and Timeline for Specific Objective 7

The table below summarises a list of targets to achieve Specific Objective 7 (of this strategy) that “By December 2015, the *Guidelines* are referenced in least four global mechanisms and initiatives relating to education and protection of children and civilians in armed conflict as a means to enhance the dissemination of and global support for the *Guidelines*.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Specific Objective 7: Summary table** | | | |
| **Protection/child protection mechanism:** | | | |
| Mechanism | Target | Timeline | Actions/Allies |
| Inclusion of language welcoming the Guidelines in the CAAC annual report | OSRSG CAAC, NY | Period for engagement: January-February 2015 | TBC |
| *Guidelines* are included in the final operational strategy of the SRSG’s Guidance Note | OSRSG CAAC, NY | Period for engagement: |  |
| Inclusion of language welcoming the Guidelines in the POC annual report | OCHA, NY | Period for engagement: January-February 2015 |  |
| EU Guidelines on CAAC (implementation strategy) | EU | TBC |  |
| EU’s ‘Checklist to help integrating the issue of children affected by armed conflict into Common Security and Defence Policy  (CSDP)missions and operations’. | EU | Period for engagement: TBC |  |
| **Education Documents and Guidelines** | | | |
| **Mechanism** | **Target** | **Timeline** | **Allies** |
| Inclusion in Global Partnership for Education Guidelines for Education Sector Plan Preparation and Appraisal | GPE | Period for engagement: Check with Diya as previously discussed with GPE. |  |
| *2015 GMR: What did we achieve?* | Global Monitoring Report Team | Period for engagement: TBC - Secretariat leading |  |
| Action plan from the World Education Forum 2015 | MoE of Category 1 countries, UNESCO Member States, High level advocates | Period for engagement: Between Jan- April | Norway Chair of EFA Steering Committee |

## 4.2: Building Momentum and Support with Key Global and Regional Stakeholders

**High Level Advocates**

GCPEA Membership brings together a range of civil society and UN agencies. Engagement of senior figures from these organisations can help enhance awareness of the *Guidelines* and influence opinion of key decisions makers. This can be done through the referring of the Safe Schools Declaration and the *Guidelines* as appropriate at high-level events or in bi-laterals if possible.

* Through *PEIC - Protect Education Insecurity and Conflict* approach **Her Highness Sheikha Moza bint Nasser**to reference Safe Schools Declaration and *Guidelines* in a speech to global education community.
* Through A World at School, **UN Special Envoy Gordon Brown** will speak at two events being organised in April in Washington and New York and will highlight the issue of MUSU and the *Guidelines.*
* Through UN agencies that are members of GCPEA mobilise the Director General of UNESCO, Executive Director of the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF). UN High Commissioner for Refugees António Guterres to make statements and draft joint letter encouraging support for safe Schools Declaration, this could be done with Norway.

**Other International Organisations**

|  |
| --- |
| **Organisation: Global Partnership for Education (GPE)**  **Summary: GPE** is a highly influential multilateral donor agency for education, working in partnership with countries to support the development of education sector plans. **Objectives:**   1. GPE endorse the Safe Schools Declaration through their high level representatives Julia Gillard, Chair of the Board of Directors of the Global Partnership and Alice Albright, Chief Executive Office 2. GPE reference *Guidelines* in their work where appropriate including with their country partners 3. GPE facilitates links with Local Education Groups at country level to support the Guidelines and where relevant participate in GCPEA’s contextualisation workshop   **Possible Approach:**  Secretariat to re-ignite previous discussions and agreements |
| **Organisation: Global Education First Initiative (GEFI)**  **Summary:** GEFI is the UNSG’s global initiative designed to give increased momentum to education in the run up to 2015 EFA deadline and through to the post-2015 development agenda. It has highlighted the issue of education in humanitarian contexts and Education Cannot Wait developed from this initiative.  **Objective:**   1. To secure supportive statement from SG for the Safe Schools Declaration 2. Mobilise youth network to support advocacy in the run up to June conference.   **Possible approaches:**   * Highlight statements by UN Secretary General in support of *Guidelines* * Mobilise GEFI Youth Ambassadors? Chernor Bah, Chair (or former chair) of GEFI Youth Advocacy Group and also works for World at School. * Link through Education Cannot Wait * UNESCO house Secretariat |
| **Organisation: African Union:**  **Summary:** AU deploys troops in conflict settings where military use of schools has been documented in Africa. AU contingents also include troops from countries where military use of schools has been documented.  **Objectives:**   1. Inclusion of the Guidelines in relevant training manuals, policy and operational frameworks. 2. Increase support for and political engagement around the Guidelines among affected countries in Africa.   **Possible approach:** build on existing dialogue and activities promoted in the context of the SRSG-CAAC’s agreement with the AU. |
| **Organisation: OSCE**  **Summary:** The OSCE's comprehensive view of security covers three “dimensions”: the politico-military; the economic and environmental; and the human. The OSCE's activities cover all three of these areas, from "hard" security issues such as conflict prevention to fostering economic development, ensuring the sustainable use of natural resources, and promoting the full respect of human rights and fundamental freedoms.  **Objectives:**   1. Get the Guidelines included on the agenda of the Forum for Security Co-operation, which meets weekly in Vienna (which provides a framework for dialogue between the OSCE participating States on military conduct etc) 2. Inform and engage the OSCE’s education unit about the impact of MUSU   **Possible Approach**  Outreach and analysis required to assess value of engagement and to map possible avenues and value of engagement through either their conflict prevention and resolution sector and/or support through education sector. (UNESCO has strong ties to the education unit). |
| **Organisation: ICRC**  **Summary:** the ICRC has followed the Guidelines closely and provided technical legal advice throughout the drafting process and are currently disseminating the Guidelines to their staff. The links between the Guidelines and IHL are a recurrent issue of discussion, in particular among less supportive states.  **Objectives:**   1. Get the Guidelines included on the agenda of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Conference in November 2015 to foster dissemination of the Guidelines to armed parties, in particular armed groups. 2. Clarify and strengthen the relationship between the Guidelines and IHL and help counter arguments from less supportive states. 3. Ensure that follow-up on the military use of schools is adequately incorporated in the IHL compliance mechanism currently under discussion.   **Possible Approach**  Continuous outreach to ICRC counterparts in Geneva. |

# Section 5: Coordination and technical assistance

## 5.1. Roles and communication flow

Coordination of the strategy will be led by GCPEA’s Military Use Working Group, with support from a dedicated staff member based in Geneva[[10]](#footnote-10) who will ensure regular communication between all those working on this issue. The Working Group and the Coordinator can help country offices and members by:

* Providing up-to-date **information on the status of the endorsement process**, including country positions during consultations around the Safe Schools Declaration; and/or the **status of implementation of the Guidelines**;
* Facilitating **exchange of information on related advocacy efforts** conducted or planned in other countries, regionally or globally and **helping coordinate joint advocacy** action at national, regional or global level;
* Providing **support for the development of advocacy and public communication materials** (background research, messaging, templates, sample documents etc.);
* Facilitate and assist with the provision of **technical assistance** for the implementation of the Guidelines.

Member organisations of GCPEA will be named as **focal points** for in-country advocacy (as capacity allows) and will work with other GCPEA members and other UN and civil society groups to inform and influence relevant national governments through country-specific advocacy plans.

The following chart illustrates the roles and flow of communication between the various actors engaged in the implementation of this strategy:

## 5.2. Resource pack

**Resources for dissemination:**

* **Guidelines** **for Protecting Schools and Universities from Military Use during Armed Conflict** (text only, on one page) – [English](http://protectingeducation.org/sites/default/files/documents/guidelines_blank_en.pdf), [French](http://protectingeducation.org/sites/default/files/documents/lignes_directrices_blank_fr.pdf), [Arabic](http://protectingeducation.org/sites/default/files/documents/guidelines_blank_ar.pdf), [Spanish](http://protectingeducation.org/sites/default/files/documents/directrices_blank_es.pdf)
* **GCPEA Commentary on the Guidelines for Protecting Schools and Universities from Military Use during Armed Conflict** - [English](http://www.protectingeducation.org/sites/default/files/documents/commentary_on_the_guidelines.pdf)
* **GCPEA Questions & Answers on the Guidelines** – [English](http://protectingeducation.org/sites/default/files/documents/questions_and_answers.pdf), [French](http://protectingeducation.org/sites/default/files/documents/questions_et_reponses.pdf), [Arabic](http://protectingeducation.org/sites/default/files/documents/questions_and_answers_ar.pdf), [Spanish](http://protectingeducation.org/sites/default/files/documents/preguntas_y_respuestas.pdf)
* **Military use of schools, applicable international legal framework** (GCPEA compilation) – [English](http://protectingeducation.org/sites/default/files/documents/applicable_international_legal_framework.pdf), [French](http://protectingeducation.org/sites/default/files/documents/cadre_juridique_international_applicable.pdf), [Arabic](http://protectingeducation.org/sites/default/files/documents/applicable_international_legal_framework_ar.pdf), [Spanish](http://protectingeducation.org/sites/default/files/documents/marco_juridico_internacional_aplicable.pdf)
* **Protection of schools from military use, examples of domestic law, guidance and practice** (GCPEA compilation) – [English](http://protectingeducation.org/sites/default/files/documents/examples_of_domestic_law_guidance_and_practice.pdf), [French](http://protectingeducation.org/sites/default/files/documents/exemples_de_legislations_orientations_et_pratiques_nationales.pdf), [Arabic](http://protectingeducation.org/sites/default/files/documents/examples_of_domestic_law_guidance_and_practice_ar.pdf), [Spanish](http://protectingeducation.org/sites/default/files/documents/ejemplos_de_normas_de_derecho_interno_pautas_y_practicas.pdf)
* [**Compilation of statements of support of the process of developing the Guidelines**](http://www.protectingeducation.org/guidelines/support) [[11]](#footnote-11)

**Resources for internal use:**

* [**Core messages on military use of schools**](http://www.protectingeducation.org/sites/default/files/documents/guidelines-core_messages-final.docx)
* [**Talking points for recurring legal questions**](http://www.protectingeducation.org/sites/default/files/documents/guidelines-suggested_talking_points_for_recurrent_questions_and_concerns-rev.docx)

**Upcoming resources:**

* Guide for social media engagement

In addition, an internal coordination [**webpage**](http://www.protectingeducation.org/MU-coordination) has been set up to provide up-to-date information, new resources and track advocacy activities in the various target countries:

# Appendices:

## [Appendix A: Calendar of advocacy opportunities](http://www.protectingeducation.org/sites/default/files/documents/guidelines_advocacy_strategy-appendix_b_calendar_of_events.docx)

## [Appendix B: Country focal point allocation](http://www.protectingeducation.org/sites/default/files/documents/guidelines-country_outreach_overview_for_gcpea-10march2015.pdf)

## [Appendix C: Contact list for national education coalitions](http://www.protectingeducation.org/sites/default/files/documents/guidelines_advocacy_strategy-appendix_c_education_coalitions.docx)

1. Source : Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack ([www.protectingeducation.org](http://www.protectingeducation.org)) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Austria, Spain, Philippines, Jordan, New Zealand, Nigeria, Cote d’Ivoire [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Following the end of phase 1 a review of the strategy will be required to reflect the change and commitment achieved by June 2015, and where advocacy resources will be focused thereafter. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The formalities of endorsements post-June conference are still unknown and this objective may need to be refined at a later stage. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. GCPEA will be working in cooperation with Geneva Call to achieve this objective. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Countries highlighted in orange below are documented as where military use of of schools and/or universities has occurred. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Overview of countries and groups with which Geneva Call is engaging : <http://www.genevacall.org/how-we-work/armed-non-state-actors/> [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Resolutions 1998 (2011) and 2143 (2014) [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. See OSRSG-CAAC Guidance Note on Security Council Resolution 1998, Annex V: <https://childrenandarmedconflict.un.org/publications/AttacksonSchoolsHospitals.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Filipa Schmitz Guinote: [fguinote@protectingeducation.org](mailto:fguinote@protectingeducation.org) [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. **Note**: caution is needed when referring to these supportive statements, as not all countries listed on this page can be labelled as “supportive of the Guidelines”, as some of the statements were made prior to the finalization of the Guidelines. Please consult with focal points or the GCPEA Coordinator if you have questions on the position of a particular country. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)