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The CPC Network is a global interagency network that strives to improve and professionalize the field of child protection through learning, research, policy advocacy and training initiatives. A lack of evidence and consensus among the humanitarian community on good practice has limited the effectiveness of efforts to improve child protection programming. In response to these needs, the CPC Network was formed to strengthen and systematize child care and protection in crisis-settings through collaborative action of humanitarian agencies, governments, local institutions and academic partners. The network is active both globally and in selected countries through a number of mechanisms that promote learning and build evidence.

At the country level, the CPC Network works through Program Learning Groups (PLGs) that organize operational research and knowledge exchanges between member agencies. PLGs are currently active in Indonesia, Sri Lanka and Uganda and new network partnerships are being developed in the Middle East and West Africa. Globally, the network works with coalitions of UN, NGO, private sector and government actors to generate evidence and link research findings to global practice. The Network has established thematic groups, known as Global Technical Groups (GTGs), to provide field support, documentation and formulation of proven practices, standards and guidelines. Functionally, the CPC Network is administered by a small Secretariat based at Columbia University in New York and is overseen by a global Steering Committee which provide leadership and oversight.

The Liberian Program Learning Group (PLG)

On 18 – 20 January 2011 at the Royal Hotel in Monrovia, Liberia representatives from a wide variety of Liberian and international non-governmental organizations, UN, government and community based organizations (a full list of participant organizations is detailed in Annex I) gathered together to attend the Liberian PLG Inception Meeting. This gathering marked the establishment of the new local network, the Liberian Program Learning Group, and allowed an extensive variety of organizations to give input into the development of new learning priorities. The new PLG is dedicated to research and learning that will inform child protection policy and programs in Liberia. It is meant to complement and contribute to other, existing child protection bodies such as the Child Protection Network and work in close collaboration with government institutions.

During the three day meeting, meeting participants learned about the mission of the new group, examined current evidence and knowledge gaps in child protection programming in Liberia and gave suggestions on the organizational structure for the new PLG. The gathered group examined a number of issues relevant to child protection programming and subsequently developed a list of priorities for further learning under each topic. The subjects examined included: the prevalence of child protection concerns in Liberia, the impact of these violations, the components that make an
effective program, livelihoods and how it effects child protection, child participation, the systems approach and child protection policy. In each session, the group prioritized a number of topics that they wanted to learn more about. These priorities will help guide the work of the PLG as it develops over the next few years.

The following is a record of the meeting which was organized under seven overarching sessions. The generated learning priority questions can be found below.

**Day 1: January 18, 2011**

**Welcome Remarks:**

Presenter: Child Fund National Director

ChildFund’s National Director opened the proceedings and welcomed participants to the three day learning event. He spoke about the importance of prioritizing learning in the field of child protection as well as the importance of government involvement in the learning process. He also noted that this meeting marks only the beginning for the new PLG here in Liberia. The welcome was concluded with thanks for the group for responding to the call and attending the meeting as well as being part of the newly established network.

The program then continued with introductions of the program participants. See attached Annex I for a list of all the agencies and representatives who participated.

**Introduction to the CPC Network**

Presenter: CPC Network Secretariat

The CPC Network Coordinator from the CPC Secretariat in New York provided an introduction to the global network and the new Liberian PLG. The CPC Secretariat is working on both a global and local level to build evidence to improve child protection policy and practice. At the global level, it functions as an interagency network that works through Global Technical Groups (GTGs) and other interagency mechanisms to generate new research in the field of child protection. At the local level, the network is working to establish Program Learning Groups (PLGs) in Uganda, Sri Lanka and Indonesia as well as Liberia. The PLG in Liberia will bring together representatives from INGOs, CBOs, government and academics to form an interagency network that works to improve learning within the field of child protection.

During the subsequent discussion, the important point of how the new PLG will complement other existing child protection networks in Liberia was brought up. This
discussion highlighted the importance of creating synergies between these networks. The PLG is meant exclusively as a research and learning initiative and can complement the work of the Child Protection Network, which is primarily a coordination mechanism.

**Session I: Prevalence**

**Presentation One: Prevalence of Child Protection Violations in Liberia**

Presenter: Think

A representative from the NGO Think addressed participants on the subject of the prevalence of child protection violations in Liberia. Think is an NGO that works to address child protection concerns including child soldiers, girl mothers, and economic challenges. THINK operates a transit home for girls and a safe house for domestic and sexual violence survivors.

The presenter identified a number of problems for children in Liberia including: violence, child labor, trafficking, and exploitation and abuse. However, it was also acknowledged that for many adolescent girls exploitation is not seen as a problem. There is a need to further educate girls that gifts should not come with strings attached. The presenter also noted that abandonment of children and fostering of children in Monrovia were child protection concerns. Other identified problems included: sexual violence against minors, early marriage, FGM, children accused of being witches, and child pornography.

There are some statistics available on child protection violations and UNMIL compiles an annual report that includes some basic statistics. However, there is no centralized database for NGOs to feed into and, even if databases were available, partners would be required to contribute data regularly to make these systems functional.

Discussion then moved to why knowledge of prevalence rates is important. These discussions brought out issues surrounding the legal framework for child protection in Liberia. The Children’s Act will harmonize this framework but has not yet been passed. In addition, while other policies to protection children are in place, they are not being enforced.

Overall, data collection is not done in a systematic manner and the new PLG could provide a mechanism to ensure that policies are based on actual prevalence rates. In Liberia, children’s rights are sometimes seen as a western priority so advocacy based on quality data is needed to keep these issues on the agenda.
Presentation Two: Prevalence of SGBV in Liberia

Presenter: SGBV Task Force

This presentation was led by a representative from the SGBV Task Force and began with an overview of the SGBV Crimes Unit. This unit, which is active in Montserrado County, is dedicated to assisting survivors of SGBV. The representative from the Task Force presented data on the number of cases of rape where the survivor sought to prosecute reported between Feb-August 2010. There were 19 cases of SGBV reported against children aged 1-5; 98 against children aged 6-12; 106 against children aged 13-17; 9 against persons aged 18-25; 6 against those 26 or older; and 6 whose age was unknown. However, these numbers represent only the cases where survivors reported the incident and sought prosecution so the actual prevalence rate could be many times higher. Overall, most of the reported cases were perpetrated against children. Of the reported cases the breakdown by type was: statutory rape cases (170), rape (48), gang rape (22), and sodomy (4).

The presenter discussed a number of consequences of SGBV including: injuries to reproductive system, physical injuries, unwanted pregnancy, STIs, feeling of helplessness, stigma, death, difficulty in establishing relationships, poor performance in school, gossip, judgment against survivors, and victims being unable to contribute as members of society. The presenter left the crowd with two final questions: why are children being raped in Liberia? And what can we do to prevent rape?

During the discussion, participants discussed the challenges of prosecuting cases of SGBV. Potential reasons included a slow judicial system and survivors moving away so that prosecutors are unable to locate them. Also, as cases are often perpetrated by family members there is societal pressure not to prosecute. Finally, survivors are responsible for the transit costs of the accused and many survivors are unable to meet these costs.

In total, 11 cases have been tried so far with 5 successful, 5 unsuccessful, and 1 hung jury. The punishment for perpetrators is a minimum of 10 years and a maximum of life imprisonment for first degree felonies (statutory rape or rape leading to disability). For second degree felonies (rape that doesn’t lead to disability) there is no minimum punishment and a maximum of 10 years. The need to expand the program outside of Montserrado County was acknowledged but there are challenges such as funding that need to be addressed.
Prevalence Learning Priorities

The meeting participants then worked in small groups to brainstorm and prioritize a number of learning priorities on prevalence rates in Liberia. They first prioritized the following issues in which more information is needed on prevalence:

Substantive Issues
- Child Labor
- Children with inadequate care (street children, orphanages, mentally challenged, abandonment)
- Child sexual exploitation and abuse
- Physical abuse
- Trafficking
- Substance abuse

They also discussed a number of systemic issues that lead to inadequate knowledge on child protection cases. The following two issues were prioritized to be examined by the network.

Systemic Issues
- Data collection and information dissemination
- Lack of capacity and knowledge on issue affecting children

Session II: Policy

Presentation III: Child Protection Policy Environment

Presenter: UNICEF

Two representatives from UNICEF presented on different aspects of child protection policy in Liberia. UNICEF utilizes the protective environment as its framework for programs. As such, policies from different sectors are inter-related and need to be addressed holistically. The presentation began with a review of the legal framework in Liberia. This includes the ratified CRC, signed but not ratified Optional Protocols, ratified ILO convention on the worst form of child labor and the signed the African Charter on the Right and Welfare of the Child. Liberia has not ratified 1993 Hague Convention No.
33 on protection of children and cooperation in respect of Interagency Adoption and has only signed, but not ratified, the African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child.

In Liberia, the legal framework includes the 1971 Judiciary Law, the 2005 Act to Establish the TRC, 2005 Act to Establish the Independent Human Rights Commission, the 2005 amendment of penal code to include the Rape Act, the Act to Ban Trafficking in Persons, the new Domestic Relations Act and legislation to restrict eligibility for armed services to those between the ages of 18 and 35. In terms of policy there are a number of plans, policies and strategies to address child protection concerns including the National Policy on Girl’s Education, National Health Sector Policy, National Plan of Action against Human Trafficking, National Youth Policy, the Poverty Reduction Strategy and the National Social Welfare Policy.

The Children’s Unit in the Ministry of Gender and Social Welfare has been upgraded to a division and the Unit has 13 child welfare officers deployed around the country. However, the only child focused court in the country is in Monrovia and magisterial court capacity is low with no specific training on working with children for magistrates. In addition, staff capacity for those in the social sector, such as social workers, is low. The Ministry of Health and Social Welfare (MoHSW) has produced the Regulations and Minimum Standards for the Appropriate Use and Conditions of Alternative Care for Children and a National Independent Accreditation Committee has been established. The Bureau of Vital Registration at MoHSW has developed a decentralized birth registration action plan. The Juvenile Justice Division has just been formed but does not have capacity. There are other key mechanisms such as the Child Protection Network, Child Welfare Committees (CWCs), Children’s Parliament, Federation of Liberian Youth and Child Justice Forum.

There are still a number gaps and concerns within the sector in Liberia. Few Child Welfare Committees are very active around the country. Concerns include: use of force as a means of discipline, corporal punishment, the death penalty for children, SGBV, harmful traditional practices, child labor, low capacity for investigating cases of violence, lack of psychosocial and victim support, deprivation of family environment, and sub standard alternative care. The Children’s Act is still under review in the legislature. This act would increase the power of CWCs to make demands on local government systems and improve the ability to remedy cases of child rights violations. It would encourage traditional customs that are compatible with the CRC and would require that customs, traditions and practices that may harm children be prohibited.

Peacekeeping to Peacebuilding

The focus of this program is on re-integration and capacity building within the government. The Peacebuilding Fund refers to statebuilding, nation building, and
support structures that can help dissolve conflict. In the Interim Poverty Reduction Strategy peacebuilding is a cross cutting issue. Peacebuilding attempts to identify conflict factors and drivers such as land, youth employment and empowerment; weak and dysfunctional justice systems; and regional dimensions. Key projects include peacebuilding, leadership and community impact. In this area the presenter explained that policy is relatively strong but implementation weaker due to capacity gaps. Support for the Peacebuilding Fund is now over. Coordination and M&E of these projects could be improved and there is a need to pair the measurement of quantitative outputs with qualitative impacts.

The discussion that followed touched on a number of issues including the lack of a centralized database for data sharing. There is a deinstitutionalization database under development by the government but this will not include wider protection concerns. The Ministry of Justice may create a database for information on children in conflict with the law. The participants also noted that peacebuilding is a difficult subject to measure.

**Session III: Impact**

**Presentation IV: Impact of Violence against Children**

Presenter: Plan Liberia

This presentation was undertaken by a representative from Plan. She discussed some of the consequences of violence against children that Plan has encountered in Liberia. These include stigmatization, psychological problems, low self esteem and a feeling of denial. The presenter noted that children who experienced violence often do not feel part of the community and don’t perform well in school. She also explained that when there are insufficient systems in place to address the problem of child protection concerns, children can grow up surrounded by violence. In Liberia, there has been a normalization of violence that has changed how people behave.

**Impact Learning Priorities**

In small groups, participants generated a list of learning priorities related the impact of child rights violations. The following are the prioritized questions the group generated.

- What is the impact of household violence on children?
- What is the impact of accompanying physically or mentally challenged adults on children?
- What are the consequences for children recruited for armed violence?
- What are the impacts on children who are fostered?
What are the impacts of school violence?

In addition to the above questions, further information is needed on the following posited impacts of violence on children:

**Educational effects**
- Learning disabilities
- School drop outs

**Social Effects**
- Substance abuse
- Unresponsive
- Low self-esteem, withdrawal, rebellion
- Children become violent

**Day 2: January 19, 2011**

**Session IV: Program Components**

Day two began with a recap of day one and then moved to a session centered on identifying important components that contribute to a successful program. In small groups, participants discussed successful programs they have seen in Liberia and discussed the aspects of these programs that they believed made these programs successful. These were then prioritized into a group of learning priorities by participants. Further research could be done to provide evidence on the importance of these program components and projects.

**Learning Priorities for Programs Components**

- Sustainability Strategies/Community Ownership
- Community Involvement
- Monitoring and Evaluation
- Social Cash Transfer Program
- Coordination between and among government agencies
A representative from Save the Children presented an overview of the benefits to using a systems approach to address child protection concerns. As the presenter explained, a systems approach involves looking more broadly at the deficits in protection facing all children. It includes addressing both prevention and response comprehensively as well as both the formal and informal sectors. A holistic approach is necessary with both displaced persons and host communities concerns addressed together.

Systems are needed at differing levels including the community, district, and national levels. Community-based protection groups such as CWCs and other community groups such as PTAs as well as higher level government and civil society actors need to be engaged. The presenter also noted that data on child protection concerns is crucial to the effective implementation of the systems approach. When we lack this data, it makes it very difficult to present and defend the case of the child protection sector.

The discussion centered on the existing systems approach in Liberia and areas where improvement is needed. Some studies have sought to provide evidence on the effectiveness of aspects of a child protection system. For example, in Uganda child protection committees have been evaluated and there also has been a review of evidence on linking formal and informal structures by Mike Wessells. The Ministry of Health and UNICEF, in collaboration with a group from Oxford University, have been engaged in a study looking at funding levels for child protection concerns. However, there have been no studies of the whole systems approach.

The group also discussed the merits and drawbacks of government recognition of community-based groups such as the CWCs. Positively, this recognition gives the groups formal standing in the community to address child protection concerns. However, this can also lead to a shift in the CWCs as they become representatives of the government rather than the community when this recognition occurs. They may be less responsive to the community after this move from the informal to the formal system.

### Child Protection Systems Learning Priorities

As a group the meeting participants generated a number of priorities for future learning around the systems approach. These include:

- Community-based CP structures
- Costs of excluding host communities
Session VI: Livelihoods and Economic Strengthening

Presentation VI: Livelihoods and Economic Strengthening

Presenter: Women’s Refugee Commission

This presentation by a representative of the Women’s Refugee Commission highlighted the potential connections between livelihoods and the protection of children. The presenter sought to convince participants to measure their livelihoods interventions in terms of their impact on children. In general, the humanitarian community believes that there is a protective benefit of income generation interventions. It is believed that girls whose income increases through economic strengthening and livelihoods projects have reduced exposure to GBV. However, there have also been examples of increasing income disrupting family dynamics and leading to an increase in GBV.

The humanitarian community also believes that improved livelihoods lead to health benefits such as better access to nutrition, more frequent clinic visits, increased utilization of preventative care, inter-generational effects, and less exposure to HIV/AIDS. In addition, it is believed that livelihoods programs lead to further educational attainment, retention and demand for schooling. However, these economic programs rarely measure their impact on the lives of children. By incorporating child protection indicators into livelihoods and economic strengthening programs we could increase the evidence base for livelihoods programs affecting the lives of children. For example, the group discussed the EPACT program that incorporates a life skills education project in a livelihoods program. We need to bring together these two practitioners communities. It is important to also address issues such as gender differentials and the ability to scale up a program.

There are a number of potential indicators that could be added to livelihoods programs to measure the impact of these interventions on children. Some of these could include indicators to measure:

- school enrollment, attendance, retention
- access to health care
- nutritional status
- provision of child care
- incidence of harmful child labor

In order to keep generating learning in this field there are a number of initiatives the humanitarian community can undertake. These include building a network, undertaking a desk review of available evidence, sharing information with one another, undertaking evaluations, developing indicators, and generating baselines.

The discussion after the conclusion of the presentation brought up a number of important points. There are cultural differences between child protection and livelihoods practitioners that need to be overcome to bring these two fields together. The importance of market analysis and ensuring that livelihoods programs target appropriate and emerging fields was also discussed. The importance of targeting and involving the most marginalized groups and creating livelihoods opportunities for these populations was also discussed.

Child Protection and Livelihoods Learning Priorities

Participants again met in small groups and generated a number of learning priorities under this topic. The prioritized questions are:

- How can livelihoods interventions affect relationships within the family (e.g., husbands, wives, and children)?
- How can livelihoods interventions include the most vulnerable children (e.g., physically, mentally-challenged, children in institutions)?
- How can livelihoods programs support enrollment and retention of children in school?
- Which do we prioritize: prevention or response?
- How can livelihoods programs promote the care of children?
- How can livelihoods interventions reduce harmful traditional practices?

Session VII: Participation

Presentation VI: Child Participation

Presenter: ChildFund International
This presentation centered on the topic of child participation in the development and implementation of programs. Currently, there is no evidence that shows child participation in program development and implementation leads to a more effective program. The difference between using children as a token symbol or decoration versus a fully fledged participant was discussed during the presentation. Hart’s ladder was used to illustrate the differences between token and full participation. The presenter noted that while we aim for the highest rungs of the ladder, we typically end up more in the middle. Different programs, in different places have varying levels of participation.

The presenter showed the participants numerous examples methods to facilitate child participation from around the world. These included pictures of children engaged in activities such as community mapping and “on the line” exercises. However, the presenter noted that there is no real evidence that child participation improves the quality and impact of our programs. We need more research and evidence to show this point. The presenter also noted that it is important to extend our reach beyond children who volunteer to participate. It is important to use those who are engaged to reach out to those more hesitant to participate as their views are important too.

The session was continued on Day 3.

**Day 3: January 20, 2011**

The third and final day of the meeting began with a review of the first two days and then completed the child participation session from the following day.

**Session VII: Participation (continued)**

The following were the final learning priorities on child participation generated by meeting participants.

**Child Participation Learning Priorities**

- How can we manage children’s hopes and fears when they participate?
- How do we get them to participate outside the influence of adults?
- What are the best practices to engage children?
- How do we engage children so they are initiators instead of decorations?
- How can we influence child participation among child protection agencies?

Once these final learning agenda items were determined, the group reviewed and modified the overall list of learning priorities generated over the course of the three days.
Session VIII: Organization of the Program Learning Group

The group then moved to generate ideas for the composition of the Program Learning Group (PLG).

Steering Group Committee

The participants then split into two groups and discussed the potential composition of the steering committee. After this discussion, the groups reported that they thought the steering committee should consist of approximately nine participants. The committee could include representatives from government, 1-2 international NGOs, UN, 1-2 local NGOs, a university and the Children’s Parliament or Federation of Liberian Youth (FLY). Participants should be at the senior level such as Deputy Ministers, County Directors and Head’s of Protection.

Steering Group Terms of Reference

The participants also discussed general aspects of the steering committee’s Terms of Reference. Members of the committee will be expected to generate, supervise and manage the action plan as it moves forward. They would also be expected to undertake advocacy on behalf of the wider PLG and the research it generates. The committee will make decisions and guide the overall progress of the network. It will also raise funds on behalf of the PLG and contribute in kind resources such as meeting space, vehicles for research, etc. Finally, the group will establish specific technical working groups to move projects forward and facilitate information sharing between agencies.

Next steps

- Meeting participants spread the word as to what happened at the PLG inception meeting with others at their organizations
- Present the results of the PLG inception meeting to the Child Protection Network as well as other relevant networks
- Solicit interest in network and steering committee membership; e-mail set up to receive nominations for the steering committee
- Follow up with Ministries
- Follow up larger group meeting in six months time
## Annex I: PLG INCEPTION WORKSHOP ATTENDANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ORG</th>
<th>EMAIL</th>
<th>CELL#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mohammed Rogers</td>
<td>LAPS</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lapsprogram@gmail.com">lapsprogram@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>06665793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lulu Sheriff</td>
<td>Liberia Red Cross</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lulu206@yahoo.com">lulu206@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>06543360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janjay A. Bryant</td>
<td>CET</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cetempowerment@yahoo.com">cetempowerment@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>0880689184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawa Bropleh</td>
<td>CLA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:adolescentgirlsprogram@yahoo.com">adolescentgirlsprogram@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>06550691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewel Wesseh</td>
<td>CET</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cetempowerment@yahoo.com">cetempowerment@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>06953019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mambu E. Johnson</td>
<td>NRC</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mambujohnson@yahoo.com">mambujohnson@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>06690643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lydia-mai Sherman</td>
<td>MOHSW</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lydiamai2001@yahoo.com">lydiamai2001@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>06953019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Bismarck Appleton</td>
<td>ACENYC</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sadehs@yahoo.com">sadehs@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>06527031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rashid Bangurah</td>
<td>Save the Children</td>
<td><a href="mailto:r.bangurah@savechildrenliberia.org">r.bangurah@savechildrenliberia.org</a></td>
<td>06833888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John S. Mulbah</td>
<td>LIB ECCD</td>
<td><a href="mailto:linaeccdo_8@yahoo.com">linaeccdo_8@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>0880650482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillip K. Bemah</td>
<td>World Learning</td>
<td><a href="mailto:philipp.bemah@worldlearning.org">philipp.bemah@worldlearning.org</a></td>
<td>06535185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosana Schaack</td>
<td>THINK/SPI</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Rosana@thinkliberia.com">Rosana@thinkliberia.com</a></td>
<td>06558492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korto Mezzeh</td>
<td>ARC</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kortomezzeh@yahoo.com">kortomezzeh@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>06953219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry H. Howe</td>
<td>ARC</td>
<td><a href="mailto:henros67@yahoo.com">henros67@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>06460292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Monibah</td>
<td>MoGD</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jmonibah57@yahoo.com">jmonibah57@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>06974528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langley Nya Kialain</td>
<td>Liberia Scout Assoc.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nyakialain@yahoo.com">nyakialain@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>06446448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Elvin Stoltzfus</td>
<td>CAM</td>
<td><a href="mailto:elvin@camlib.org">elvin@camlib.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Philminah C.M. Bakellah</td>
<td>ChildFund</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pmbakella@liberia.childfund.org">pmbakella@liberia.childfund.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Dorothy Smith</td>
<td>Plan Liberia</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dorothy.smith@plan-international.org">dorothy.smith@plan-international.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Deola Famak</td>
<td>Educare</td>
<td><a href="mailto:educare-liberia@yahoo.com">educare-liberia@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>David S. Konneh</td>
<td>Don Bosco Homes</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dbhliberia@yahoo.com">dbhliberia@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Fred A. Weedor Jr.</td>
<td>SASEF</td>
<td><a href="mailto:f.aweedor@yahoo.com">f.aweedor@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Saye A. Tiah</td>
<td>Helping Hand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Lawrence Bestman</td>
<td>YOCADS</td>
<td><a href="mailto:yocads2003.org@yahoo.com">yocads2003.org@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Jessie Travers</td>
<td>CEP</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jestravers@yahoo.com">jestravers@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Mildred Fuah</td>
<td>CAP</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mamalay66@yahoo.com">mamalay66@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Robert Taylor</td>
<td>MoGD</td>
<td><a href="mailto:roberttaylor-gender@yahoo.com">roberttaylor-gender@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Natasha Andersen</td>
<td>Right to Play</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nandersen@righttoplay.com">nandersen@righttoplay.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Amy Spelz</td>
<td>Liberia Mission</td>
<td><a href="mailto:as.liberiamission@gmail.com">as.liberiamission@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Jessica Lowden</td>
<td>World Learning</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jessicalowden@worldlearning.org">jessicalowden@worldlearning.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Logan S. Stewart Jr.</td>
<td>CESP</td>
<td>infocespliberia.org</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Danielle Carpenter</td>
<td>Samaritan Purse</td>
<td><a href="mailto:daniellecarpenter@gmail.com">daniellecarpenter@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Christine Davis</td>
<td>ChildFund</td>
<td><a href="mailto:chriswash2q2@yahoo.com">chriswash2q2@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Emily Garin</td>
<td>MPEA</td>
<td>egarinmopea.gov.lr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Helena S. Massaquoi</td>
<td>Right to Play</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Massaquoi@righttoplay.com">Massaquoi@righttoplay.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Geoffrey Oyat</td>
<td>Save the Children</td>
<td><a href="mailto:g.oyat@savethechildrenliberia.org">g.oyat@savethechildrenliberia.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Ron S. Meh</td>
<td>Right to Play</td>
<td><a href="mailto:meh@righttoplay.com">meh@righttoplay.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Lilit Umroyan</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lumroyan@unicef.org">lumroyan@unicef.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Andrew Dunbrack</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td><a href="mailto:adunbrack@unicef.org">adunbrack@unicef.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>