**Community Based Child Protection in Humanitarian Action: Terminology and Definitions**

Developed by the Community Based Child Protection in Emergencies Task Force of the Alliance for Child Protection in Humanitarian Action

**1. Introduction**: Verbal communication is one of the core ways International Non-Governmental Organizations (INGOs) work with children, their families, community members, government officials, and other professionals and volunteers that protect children in humanitarian crises. However, terminology used by staff to describe risks that children face, actions to mitigate those risks, and available services are not always contextualized to the appropriate language and concepts of affected people. This terminology can alienate and in some cases, can remove affected people from technical and strategic discussions about what risks their children face, what can be done to address those risks, and how it should be implemented. The importance of language and terminology cannot be underestimated. It can affect the way we communicate with and are understood by one another, it can lead to un-intended power dynamics, exclusion of certain groups, can create a perceived sense of disrespect, and can lead to the design of interventions that undermine existing protective practices in communities.

The following list of common Community Based Child Protection (CBCP) - related terms and their definitions is intended to show the evolving definitions INGO actors have around CBCP, not to agree or disagree on standard definitions, but to help the international humanitarian community to reflect on how it thinks about and conceptualizes working with and alongside communities on behalf of children. These definitions were collected through a Systematic Review of over 234 documents (both published and grey literature).[[1]](#footnote-1) They provide an orientation from which new ways of talking about work with communities can emerge. This is a “living” reference document that will be continuously updated as the Inter-agency Community Based Child Protection Task Force outlines new “ways of working” in collaboration with communities, civil society, National NGOs and government actors throughout 2018-2020. Our hope is that this terminology reference document will contribute to more sustainable and meaningful partnerships with communities to create safer environments for children in emergencies.

**2. Organizations Involved**: The Terminology Database was developed by Anthony Guevara, Consultant for Plan International, and guided by the Review Committee of the USAID/OFDA Project under the Community Based Child Protection in Emergencies Task Force (CBCP TF).[[2]](#footnote-2)

**3. Terminology Database**

**Community**

Definition(s):

* Community is defined geographically, emphasising a group of interacting people living in proximity in a particular location such as a village or urban neighbourhood. (Child Protection working Group, 2010)
* A community frequently consists of multiple sub-groups that differ according to religion, socio-economic status, and ethnicity, and some groups may wield much more power and influence than others do (Wessells M. , What Are We Learning About Protection Children in the Community?, 2009).
* Community can be described as a group of people that recognizes itself or is recognized by outsiders as sharing common cultural, religious or other social features, and a common background and interests, forming a collective identity with common goals. However, what is externally perceived as a community may in fact be an entity with many subgroups or communities, divided into clans or castes or by social class, language, religion and so on (UNHCR, 2007, pp. 8-9).
* Community refers not only to a group of people who live in a defined territory, but also to groups of people who may be physically separated but who are connected by other common characteristics, such as profession, interests, age, ethnic origin, or language (Howard-­Grabman, 2003, p. 261)
* Community [is] a concept pertaining essentially to social relations, a group of people, less self‐sufficient than society, but who have closer “associations” and deeper sympathy among members than society in general. Members of a community often share a common identity, tend to use a common language, have clear criteria for membership and understand the social boundaries within which they operate. There are social and psychological ties among members, and often a connection with a geographic area. While one of the functions of community is to promote common interest, relationships of dominance and dependency exist in communities as they do in all human organizations (Gubbels, 2000, p. 2)
* Community is defined as a collective of people who live in a similar area and are willing to collaborate on the achievement of a shared goal (Wessells M. , A Guide For Supporting Community Led Child Protection Processes (DRAFT), 2017).
* Whole population in a given territorial unit, including the village, herding families who seek to safeguard common interests (Save the Children, 2010).[[3]](#footnote-3)
* A group of people living in or near a particular location, such as a village or an urban neighbourhood. Although a community may not always be a homogeneous group (there may be different ethnic groups, religious groups, people with varying levels of socio-economic status, etc.), communities can provide significant ways of preventing and responding to CP risks. Even in situations of mass displacement where no ‘community’ is easy to see, groups of people can organize themselves to support children at risk (Child Protection Working Group, 2011, p. Standard 16).
* A group of interacting people who live in some geographical proximity to one another and usually shares common values and interests. The term refers to a social unit larger than the household. This definition applies equally to rural, urban and emergency settings. (Baulieu, 2017)[[4]](#footnote-4)
* A group of interacting people who live in some geographical proximity to one another and usually shares common values and interests. The term refers to a social unit larger than the household. This definition applies equally to rural, urban and emergency settings (Benham, 2008).
* Community refers to a group of people who recognizes itself or is recognized by outsiders as sharing common cultural, religious or other social features, backgrounds and interests and that forms a collective identity with shared goals (Child Protection Working Group in Sudan, 2012).
* A group of interacting people who live in some geographical proximity to one another and usually shares common values and interests. The term refers to a social unit larger than the household. This definition applies equally to rural and urban settings (Sekulović, 2014).
* A community is a social group whose members share a common locality, traditions and history (Care International, 2007).
* The concept of community includes two key ideas: a structural dimension and a functional dimension. The notion of structure refers to a defined geographical area, and the functional idea appears in the social and psychological aspects, the objective needs and the shared interests of the group. In this sense, community is a group of people living in a particular geographical area (village, district, area, municipality, nation, country) who have shared interests and activities and who cooperate formally and informally to resolve problems that affect them all. Community is also based on a feeling of belonging associated with a shared history and shared traditions, customs, standards and symbols (Crauzaz, 2011).
* Community is defined geographically, emphasising a group of interacting people living in proximity in a particular location such as a village or urban neighbourhood (Child Protection Working Group , 2010).

**Community Based**

Definition(s):

* The term ‘community-based approach’ implies that communities engage meaningfully and substantially in all aspects of programmes that affect them, strengthening the community’s leading role as a driving force for change. To be truly community-based, programmes must involve affected groups in a community at every stage: in assessment, diagnosis, prioritization, design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. The approach emphasizes the community’s self-determination and capacity, but does not remove the need for formal protection mechanisms or imply that communities are expected to be completely self- sufficient (UNHCR, 2013).
* Any practice or institution that is developed or occurs at local level, for example in a village (in a rural area) or at a ward level (in an urban area) (Baulieu, 2017).[[5]](#footnote-5)
* A community-based approach is a way of working in partnership with persons of concern during all stages of UNHCR’s programme cycle. It recognizes the resilience, capacities, skills and resources of persons of concern, builds on these to deliver protection and solutions, and supports the community’s own goals (UNHCR, 2008).
* Community‐based approach is a way of working that is based on an inclusive partnership with communities of persons of concern, which recognizes their resilience, capacities and resources. It mobilizes and builds on these to deliver protection, assistance and solutions while supporting community processes and goals…It calls for the recognition of our facilitation role as external actors and our limitations in terms of capacities, resources and the temporary nature of our presence, as well as the longer‐ term impact of our interventions. The community‐based approach reinforces the dignity and self‐esteem of the people of concern and seeks to empower all the actors to work together to support the different members of the community in exercising and enjoying their human rights (UNHCR, 2007, p.8).
* [A]n inclusive type of organization created and controlled by local people for their own benefit. These can be traditional organizations or more recently formed groups designed to help members meet their basic needs and further common interests. Examples include self‐ help groups, savings and credit groups and village development committees (Gubbels, 2000, p. 182).
* Any practice or institution hat is developed or occurs at local level, for example in a village (in a rural area) or at ward level (in an urban area) (Plan International, 2015).

**Community Based Child Protection (Mechanism, Group, Committee)**

Definition(s):

* Child protection mechanisms are practices and processes designed to ensure the safety of children from physical, psychological and emotional harm at community, local government and national levels. These mechanisms are usually considered as “a network or group of individuals at a community level who work in a coordinated manner towards child protection goals. Such mechanisms can be indigenous or externally initiated and supported. They may also be informal or formal in their structure and functioning (War Child, 2012, p. 9).[[6]](#footnote-6)
* Community-based organisation (CBO): A local membership organisation that relies almost exclusively on volunteers from within the community and usually receives little external funding (Save the Children UK, 2007).
* Community-based structures are initiatives that are grounded within the context of cultural, economical, societal and traditional values within a given population. They draw upon the effective participation of community members in the initial stages of formulation, planning, decision-making, implementing and controlling/managing activities, and they support community-driven choices that respond with the community and not on behalf of the community. (not cited)
* Community-based child protection mechanism (CBCPM) is a network or group of individuals at community level who work in a coordinated manner towards protection of children from all forms of violence, in all settings. Such mechanisms can be indigenous or externally initiated and supported. They may be formal or informal in their structure and functioning. CBCPMs are linked and contribute to child protection systems. (Plan International, 2015)
* Community-based child protection mechanism (CBCPM) is a network or group of individuals at community level who work in a coordinated way towards child protection goals (Child Protection Working Group, 2011, p. 163).
* Community-based child protection groups are defined as a collection of people, often volunteers, who aim to ensure the protection and well0being of children in a village, urban neighbourhood or other community – for example, an IDP camp or temporary settlement. By definition, these groups operate at the grassroots or district level, as opposed to a national level (Wessells M. , What Are We Learning About Protection Children in the Community?, 2009).
* A grouping of local people, sometimes volunteers, that aims to ensure the protection and wellbeing of children in a village, urban neighbourhood or other community – for example, a camp for internally displaced people (IDPs) or a temporary settlement (Save the Children, 2008).
* A network or group of individuals at community level who work in a coordinated manner towards protection of children from all forms of violence, in all settings. Such mechanisms can be endogenous or externally initiated and supported. They may be more formal or informal in their structure and functioning. CBCPMs are linked and contribute to child protection systems (Plan International, 2015).
* Groups or networks that respond to and prevent issues of children protection at the grassroots level. They range from family and peer group supports to women‘s groups, religious groups, and youth groups. They also include traditional community based processes and formal mechanisms initiated by government and national and international nongovernmental organizations (NGOs). Examples of CBCPMs are Child Welfare Committees, religious groups that support orphans and other vulnerable children, family responses to problems such as teenage pregnancy, and traditional processes where a chief and/or elders use by-laws to respond to violations against children (Inter-agency Learning Initiative on Community Based Child Protection Mechanisms and Child Protection Systems, 2012).
* CBCPMs include all groups or networks at grassroots level that respond to and prevent child protection issues and harms to vulnerable children. These may include family supports (including extended family supports), peer group supports, and community groups such as women’s groups, religious groups, and youth groups, as well as traditional or endogenous community processes, government mechanisms, and mechanisms initiated by national and international non-governmental organizations (NGOs) (Kostelny, 2014).
* Components of CBCPMs include the people, groups, and networks that exist in communities to prevent and address child protection concerns and violations. Members of CBCPMs include families, community members, leaders, and groups, religious organizations, and locally based government and NGO actors. The inherent value of CBCPMs lies in their creation in response to local child protection concerns. These responses are conceptualized and implemented by community members according to their existing beliefs and prior experiences in preventing and responding to child protection violations (Child Protection in Crisis: Network for Research, Learning and Action, 2012).
* Child protection mechanisms are practices and processes designed to ensure the safety of children from physical, psychological and emotional harm at community, local government and national levels. These mechanisms are usually considered as “a network or group of individuals at a community level who work in a coordinated manner towards child protection goals. Such mechanisms can be indigenous or externally initiated and supported. They may also be informal or formal in their structure and functioning (War Child, 2012).
* Community-based protection is an approach that puts the capacities, agency, rights and dignity of persons of concern at the centre of programming. It generates more effective and sustainable protection outcomes by identifying protection gaps through consultation and strengthening local resources and capacity (UNHCR, 2013).[[7]](#footnote-7)
* A network or group of individuals at community level who work in a coordinated manner towards protection of children from all forms of violence, in all settings. Such mechanisms can be indigenous or externally initiated and supported. They may be more formal or informal in their structure and functioning. Community-based child protection mechanisms are linked to and contribute to child protection systems (Plan International, 2016).
* Community-based child protection mechanism is a person or group in the community providing child protection. It may be voluntary or paid, and may be organized through external support (for example from an NGO) or independently within the community (Jordanwood, 2016).
* Community-based child protection include specific interventions that are focused towards empowering and enabling a community to protect their children, and for children to protect themselves. In essence, almost all of World Vision’s child-focused work can and should have a protective impact on children. However, the term ‘Community- based child protection’ is reserved for activities which intentionally address abuse, neglect, exploitation or other forms of violence within families and communities. It focuses on strengthening the protective environment for children and can include addressing root causes as well as strengthening community-based referral and assistance to children whose rights to protection have been, or are at risk of being, violated (World Vision International, 2012).
* Community-based child protection mechanism is a network or group of individuals at community level who work in a coordinated manner towards child protection goals. Such mechanisms can be indigenous or externally initiated and supported. They may be more formal or informal in their structure and functioning (Child Protection Working Group , 2010).

**Community Driven**

Definition(s):

* Ownership is achieved when the persons of concern in the community assume full responsibility for the continuity of the work and are managing the activities and services; this is the overriding goal of our work. Ownership is the end result of a process that has respected the principles of meaningful participation and empowerment (UNHCR, 2007, p. 13).
* Ownership is the sense among those involved that the problems identified are theirs and that they hold primary responsibility for addressing them (Donahue, 2006, p. i).
* Community-led approaches are ones that are led not by an NGO or other outsider but by a collective, community process. Community led approaches are grounded in the idea of people power, that is, the ability of ordinary people, even under difficult circumstances, to organize themselves, define their main problems or challenges, and collectively address those problems (Wessells M. , A Guide For Supporting Community Led Child Protection Processes (DRAFT), 2017).
* Community ownership is determined by: “acceptance of collective responsibility; agencies’ patient cultivation of ownership over time; use of facilitation approaches that enabled community dialogue, mutual learning, and collective decision‐making; a community sense that “this is our programme”; volunteerism motivated by wanting to help address a collective problem; and mobilisation of community resources (War Child, 2012).[[8]](#footnote-8)

**Formal Child Protection System**

Definition(s):

* National child protection system is broadly defined as a comprehensive and interrelated approach to the protection of children from abuse, neglect, exploitation and violence and to the fulfilment of children’s rights to protection. Key elements of a child protection system include families, communities and government mechanisms, as well as children themselves. The components of the system broadly include structures, functions, capacities, a continuum of care, processes of care and accountability. They include both more formal and less formal components. Ideally, the components of a child protection system are coordinated and linked to a common goal (Child Protection Working Group , 2010).
  + Formal: describes structures, mechanisms or processes in the system that have some degree of institutionalised organisation and are officially recognised and mandated. The term ‘more formal’ can be used to describe structures, mechanisms or processes that exist at all levels, including community level.
* A comprehensive, interacting and sustainable series of functions and structures including laws, policies, and services (at all levels) with the purpose of preventing and responding to all forms of violence against all children (Plan International, 2015).
* Child Protection System: A comprehensive and sustainable approach to preventing and responding to child protection issues, comprising the set of laws, policies, regulations and services required across all social sectors – especially social welfare, education, health, security and justice – to respond to and prevent protection-related risks (Inter-agency Working Group on Child Protection Systems in Sub-Saharan Africa, 2011).
* Formal System: Refers to government, international organizations and local NGOs (including community and faith-based organizations) involved in providing child protection, being recognized or endorsed by and subject to supervision and regulation by the government. It is also important to note that some groups, such as traditional leaders, also have clear roles within both the formal and informal systems (Inter-agency Working Group on Child Protection Systems in Sub-Saharan Africa, 2011).
* Child Protection System: A comprehensive, interacting and sustainable series of functions and structures including laws, policies, and services (at all levels) with the purpose of preventing and responding to all forms of violence against all children (Baulieu, 2017).
* Child Protection System: IICRD and the CAPE project view the child protection system as a web of interconnected elements that create layers of safety nets to prevent violence, exploitation and abuse of girls and boys as well as appropriate care for children who have already experienced violence, exploitation and abuse. In addition to being oriented to prevention and care, all child protection systems have to have a means to identify children whose rights have been violated. Instead of being focused on a single child protection issue such as child trafficking or sexual abuse, a systems approach to child protection promotes a holistic response that requires coordination and cooperation among the many actors involved in protecting children from violence, exploitation and abuse to help reduce overall vulnerability and to promote resilience. Actors within an integrated child protection system include the child, peers, family, community, state and multinational bodies. The five building blocks of integrated child protection systems include (ICCRD, 2016):
  + Legislation, Policy and Enforcement Mechanisms: child protection laws, child specific policies, formal enforcement mechanisms and community-based child protection mechanisms.
  + Services: child specific health, education and other services.
  + Social Change: changing harmful traditional behaviour and attitudes towards children, especially at the family and community level.
  + Bridging government services with family and community protective mechanisms: partnering with communities to better draw on natural support, care and advocacy systems.
  + Child Participation: participatory activities that build children’s capacity to protect them- selves and their peers from violence, exploitation and abuse.
* Child protection system is defined as a comprehensive and sustainable approach to preventing and responding to child protection issues, comprising of the set of laws, policies, regulations and services required across all social sectors, especially social welfare, education, health, security and justice to respond to and prevent protection-related risks (Jordanwood, 2016).[[9]](#footnote-9)
* A national child protection system is a rights-based national child protection system recognising the State’s responsibility and human rights obligations to children and provides governments with a coordinated and sustainable way to protect children. A good system is made up of a set of laws and policies; a central government coordination mechanism with a clear mandate; effective regulation and monitoring at all levels; a committed, competent workforce; and child-friendly, non- discriminatory services, accessible to all children. Children and other members of society should be involved in developing and monitoring the system. And it must be connected with and support informal community mechanisms that are better placed to recognise problems and respond to them quickly, such as extended family, friends and neighbours, and religious and cultural networks (Save the Children Sweden, 2012).
* Child protection systems are comprehensive approaches to protect children from abuse, neglect, exploitation and violence and to the fulfilment of children’s rights to protection (Save the Children, 2008).
* Child Protection System: A set of laws, policies, regulations and services needed across all social sectors – especially social welfare, education, health, security and justice – as well as community and faith based groups and other private service providers. It is part of social protection, and also extends beyond it (Child Frontiers, 2011).
* Formal system: Refers to government, international organisations and local NGOs (including community and faith based organisations) involved in providing child protection, being recognized or endorsed by and subject to supervision and regulation by the government. It is also important to note that some groups, such as traditional leaders, also have clear roles within both the formal and informal systems (Child Frontiers, 2011).
* Child Protection System is a coherent set of actions and actors, in which the child is the starting point and which aims to guarantee the rights and well-being of the child by constructing synergies within and between protective environments (Delaney, 2014).
* Child protection systems comprise the set of laws, policies, regulations and services needed across all social sectors — especially social welfare, education, health, security and justice — to support prevention and response to protection related risks (UNICEF, 2008).
* Essential components of a [child protection] system includes: laws and policies; a meaningful coordination across government departments and between sectors at different levels; knowledge and data on child protection issues and good practices; minimum standards and oversight; preventive and responsive services; a skilled child protection workforce; adequate funding; children’s voices and participation; and an aware and supportive public (Save the Children, 2010).[[10]](#footnote-10)
* UNICEF has defined child protection systems as a certain formal and informal structures, functions and capacities that have been assembled to prevent and respond to violence, abuse, neglect, and exploitation of children (Wessells M. K., 2014).[[11]](#footnote-11)
* An interlocking, dynamic set of institutions, mechanisms, norms and practices at different levels (e.g., family, community, district, society) that, in combination, have nationwide reach and protect children by preventing, responding to, and mitigating the effects of violence, abuse, exploitation, and neglect of children. A national child protection system may include Government institutions such as a Ministry of Social Welfare, police, and a judiciary, and many civil society mechanisms such as traditional chiefdom practices, customary law, and community based mechanisms (The Columbia Group for Children in Adversity, 2011).
* Formal System: Refers to components of the child protection system being recognized or endorsed by and subject to supervision and regulation by the government, international organisations and local NGOs (including community and faith based organisations) (Thompstone, G., Crispin, V., 2010).
* It is important to note that formal and Informal should be considered as the two ends of a continuum and that there are likely to be elements of crossover between the formal and informal systems. In several instances it might be challenging to define elements clearly due to ambivalent roles and mandates. Elaborating the nature of the relationship between these groups is an important part of the analysis and mapping and may well require revision as a result of this exercise (Thompstone, G., Crispin, V., 2010).
* Child Protection System: A child protection system consists of laws and policies, meaningful coordination across government departments and between sectors at different levels, multiple governmental and nongovernmental actors working in synergy, knowledge of and data on child protection issues and good practices, minimum child protection standards and oversight, preventive and responsive services, a skilled child protection workforce, adequate funding, children’s voices and participation and an aware and supportive public (Medrano T, 2012).
* A Child Protection System incorporates subsystems for the administration of foster care and juvenile justice. A Child Protection System also intersects with global systems in such domains as education, justice and health. The synergies among the components of a Child Protection System and between a Child Protection System and its subsystems and related global systems are essential for child protection (Medrano T, 2012).
* National child protection systems are premised on a government’s obligations as the primary duty bearer of children’s rights, these systems are comprehensive with a robust legal and policy framework; adequate budget allocations; coordination across multiple sectors; services aimed at preventing and responding to harm against children; a protection focused workforce; oversight and regulation; and information systems to capture data on protection issues (Child Protection Working Group in Sudan, 2012).
* By ‘child protection systems’ we are referring to systems that ‘comprise the set of laws, policies, regulations and services needed across all social sectors—especially social welfare, education, health, security and justice—to support prevention and response to protection related risks (Jones, 2009).[[12]](#footnote-12)
* Child protection systems are defined as comprehensive approaches to the protection of children from abuse, neglect, exploitation and violence and to the fulfilment of children’s rights to protection [and] can also be considered as all the activities whose primary purpose is to prevent or respond to the abuse, neglect, exploitation and violence of children (War Child, 2012).[[13]](#footnote-13)
* Child protection systems comprise the set of laws, policies, regulations and services needed across all social sectors‐ especially social welfare, education, health, security and justice‐ to support prevention and response to protection related risks (War Child, 2012).[[14]](#footnote-14)
* Formal vs. non-formal aspects of the system. Although traditional societies can have quite formal structures, the formal child protection system refers in this report to the parts of the national system that are constructed and implemented by the Government, often with support from mechanisms facilitated or funded by UN agencies or NGOs. Thus, chiefdom, family, and other civil society mechanisms are non-formal aspects of the system, whereas Government ministries, courts, and Government social workers and police are part of the formal system. In Sierra Leone, CWCs are part of the formal system because they are mandated by law (The Columbia Group for Children in Adversity, 2011).

**Informal Child Protection System**

Definition(s):

* Refers to child protection initiatives undertaken by families, communities and children themselves (Inter-agency Working Group on Child Protection Systems in Sub-Saharan Africa, 2011).
* Refers to child protection initiatives undertaken by families, communities and children themselves. It is important to note that Formal and Informal should be considered as the two ends of a continuum and that there are likely to be elements of cross-over between the formal and informal systems. In several instances it might be challenging to define elements clearly due to ambivalent roles and mandates (Child Protection Initiative, 2015).[[15]](#footnote-15)
* Informal System: Refers to initiatives undertaken by families, communities and children themselves in promoting children’s well-being, protection and to mobilize helping resources available in communities to strengthen families and to respond when children are mistreated (Thompstone, G., Crispin, V., 2010).
* This informal system refers to practices used and initiatives undertaken by communities and families for protecting children (ECPAT International, Plan International, Save the Children, UNICEF and World Vision, 2014).
* Less formal (or informal) describes structures, mechanisms or processes whose functioning is less specifically prescribed. Less formal or informal is generally used to describe structures and mechanisms at community or family level (Child Protection Working Group , 2010).

**Family and Kinship Structures**

Definition(s):

* Community and family based care is defined as an approach designed to enable children either to remain with their own family or to be placed with a foster family, if possible within their community. Family in this context comprises the extended family offering kinship care, child-headed households and foster families unrelated to the child (Jordanwood, 2016).[[16]](#footnote-16)
* Kinship care is a situation in which extended family members take an orphaned or other child in. Carers could be grandparents, aunts, uncles or other relatives of the child. This common practice also is deeply rooted in Cambodia. This type of care may however be based on a written agreement between parents, extended family, local or central authorities and an organization (Jordanwood, 2016)[[17]](#footnote-17).
* Alternative informal care is any private arrangement provided in a family environment whereby the child is looked after on an ongoing or indefinite basis by relatives or friends (informal kinship care) or by others in their individual capacity, at the initiative of the child, his/her parents or other person without this arrangement having been ordered by an administrative or judicial authority or a duly accredited body (Ah Ken, 2007).[[18]](#footnote-18)
* Alternative formal care is all care provided in a family environment which has been ordered or authorised by competent administrative body or judicial authority, and all care provided in a residential environment, including in private facilities, whether or not as a result of administrative or judicial measures (Ah Ken, 2007).[[19]](#footnote-19)
* Kinship care is family-based care within the child’s extended family or with close friends of the family known to the child, whether formal or informal in nature (Ah Ken, 2007).[[20]](#footnote-20)
* The term ‘family’ is used as shorthand to refer to those within the caring circle of a child. This caring circle varies according to culture and circumstance; thus, the use of the term `family’ recognizes that in many societies the care environment of a child is broader than the immediate family and includes the extended family. The term also recognizes that in some circumstances, children are primary caregivers. However, it is important to clarify that individuals from the community or service providers who are not providing daily emotional, physical and psychological care to children would not be considered family (Child Protection Initiative, 2015)
* Family means those within the caring circle of a child. This caring circle varies according to culture and circumstance; thus, the use of the term `family‟ recognizes that in many societies the care environment of a child is broader than the immediate family and includes the extended family. The term also recognizes that in some circumstances, children are primary caregivers. However, it is important to clarify that individuals from the community or service providers who are not providing daily emotional, physical and psychological care to children would not be considered family (Inter-agency Working Group on Child Protection Systems in Sub-Saharan Africa, 2011).
* Family comprises those people who are related—usually through blood or marriage—and who provide emotional, physical and psychological care to children. This may refer to both a small nuclear family and household, or alternatively and extended kinship network (Plan International, 2015).

**Child Welfare Workforce**

Definition(s):

* All categories of people who work in the public sector, private nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), and faith-based organizations (FBOs) on behalf of highly vulnerable children, including frontline social workers and paraprofessionals (with and without qualifications); child protection officers; community para-social workers; teachers and trainers of social workers; child welfare supervisors; managers and program planners; and local and national advocates (Inter-agency Working Group on Child Protection Systems in Sub-Saharan Africa, 2011).

**4. Amendments**: The Terminology Database is a working/living document and should be amended to current needs, changing contexts, and understanding of community-based work as the evidence and knowledge in the thematic area evolves. For question, comments, or additions, please contact the CBCP in Emergencies Task Force at [cbcp.tf@alliancecpha.org](mailto:cbcp.tf@alliancecpha.org).
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