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Annex 1

Evaluation of UNICEF Programmes to Protect Children in Emergencies

Terms of Reference

BACKGROUND

UNICEF estimates that just over 1 billion children live in countries or territories affected by armed conflict, and of these, around 300 million are under 5 years old. Children living in conflict-affected countries are more likely to suffer from poverty, under nutrition, poor health and lack of education. Social systems and networks often fall into disrepair in times of conflict, meaning that they are less able to protect vulnerable children from harmful by-products such as child recruitment, trafficking and gender-based violence (GBV).

Children are also disproportionately affected by natural disasters, including earthquakes, droughts, monsoons and floods. Such disasters destroy homes and communities, create conditions in which diseases can spread, keep children out of school, and adversely affect the social systems that protect vulnerable children. Children may be separated from their families or may lose official documents necessary for them to gain access to humanitarian assistance. Unaccompanied and separated children, especially those from child-headed households, are more vulnerable to economic or sexual exploitation and abuse.

Emergencies arising from armed conflict or natural disaster can cause serious threats to the mental health and social well-being of children and their families and communities, jeopardizing their long-term ability to live and thrive in the aftermath of the emergency. Children may experience psychosocial as well as cognitive and social difficulties because of a number of factors, including death, injury or illness of parents and other caregivers; injury and illness borne by children themselves; destruction of and displacement from the protective influence of home, school, and community; and the suspension of essential services. Such emergencies can also disrupt social institutions, deprive families of their livelihoods, and create tensions and divisions within communities. Conflict and natural disaster-related emergencies thus increase the vulnerability of and create or reinforce inequities for girls and boys to all forms of violence and exploitation, which have serious consequences that need to be addressed in a systematic manner. For example, survivors of GBV, both children and women, may be left with fistulae, sexually transmitted infections including HIV, and unwanted pregnancies, and as a result, may be ostracized and abandoned by their families and communities.

UNICEF’s child protection programming in the context of emergencies is guided by the Core Commitments for Children in Humanitarian Action (CCCs) and Human Rights-based Approach to Programming. Within the UN humanitarian cluster system, UNICEF leads the Child Protection Working Group (CPWG), and co-lead the GBV Area of Responsibility with UNFPA and the Mental Health and Psycho-social Support Reference Group (MHPSS).

UNICEF, working with a variety of partners has made important strides over the past decade in strengthening the response to protection concerns for children, including preventive actions. Advances have been made in the legal and policy frameworks governing child protection, high-level advocacy, inter-agency coordination, and programme response. For example, in 2010, reintegration support was provided to 28,000 children affected by armed conflict and 11,400 boys and girls associated with armed forces or armed groups in 15 conflict-affected countries. Since the launch of the universal ratification campaign of the CRC Optional Protocols in May 2010, ten more countries have ratified or signed the Optional Protocol on the Involvement of Children in Armed Conflict (OPAC). Sixteen (16) additional countries have endorsed the Paris Commitments in 2010-11, raising the total to 100.

Despite the achievements, many challenges remain. For instance, the major natural disasters in Haiti and Pakistan in 2010 highlighted challenges to rapidly scale up child protection programmes to address increased protection concerns, including preventing and responding to family separation and GBV, providing psychosocial support and establishing child-friendly spaces (CFS). The earthquake in Haiti in particular marked a pivotal moment in humanitarian response because global attention was drawn to
the importance of strong preventive and responsive child protection (CP) systems. The Haiti response led to system strengthening, including legal reform and improved social welfare systems.

In the past years, a number of evaluations have examined UNICEF’s child protection response to particular emergencies, both in the context of natural disasters and conflicts. These evaluations have primarily examined the early and, sometimes, recovery phases of the humanitarian response. (e.g. tsunami evaluation). However, there has been no comprehensive evaluation to examine the entire cycle of emergency child protection programming, ranging from disaster risk reduction (DRR) and preparedness planning to early response and recovery phases. The fact that emergencies can provide opportunities for long term action and can increase importance accorded to the role of DRR and preparedness requires evaluative evidence and lessons in terms of what works not only in each phase of child protection programming vis-à-vis emergencies, but also the sequencing and synergy that is necessary for adequately protecting children and women in the context of emergencies. The proposed exercise will include a synthesis of the findings and lessons based on country case studies and represents the first comprehensive evaluation of UNICEF’s child protection programming in the context of emergencies.

**Purpose, Use and Scope**

The purpose of the evaluation is to strengthen child protection programming in the context of emergencies by assessing UNICEF’s performance in recent years and drawing lessons and recommendations that will influence on-going and future programmes, both in terms of preparedness and response. The evaluation will examine the performance of child protection strategies and interventions along a continuum of pre-crisis, crisis and post-crisis (recovery) phases of transition and therefore incorporates both preventive and responsive perspectives, in line with UNICEF’s CCCs.

The evidence and recommendations provided by the evaluation will be used for improving UNICEF’s organisational accountability, policy and management decisions, and technical guidance, and they will serve as a systematic knowledge base for use by national governments, donors and other partners who contribute to child protection outcomes.

The evaluation has the following objectives:

1) Based on the OECD-DAC criteria, informed by UNICEF’s CCCs, and taking account of specific contexts, determine the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coverage, impact (where feasible), and sustainability of UNICEF’s child protection programmes that focus on emergency preparedness, response and recovery phases.


3) Identify key successes and gaps (in terms of what works and does not work and why?) in child protection programming and draw lessons learned, in the context of both armed conflict and natural disaster.

4) Based on evidence gathered, provide recommendations for policy and management decisions and providing technical guidance and/or operational aspects for strengthening child protection response in the context of emergencies; including required leadership, guidance and supportive actions from regional offices and headquarters (HQ).

The evaluation will focus on a selection of case study countries that are affected by conflict and/or natural disaster, and it will examine the roles of and linkages with regional and global level support (technical support, policy guidance, and advocacy) and partnerships. The scope of the evaluation covers an examination of a) UNICEF’s work in child protection before, during and after a conflict or natural disaster, covering preparedness planning to recovery phases and related transition issues in

---

1 Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development – Development Assistance Committee
2 For example, preventive advocacy work, coordination mechanisms, child-friendly spaces, referrals for health, psychosocial and legal support, socio-economic reintegration, strengthening of child protection systems.
particular country contexts; b) the role of, support from, and performance of the regional and HQ levels; and c) country specific and synthesised findings, lessons, and recommendations that are broadly applicable.

**Evaluation questions and issues** (organised as OECD/DAC evaluation criteria and cross-cutting issues) to be addressed by the evaluation are as follows:

**Impact (long-term and/or intermediate results)**

- What are the key results achieved by UNICEF child protection programmes in various emergency contexts (conflict and natural disaster) and in the key phases of preparedness, emergency relief; response; and recovery To what extent were the intended results (impact/outcome level) results achieved? What are the key measures required to improve child protection results in the context of emergencies?

**Relevance / Appropriateness**

- What specific approaches and tools are used to undertake situation analysis and needs / capacity assessments before, during and after the conflict or natural disaster? How adequate is the information / analysis for programme development and monitoring and evaluation?
- How explicit was the programme design with respect to theory of change (how change comes about?) in various stages of the programme response? Was the design adapted to reflect changing contexts? What conclusions can be drawn about the need / importance to focus on and articulate programme theory / logic in programme design, including its adaptation at various stages?
- How relevant and responsive are UNICEF’s emergency child protection programme strategies / interventions to the needs of the children and women affected by the emergency (conflict or natural disaster)?
- To what degree do child protection interventions through preparedness, early response and recovery phases build on existing systems and mechanisms (i.e. coordination mechanisms, and adapt to changing needs and context? regulatory

**Effectiveness**

The evaluation will examine key components of child protection programming in the context of emergencies using the CCCs as a reference and based on context specific needs and priorities and UNICEF’s comparative advantage. Key questions include:

- How systematically has UNICEF engaged with national government and other partners in child protection related preparedness activities before the emergency and during early response and recovery phases? To what extent has UNICEF delivered on its commitments and targets to preparedness planning?
- How effective is UNICEF’s child protection response in various emergency contexts? Which strategies / interventions are most successful? Which interventions are less successful? What factors contribute to success and or gaps?
- To what extent have UNICEF’s country programmes succeeded in developing national capacities for child protection at central and decentralised levels (including the capacities of NGOs and civil society organisations)? What results have been achieved in capacity development? What conclusions can be drawn with respect to the effectiveness (including context specificity and sustainability) of the strategies and interventions used for national capacity development?
- How effective is UNICEF’s advocacy and communication strategy with respect to child protection issues in emergencies?
- To what extent have emergency child protection interventions provided an opportunity to strengthen systems for protecting children (laws, policies and service provision)?
Efficiency

- To what extent do the child protection services meet expected quality standards? What factors have contributed to meeting quality standards? Where quality standards are not met, what are the key bottlenecks/constraints that need to be addressed in order to meet quality standards?
- How adequate was the funding allocated for child protection during various phases? How well were the funds utilised across various strategies and interventions? Were there any major imbalances (under or over allocations) that led to poor outcomes?
- Based on a basic analysis of cost data, what conclusions can be drawn regarding “value for money” and cost related efficiencies or inefficiencies in implementing child protection responses to emergencies.
- Is there any evidence of use of any innovation, device or otherwise, which contributed to the child protection response? What conclusions can be drawn regarding the utility and cost effectiveness of such innovations in similar contexts?

Connectedness / Coordination

- To what extent has UNICEF met its commitment to country level coordination (cluster and otherwise) in various phases of preparedness and emergency response, by engaging with key partners, including international and local organizations as well as government institutions?
- How effectively has UNICEF’s child protection programme coordinated with other sectors, notably with education, health, WASH, nutrition, ECD and HIV/AIDS during various phases?
- What conclusions can be drawn as to timeline and synergy of UNICEF plans from preparedness to various response phases?

Sustainability and scaling up

- How systematically and effectively have partnerships (Governments, UN system, donors, INGOs, private sector, academics, media) been mobilized to contribute to programme expansion and scale up in various phases of an emergency?
- Are there clear, well-conceived strategies for expansion, scale up and phasing out of child protection programmes (as a whole or specific strategies and interventions)?

Cross-cutting issues (including equity, participation, M&E)

- How effectively have the child protection programmes integrated UNICEF’s commitment to gender equality and the empowerment of girls and women, and what results have been achieved in relation to these commitments? More specifically: a) to what extent have the distinct needs, vulnerabilities and capacities of girls and boys (including adolescents) been identified and addressed in child protection programme design and implementation?
  b) to what extent are sex and age-disaggregated data collected, monitored, and analysed for gender equality to inform child protection programme design and implementation?
  c) to what degree have UNICEF supported programmes improved the ability of women, girls and boys to participate effectively in the design, delivery and monitoring of UNICEF interventions at all levels?
  d) have women, girls, and boys of all ages been enabled to play a greater role in preparedness, prediction and prevention of violence in situations of conflict or natural disaster?
- How has the distinct impact of conflict or natural disaster on boys/girls, men/women, from abduction and recruitment into armed groups, to devastation of livelihood opportunities, been taken into consideration and integrated into the design and implementation of emergency child protection interventions?
- How relevant and adequate are data collection/management (including disaggregation by gender, vulnerabilities), monitoring and evaluation, including their use for policy and other decisions, during different phases of emergency response?

In addition to the above questions (which will be applied for the evaluation case study countries), the evaluation will respond to the following questions, which relate to the regional and HQ roles and performance.
To what extent has UNICEF’s global and regional advocacy for emergency child protection and related interventions contributed to increased funding allocations to emergency preparedness and response?

To what extent have guidance and support from regional and HQ offices to country offices contributed to a timely and adequate response to child protection concerns in emergencies, before, during and after a conflict or natural disaster?

Are strategy papers, guidance documents, technical notes (including those related to equity) that have been developed in recent years adequate and utilized? What are the areas where additional guidance and support is needed?

**EVALUATION APPROACH / METHODOLOGY**

The evaluation will be conducted in two phases. The **first phase** will involve an extensive inception phase involving desk review of secondary information, interviews with selected UNICEF staff and other stakeholders, and a visit to the first case study country. A detailed inception report that presents the final evaluation scope and methods based on information gathered during the first phase will be prepared.

The **second phase** will involve field visits to the remaining case study countries, additional desk reviews and interviews and preparation of the case study reports and the global synthesis report. The evaluation will be guided by UNICEF’s conceptual framework for child protection programmes (underlain by CCCs and CP Global Strategy) and country specific programme logic models and results frameworks, which will be discussed and made explicit in the initial stage of the evaluation. In addition, the evaluation will take account of specific contexts (before, during and after the emergency) and apply systems thinking to examine programme implementation and management.

Given the multi-dimensional focus of the evaluation, a combination of methods will be used:

a) Review of secondary data and documents: A list of relevant documents together with electronic copies of key documents will be shared with the evaluation team by the Evaluation Office during the inception phase. In addition, programme managers will provide data that are readily available from various sources. The information shared will be reviewed and analysed during the inception phase to determine the need for additional information and finalisation of the detailed evaluation methodology.

b) Interviews with key informants: Interviews will be conducted at several levels and in phases. A few key staff from the countries involved and global/regional advisors/experts will be interviewed during the inception phase. In the following phase, interviews will be conducted with additional experts and staff including local level personnel involved in managing and supporting child protection programmes. Additional interviews will be conducted with policy makers and programme coordinators in the countries involved, including sub-national level staff, UNICEF Representatives and/or deputies, programme managers and advisors at various levels. Interviews will also be held with staff of other agencies that contribute to and partner in child protection at global or national levels.

c) Field observation and focus group discussions with selected UNICEF/UN staff, programme participants/beneficiaries, service providers, and decision/policy makers/NGOs. When organising field visits and interviews, attention will be given to ensure gender balance, geographic distribution, representation of all population groups and representation of the stakeholders/duty bearers at all levels (policy/service providers/parents/community).

d) Use of secondary information. Each country office will be responsible for providing information (both qualitative and quantitative) on the child protection’s programme evolution in the country based on secondary data and information that is readily available. In addition, the Child Protection Section and Office of Emergency Programmes (EMOPS) at HQ will share global-level information that is already available. These include annual reports, mid-term review reports, strategy papers and related studies and evaluation reports.

e) An internet based survey to assess global level progress in child protection response, adequacy of guidance and technical support, inter-agency / cluster coordination issues, challenges and
needs related to child protection response may be necessary to generate additional information for the evaluation. The scope and timing of such survey will be provided in the inception report.

f) Ethical considerations (of respondents and data collectors) will be of utmost priority in determining the most appropriate methods and their implementation, and will be documented and included in all reports.

Management Arrangements

The evaluation will be managed by UNICEF’s Evaluation Office as an independent evaluation under the leadership of a Senior Evaluation Specialist. As the main counterpart, the Child Protection Section in the Programme Division will be responsible for timely contributions and support to the evaluation, including information sharing, meetings, and interview arrangements. UNICEF regional offices and case study country offices will be responsible for providing relevant information at the regional and country level, providing access to relevant reports and figures. Case study country offices will organize recruitment of local consultants (as necessary), field visits, logistical support, and meetings with different stakeholders at the country level.

An Evaluation Advisory Group (EAG), chaired by a senior staff from the Programme Division at HQ and members from the Child Protection Section, EMOPS, and selected (2 to 3) regional staff will be established to ensure broad-based ownership of and support to the evaluation. The EAG will review and comment on the draft inception report and the draft evaluation reports. The EAG will also be involved during the dissemination and management response phases of the evaluation. In the participating case study countries, a country-level EAG will be established to support the evaluation, which may include RO advisors, national government officials and selected members from other UN agencies and NGOs or civil society organisations.

EVALUATION TEAM

The evaluation is planned to be conducted by a registered institution or by a team of freelance consultants. It is proposed that the evaluation team consist of two evaluation experts (a leader and a technical expert), one of whom must have a significant research/evaluation background in emergency child protection programmes. The exact division of work will be decided by the institution/team, but in general, both members will be responsible for each deliverable as the technical work will be shared by both persons. In view of the questions related to gender sensitivity, at least one member of the team is expected to be a woman. The qualifications and experience required are as follows:

Team Leader:
- Extensive evaluation expertise and experience (at least 8 years) and a strong commitment to undertake the evaluation. Evaluation experience in emergency contexts is desirable.
- Knowledgeable of institutional issues related to development / humanitarian programming (including funding, administration, the role of the UN system, partnerships, human rights, humanitarian law, sustainable development issues).
- Familiarity with child protection programmes either as researcher/evaluator or as programme manager.
- Team leadership and management, interpersonal/communication skills.

Team Member (child protection evaluation expert)
- Strong research and evaluation expertise and experience (at least 5 years), including methodological and data collection skills with focus on child protection issues.
- Demonstrated skill in conducting evaluations of child protection programmes.
- Team work and inter-personal communication and strong commitment to undertake the evaluation.

Team Leader and Member:
- Advanced university degree in social science, preferably with multi-disciplinary training.
- Significant international exposure and experience in working with UN agencies in emergency contexts.
- Established record in conducting good quality, utilisation focused evaluation in child protection or related areas.
- Strong analytical, synthesising, report writing and presentation skills.
- Must be willing to work in a challenging environment and independently, with limited regular supervision.
- Good communication, advocacy and people skills. Ability to communicate with various stakeholders and to express concisely and clearly ideas and concepts in written and oral form.
- Language proficiency: Fluency in English is mandatory; good command of French is desirable.

TIMING AND DELIVERABLES

The evaluation is expected to be conducted during April - December 2012. Key deliverables are as follows:

- Evaluation plan outlining detailed scope, evaluation framework and / methodology for both country case studies and global analysis; field visit timing and data collection methods (within 10 days after signing the contract).
- Detailed inception report based on the first country visit and secondary data and documentary review, providing findings based on the work completed during the inception phase and final evaluation design/plan. Draft to be shared in advance for comments.
- Evaluation case study reports for 4 countries, draft to be shared in advance for comments.
- Draft evaluation report (global synthesis) for review by the reference group.
- Final edited report with an executive summary.
Annex 2
Selection of Sample Countries

Table 1: COUNTRIES INCLUDED IN EVALUATION BY TYPE OF CONFLICT/DISASTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNICEF Region</th>
<th>Country/Income level</th>
<th>Case/Desk Study</th>
<th>Armed conflict/Disaster</th>
<th>Main emergency events or displaced/affected populations during evaluation period</th>
<th>Number affected/displaced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EAPRO</td>
<td>Philippines/ Lower middle income</td>
<td>Desk study</td>
<td>Disaster and armed conflict</td>
<td>Tropical storm Bopha Dec 2012 - 6.2mn⁴ affected</td>
<td>6.2mn⁴ affected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Floods August 2012 4.4mn⁵ affected</td>
<td>4.4mn⁵ affected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tropical storm, Sept 2011 3mn⁶ affected</td>
<td>3mn⁶ affected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regional armed conflict, Mindanao 1,200 displaced⁷</td>
<td>1,200 displaced⁷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Myanmar/ Low income</td>
<td>Desk study</td>
<td>Disaster and Armed conflict</td>
<td>Cyclone Nargis, May 2008, 2.4mn affected</td>
<td>2.4mn⁸</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regional armed conflict, Rakhine, Kachin States – 2012 450,000 displaced⁹</td>
<td>450,000 displaced⁹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESARO</td>
<td>Somalia/ Low income</td>
<td>Desk study</td>
<td>Armed conflict</td>
<td>Armed conflict -2012. ¹⁰</td>
<td>1.13 mn displaced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>From Sudan (2010-12)</td>
<td>405,700 returnees¹¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>Case study</td>
<td>Armed conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³ World Bank classifications of income
⁵ Ibid.
⁶ Ibid.
⁹ Ibid
¹⁰ Ibid
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Nature of Event</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Displaced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower middle income</td>
<td>Conflict in 2012</td>
<td>560,000 displaced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENA State of Palestine Lower middle income</td>
<td>Desk Study</td>
<td>Armed conflict</td>
<td>Conflict with Israel 2012</td>
<td>144,500 displaced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan Lower middle income</td>
<td>Desk study</td>
<td>Armed conflict</td>
<td>Conflict during 2012</td>
<td>2.23 mn displaced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSA Afghanistan Low income</td>
<td>Desk study</td>
<td>Armed conflict</td>
<td>Conflict during 2012</td>
<td>493,000 displaced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan Lower middle income</td>
<td>Case study</td>
<td>Disaster and armed conflict</td>
<td>Mega floods August 2010 – 25.5mn affected Floods 2011 – 5.4 mn affected Complex emergency -4mn displaced – 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka Lower middle income</td>
<td>Desk study</td>
<td>Transition from armed conflict</td>
<td>470,000 returnees – 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TACRO Colombia Upper middle income</td>
<td>Case study</td>
<td>Armed conflict</td>
<td>5.5 mn displaced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti Low income</td>
<td>Desk study</td>
<td>Disaster</td>
<td>Earthquake Jan 2010 – 3.7mn affected 360,000 displaced – disaster and forced evictions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCARO Democratic Rep. of Congo Low income</td>
<td>Case study</td>
<td>Armed conflict</td>
<td>2.6 mn displaced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14 Ibid
15 Ibid
18 Ibid
19 Ibid
20 Ibid
### Annex 3

**Country Status against Dimensions of Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disaster/Armed Conflict</td>
<td>Disaster: Haiti, Myanmar, Pakistan, Philippines</td>
<td>Armed conflict: Afghanistan, Colombia, DRC, occupied Palestinian Territories, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transition from armed conflict: Sri Lanka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development status(^{21})</td>
<td>Low income: Afghanistan, DRC, Haiti, Myanmar, Somalia.</td>
<td>Lower middle income: oPT, Pakistan, Philippines, South Sudan, Sri Lanka Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upper middle income: Colombia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudden onset / protracted</td>
<td>Sudden onset: Haiti, Myanmar, Pakistan, Philippines</td>
<td>Protracted: Afghanistan, Colombia, DRC, occupied Palestinian Territories, Somalia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance Status(^{22})</td>
<td>0-10% effectiveness: Afghanistan, DRC, Haiti, Myanmar, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, 20-30% oPT, Pakistan 40-50% Sri Lanka</td>
<td>50-60% effectiveness Colombia, Philippines</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Interviews Conducted

*(in alphabetical order of surname within groups)*

**UNICEF NEW YORK**

John-Paul Anderson  Human Resources Specialist, Surge Capacity, Division Human Resources
Krishna Belbase  Senior Evaluation Specialist, Evaluation Office (CPIE Evaluation Manager)
Susan Bissell  Chief of Child Protection, Programme Division
Genevieve Boutin  Chief, Humanitarian Policy Section
Claudia Cappa  Statistics and Monitoring Officer – Policy and Practice Unit
Dermot Carty  Deputy Director, EMOPS
Emmanuelle Compingt  Child Protection Specialist, GBV
Silvia Danailov  Chief of Section, Office Emergency Programmes
Cody Donahue  Child Protection Specialist
Rebecca Fordham  Communication Officer, Media Section/Division of Communication
Judy Grayson  Child Protection Specialist, Landmines and Small Arms
Kendra Gregson  Senior Advisor, Social Welfare and Justice Systems
Celine Guiliani  Child Protection Specialist, MRM Grave Violations
Stephen Hamner  Civil Society and Parliamentary Specialist
Pernille Ironside  Acting Chief, Child Protection in Emergencies
Theresa Kilbane  Senior Advisor, Social Norms and Protection of Children from Violence
Colin Kirk  Director, Evaluation Office
Afshan Khan  Director, Public Sector Alliances and Resources Mobilization Office (PARMO)
Gwyn Lewis  Global Cluster Coordinator
Mendy Marsh  Gender Based Violence in Emergencies Specialist
Louise Maule  Programme Specialist, Coordination Programmes
Robert McCouch  Senior Evaluation Specialist, Evaluation Office
Stephane Pichette  Child Protection Specialist, CAAC
Gary Risser  Policy and Advocacy Specialist, Office Emergency Programmes
James Rogan  Chief, Peacebuilding and Recovery Section, Office Emergency Programmes
Christian Salazar  Deputy Head, Programs Division (Chair of Evaluation Advisory Group)
Cecilia Sanchez Bodas  Health Specialist MNCH and Emergencies
Saudamini Siegrist  Chief, Child Protection in Emergencies
Saji Thomas  Child Protection Specialist: Community Based Protection
Gavin Wood  Cluster Information Manager, EMOPS

**UNICEF REGIONAL OFFICES**

Annette Lyth  Senior Child Protection in Emergencies Specialist EAPRO
Nadine Perrault  Child Protection Regional Advisor TACRO
Ron Pouwels  Child Protection Regional Advisor, ROSA
Diane Swales  Child Protection Regional Advisor EAPRO
Joaquim Theis  Child Protection Regional Advisor WCARO
Cornelius Williams  Child Protection Advisor, ESARO

**CHILD PROTECTION WORKING GROUP**

Katy Barnett  Coordinator, Child Protection Working Group

**CHILD PROTECTION WORKING GROUP**

Andrew Mawson  Chief, Child Protection, Innocenti Research Centre
Country Case Studies

(in alphabetical order: Colombia, DRC, Pakistan, South Sudan)

**COLOMBIA**

**UNICEF**

- Luz Angela Artunduaga: Specialist Child Survival and Development
- Catherine Bokkers: Volunteer in Education Section
- Claudia Camacho: Chief Education
- Esther Ruiz Entrena: Programme Officer, Monitoring and Reporting Mechanism, MRM
- Miriam R. de Figueroa: Representative
- Viviana Limpias: Deputy Representative
- Rocio Mojica: Programme Officer, Child Protection
- Esteban Muñoz: Protection Coordinator, Putumayo
- Joanna Radziukiewicz: Specialist, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action
- Sergio Riaga: Monitoring and Evaluation Officer
- Luis Eduardo Rios: Protection Assistant
- Sandra Salazar: Programme Officer, Mine Action
- Olga Lucia Zuluaga: Programme Officer, Prevention of Recruitment

**Government of Colombia**

- Gabriel Arbelaéz: Director, Colombia Joven
- Juan Felipe Barrera: Programme Officer, Colombia Joven
- Sebastian de los Rios: Technical Advisor, ICBF (Institute Family Welfare)
- Emilio Torres Orizo: Chief, Department of Human Rights, Armed Forces Colombia
- Juan Sebastian Estrada: Director, Office Cooperation, ICBF (Institute Family Welfare)
- Gladys Fernandez: Chief, Secretariat of Intersectorial Commission on Prevention of Recruitment
- Adriana Gonzalez: Deputy Head ICBF (Institute Family Welfare)
- Juan Manuel Guewevo: National Advisor, Intersectorial Commission on Prevention of Carlos
- Eduardo Guerrero: Special Programmes Officer, Armed Forces Colombia
- Cesar Laverde: Partnerships Officer, Presidential Programme on Mine Action (PAICMA)
- Maria Elisa Piuto: Quality Control Officer, Presidential Programme on Mine Action (PAICMA)
- Silvia Rinckoar: Programme Officer, Intersectorial Commission on Prevention of
- Javeth Sanchez: Senior Officer, Office Cooperation, ICBF (Institute Family Welfare)
- Elizabeth Tregillo: Support to Special Groups, Armed Forces Colombia
- Alexander Vasquez: Chief, Human Rights Dissemination, Armed Forces Colombia
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Annex 5
Key Informant Interviews (example of Pakistan)

UNICEF INTERNAL

COMMUNICATION AND ADVOCACY FOCAL POINTS

Social change

1. Has C4D worked with Child Protection on social change related to specific negative practices e.g. early marriage? How effective has it been? What were the principal methodologies? How was it measured?
2. Has there been any joint work on violence in general or on gender based violence specifically? Again, how was it measured?

Advocacy strategy – focus on Khyber Pakhtunkhwa/FATA

3. Is there an advocacy strategy for the protection of children and women in emergencies? And especially in relation to the complex emergency?
4. Has UNICEF undertaken a political analysis of the actors and their forms of influence in order to develop a better understanding of advocacy targets?

Communication/Advocacy during the floods

5. How effective was messaging on CP during the floods?
6. Were specific advocacy targets established at that time? How effective were they in protection?

Partners

7. Which partners have been most effective in communication/advocacy on protection? Why? Have there been attempts to work with CBOs?

GOVERNMENT

PAKISTAN BAIT UL MAL http://www.pbm.gov.pk/

1. How does Pakistan’s social protection system function in emergencies? What provisions are made and how do they link to child protection?

Examples taken from UNICEF Integrated Social Protection Systems

E.g. Social transfers: cash transfers (inc. child benefits, poverty-targeted and short term seasonal benefits), food transfers, nutritional supplementation, ARVs, public works
Access to services – birth registration, user fee abolition, health insurance, exemptions, vouchers, subsidies, anti stigma programmes
Social support and care services family support services (e.g. care of under 5s), home based care
Legislation and policy reform: e.g. employment guarantee schemes, inheritance rights.

2. We know that child labour is likely to increase in emergencies and is already high in Pakistan. Also that trafficking may increase. Was there any attempt to monitor these areas in the floods
or in the complex emergency? And to monitor in relation to the provision of social protection. Likewise early marriage.

3. Has Bait ul Mal partnered with UNICEF on social protection? In relation to the cash transfers in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa? How has that programme compared with the child transfer programme together with the World Bank?

4. What more do you think needs to be done in emergencies?

5. What added value can you identify that UNICEF brings to your partnership?

6. Do you see their priority areas as being on target? If not what is missing?

7. What have been the challenges and opportunities in partnering with UNICEF?

OMBUDS OFFICE

We know that UNICEF has provided training to the Ombuds Office, including five Child Complaints Offices established under Federal and Provincial Ombudsmen.

1. Could you explain your role a little more, please?

2. How does the Ombuds Office contribute to child protection in emergencies? Were reports made during the floods in relation to violence against children or women?

3. Does the Office also exist in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa/FATA? What types of complaints are received?

4. Does the Ombuds Office help to ensure that the police work effectively in camps and that the justice systems function effectively for children and women? How is that done?

5. What added value can you identify that UNICEF brings to your partnership?

6. Do you see their priority areas as being on target? If not what is missing?

7. What have been the challenges and opportunities in partnering with UNICEF?

National Disaster Management Authority

1. We are aware that the NDMA is engaged in developing a Contingency Plan for Protection in emergencies. How has this process progressed? What are the main challenges from your perspective?

2. Do you have any views on how the cluster system has worked and in particular on UNICEF’s work with the Child Protection sub Cluster and the GBV Sub Cluster?

3. What is your perspective on protection issues in the context of disaster response, including cross sectoral coordination?

4. The Gender and Child Cell seemed to be important in ensuring that the protection of children and women were a focus in emergencies but we understand it is no longer functioning. Do you have any thoughts on its role?

NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR CHILD RIGHTS

Ministry of Human Rights

1. What is the note of the National Commission for Child Rights in the broader context of the Ministry?

2. What does the Ministry consider as the principal protection issues for children in the complex emergency?

3. What are Ministry perspectives on monitoring protection issues for children in the complex emergency? This is in the context of UNICEF’s responsibility to monitor child protection in armed conflict through the Optional Protocol for the Involvement of Children in Armed Conflict (OPAC) and through the UN General Assembly and Security Council Resolutions.
4. We know that the Ministry had a joint project with UNICEF in 2009 (Children and Armed Conflict). Has there been any further collaboration since that time?

5. Does the Ministry have any views on UNICEF’s work in this area? (in terms of added value, challenges/opportunities in partnership)

POLICE

We know that violence against children and women tend to increase in the context of emergencies, especially in camp contexts. And especially gender based violence. But it is more difficult to make services reach into those contexts.

1. What is the perspective of the Police on how to be most effective in protecting children and women in disasters/complex emergency and ensuring that the rule of law is maintained?

2. We understand that Child-Friendly Desks have been established in some areas to make it easier for children to report violence and abuse. How are they working? Are there plans for expansion of CF Desks and could they be expanded into emergency affected populations?

3. Do the Police have any views on UNICEF’s work to prevent violence against children and women?

DEPT SOCIAL WELFARE (PROVINCES/DISTRICTS ONLY)

Two issues

1. How the Social Welfare system at Provincial/District/local levels aim to identify vulnerable children in emergencies and what protection services are provided.

2. How does the system links to less formal services - especially civil society provision and perspectives of Social Welfare on the work done by NGOs.

3. What is the approach of Social Welfare to social norms, culture, traditions that do not favour child protection e.g. child marriage - that can increase in an emergency.


NATIONAL NGO PARTNERS

National NGO Partners in Islamabad or Provinces

SPARC- Takes up individual advocacy cases, works with the media. Including in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa.

PODA – national NGO. Doing DRR and PLaCES work in Sindh

SSD

Issues for children

1. What do you see as the main protection issues for children/women in the disaster compared to the complex emergency?

2. Which are your programme priorities?

3. What are your perspectives on the relevance, effectiveness and coverage of protection services? What are the main gaps? Any perspectives on UNICEF’s support to partner programmes?

Partnership with UNICEF

4. Please give us an overview of your partnership with UNICEF and the components?

5. What added value can you identify that UNICEF brings to your partnership?

6. Do you see UNICEF’s priority areas as being on target? If not what is missing?

7. What have been the challenges and opportunities in partnering with UNICEF?
Sub Cluster
8. Can you please describe UNICEF’s role and performance in the sub cluster?
9. Advocacy for child protection in emergencies - what are the principal issues that have been addressed jointly by the CPWG or separately by agencies. Achievements and gaps.
10. How active has UNICEF been in sharing technical guidance? Specific examples?
11. How effective have joint assessments, indicators and monitoring systems been?
12. How effective has advocacy been in relation to child protection violations? Either jointly or by UNICEF?

Systems
13. Are there any examples of using the disaster response and complex emergency as a catalyst to protection system development? E.g. in terms of legislation, policies, regulations, capacity etc. Or strengthening linkages between state and non state actors?

Disaster preparedness and phasing
14. Perspectives on disaster preparedness, risk reduction in protection and the contingency planning work.

Social norms
15. Perspectives on work to change negative social norms, cultures, traditions in relation to protection e.g. on child marriage. Has there been any sub Cluster work specifically to prevent violence against children and women by working on social norms?

| NATIONAL NGO PARTNERS IN PLACES |

Services provided at PLaCES
What PLaCES has provided in terms of services? Which services were most used and by who (women/men/ girls/boys – ages)? Are there registers to be viewed of participation in different service types?

What referrals were made from PLaCES to other services external to PLaCES? How did that work? Was there any follow up?

Inclusion
Were any disabled people (women/girls, boys/men) included?
Any people of ‘excluded’ ethnic groups?
Do you think PLaCES reaches everyone who needs that kind of support?

Protection Issues/Threats for Women and Children
What were the principal protection issues for women in the early days of the floods? What were the main issues later during the recovery phase?

How far did the services respond to the protection threats? What other types of protection or services did women need?

What kinds of measures can be taken to prevent violence against girls and women in disasters?
What are the main issues for children (aged 0-5, aged 6-11 (girls/boys) and 12-18 (girls/boys)? What did women most need to protect their children?

Complaints
Was there any system established for complaints from users if they were not happy? How did systems reach all groups of users?

Longer Term use of PLaCES
Do you think the PLaCES model could apply after the recovery phase? Is the outreach mobile programme useful?

COMMUNITY CHILD PROTECTION COMMITTEES

The composition and functioning of Committees
How many men, women?
Roles played by women (decision makers or mirroring usual gender structures?)
Do the groups actually address CP violations and violations of womens protection rights?
How do they maintain the confidentiality of cases?
What kind of support/training have they received?
? Utility of model in emergencies? Utility in non emergency?
? Scale up?

GROUPS WITH WOMEN WHO HAVE PARTICIPATED IN PLaCES

Services provided at PLaCES
What PLaCES has provided in terms of services? (use photos as prompts)
Which services the women have used and how often? Which were most and least useful and why?
Has anyone been referred by PLaCES to services provided by the State or another organisation? If so, probe for the type of service and how useful it was.
Do you think PLaCES reaches everyone who needs that kind of support?

Protection Issues/Threats for Women and Children
What were the principal protection issues for women in the early days of the floods? What were the main issues later during the recovery phase?
We have talked about the activities at PLaCES – which activities actually address the protection threats? What other types of protection or services did women need?
What are the main issues for children (aged 0-5, aged 6-11 (girls/boys) and 12-18 (girls/boys)? What did women most need to protect their children?
Well Being

How do you feel since being in PLaCES

Longer Term use of PLaCES

If you need this kind of help in the future, where will you go if PLaCES does not exist? Or do PLaCES could continue in the recovery phase? Is the outreach mobile programme useful?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INGOs and MEMBERS OF SUB CLUSTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

INGOs - PLAN, World Vision, Save the Children

Issues for children

What do you see as the main protection issues for children/women in the disaster compared to the complex emergency?

Which are your programme priorities?

What are your perspectives on the relevance, effectiveness and coverage of protection services?

What are the main gaps? Any perspectives on UNICEF’s support to partner programmes?

Sub Cluster

Can you please describe UNICEF’s role and performance in the sub cluster?

Advocacy for child protection in emergencies - what are the principal issues that have been addressed jointly by the CPWG or separately by agencies. Achievements and gaps.

How active has UNICEF been in sharing technical guidance? Specific examples?

How effective have joint assessments, indicators and monitoring systems been?

How effective has advocacy been in relation to child protection violations? Either jointly or by UNICEF?

Systems

Are there any examples of using the disaster response and complex emergency as a catalyst to protection system development? E.g. in terms of legislation, policies, regulations, capacity etc. Or strengthening linkages between state and non state actors?

Disaster preparedness and phasing

Perspectives on disaster preparedness, risk reduction in protection and the contingency planning work.

Social norms

Perspectives on work to change negative social norms, cultures, traditions in relation to protection e.g. on child marriage. Has there been any sub Cluster work specifically to prevent violence against children and women by working on social norms?
RESIDENT COORDINATOR

How has the Cluster system worked in your opinion – especially the Protection Cluster and CP sub Cluster?

There were constraints on funding when CP was not included in the early appeals for the floods – why was CP not considered a life-saving sector in emergencies as it is now in the CERF guidelines.

There appears to have been some separation between the clusters and the complex emergency. What was the reason for that? Was there any orientation on that from head offices of the UN Agencies? Was it the most appropriate decision in retrospect?

How should the complex emergency be addressed going forward?

UNHCR Protection Cluster

What were the major protection issues in the disaster?

What has worked well and less well in the Protection Cluster overall?

What have the principal constraints been? (Funding?).

What is the current position of the Protection Cluster – has its role come to a close? What about the complex emergency?

What is your view on how the CP sub Cluster has functioned and on UNICEF’s role?

How should coordination function in the future?

UNFPA

What were the major incidents reported of GBV during the floods – early stages and recovery?

What are the ongoing issues of GBV in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa?

How has the GBV sub Cluster functioned? How important has UNICEF’s role been?

What were the major successes and aspects that went less well?

How is the GBV MIS working?

Who are the main actors and what do they do? What are the gaps? What should UNICEF be doing?

Have there been any examples of the disaster acting as a catalyst to strengthen permanent system to protect women and girls from GBV?

How well do you think technical guidance has been known and used?

UN WOMEN

What was the principal role of UN Women in the floods? What is your role in the complex emergency?

UN Women supported the Gender and Child cell in the NDMA – how did that work?

UN Women has worked to ensure that gender issues were included in the appeals. Was it effective?
How has UN Women worked with GBV and with the sub Cluster?

Where does /should GBV sit in the formal systems?

How has your collaboration with UNICEF worked and what is UNICEF’s added value?

What is your perspective on the PLaCES programme that has worked to ensure women and children access all relevant services from one place?

Have there been any examples of the disaster acting as a catalyst to strengthen permanent system to protect women and girls from GBV?

How well do you think technical guidance has been known and used?

**OCHA**

Why did the cluster system focus on the floods and not on the complex emergency?

How have the information systems worked?
EVALUATION OF UNICEF PROGRAMMES TO PROTECT CHILDREN IN EMERGENCIES

ORIENTATION FOR PARTNERS ON PREPARING FOCUS/ACTIVITY GROUPS

We are very grateful to your organisation for participating in the Evaluation of UNICEF Programmes to Protect Children in Emergencies. The Evaluation is aimed at ensuring that UNICEF programmes are as relevant and useful as possible to children and adolescents affected by emergencies.

This set of notes is intended as a guide to preparing the visit of the Evaluation Team.

We hope that you will be able to help the evaluation in three ways: a) Organising Focus/Activity Groups with adolescents – to be planned in advance of the visit. You will be informed by UNICEF staff in country how many and which groups to prepare. You will agree on the date/time together with UNICEF staff. b) Organizing a meeting of project staff with the Evaluation Team that will take place at the same time as the Focus/Activity Group and c) Providing key documentation prepared in advance to give to the team.

1. FOCUS /ACTIVITY GROUPS

We will be holding Focus/Activity Groups with the adolescent age group – girls and boys – in view of the fact that this age group is most at risk of key protection issues: gender based violence, trafficking, child labour and recruitment. In addition, we will be meeting with members of child protection committees (or similar) and with some groups of women.

We are calling them Focus/Activity Groups as they will be participatory and engage the participants in activities, as opposed to a more traditional focus group.

SIZE OF FOCUS/ACTIVITY GROUPS

All Focus/Activity Groups will have 10 participants only. In all cases boys and girls will be separated – so there will be 10 boys or 10 girls in each group.

LENGTH OF GROUP

Group activities will last 1.5-2 hours. We will provide drinks/snacks during that time.

VENUE FOR GROUP

Please could you try to select a venue that has space to move around and to divide into two subgroups. But it should also have sufficient privacy that the group can work without being disturbed by other members of the community. In particular, we should try to ensure that groups are not watched by others or that others try to join the group.

TIMING OF THE GROUP

Please ensure that the timing of the group is outside of school hours. We do not want to take children out of school for the group.
SELECTION OF PARTICIPANTS

*This is where we most need your help.*

We want to ensure that group participants are representative of all project participants. To do that, we request that you randomly select adolescents to participate in groups from the whole beneficiary list.

Please divide the whole beneficiary list by:

- Adolescents **girls** aged 11-14 and 15-17
- Adolescents **boys** aged 11-14 and 15-17

Then randomly select groups of 10 in each category. To do that you could put all the names in a box, shake them up and select 10.

Or if you have a very long list of names (such as 200 in each group) you can divide the total number in each subgroup by 10 (the number you need) and then select names on multiples. For example, with a list of 200 divided by 10, you would select every 20th child.

REQUESTING PARTICIPATION

Each participant should be contacted in advance of the session to ask whether they are willing and interested in participating. It may be wise to contact one additional child from each age group so that if some do not turn up on the day, numbers will not be badly affected.

Please explain in simple language that the purpose is to listen to their views on how best to ensure that they are protected from harm in emergencies and that we also want to talk about the programme they are participating in. We aim to use the information to make sure that the way we work with young people in the future is as helpful as possible to all children and young people when they are displaced from home or have had to live through a flood or similar situation.

They should be told that the exercises they will do are aimed to be enjoyable and interesting and that we are very keen to hear what they think. But that nobody should feel *obliged* to participate.

Please share with them the points on the consent form below:

- That they have been randomly selected to participate – so they do not wonder 'why me?'
- We will not name the individuals that participated in the group and no photos will be taken so they will not be identified. Their comments are confidential.
- The group will last no more than 1.5-2 hours
- There will only be girls or boys present (they will not be mixed)
- If there is anything that concerns them about the group, they can talk to the facilitators at the end of the session and they will be invited to evaluate what they liked/didn't like and what they found useful so we can learn for the future.

All exercises and work will all be in their own local language.

Their parents should also agree to their participation. We have attached a simple consent form for both child and parent to sign (we would be grateful if you could translate the form into the local language).

Finally, we would be grateful if a member of staff who knows the programme participants could be available in case a child gets upset. We hope this will not happen as we are not asking children about their individual experiences of harm but we would prefer to be prepared.
2. VISIT TO THE PROJECT

While the Focus /Activity group is being held, we would also be grateful for time to talk to staff of the project about its aims, how it functions, what works well and what has worked less well. We will need about 1 hour of your time for this.

3. PROJECT DOCUMENTATION

We would be very grateful if you could prepare any project documentation in advance of the meeting. That means proposals, reports, monitoring data:

- Numbers of children entering/leaving the project (by age/sex, period of participation and type of activity)
- Any information available on hard-to-reach children in the project (children with disabilities or from minority groups)
- Progress against project indicators

WE MUCH APPRECIATE ALL YOUR HELP

EVALUATION OF UNICEF PROGRAMMES TO PROTECT CHILDREN IN EMERGENCIES

AGREEMENT TO PARTICIPATE IN FOCUS/ACTIVITY GROUP

I agree to participate in the focus/activity group to discuss how best to protect children and young people from harm in emergencies. I understand we will also talk about the programme I am involved in.

I understand that the aim is to help to ensure that programmes in the future are as useful as possible to children and young people in a situation of emergency response or recovery after emergencies.

I also understand that:

- I have been randomly selected to participate *(please explain the idea of ‘random’)*
- The group should be interesting and enjoyable
- I am not obliged to participate
- No photos will be taken
- It will last no more than 1.5-2 hours
- There will only be girls or boys present (they will not be mixed)
- My name will never be used in the report so nobody will know what I said (except for other children in the group)
- If I am not happy about anything I will be able to say so in confidence to one of the staff
- I will be able to say what I thought of the session at the end (evaluation)

Name:

Signed by ………………………………………

Date

Parent's signature ……………………………………………

Date
FOCUS GROUP EXERCISES

The moderator explains that the purpose of the group is to understand more about the programme that they are participating in. The kinds of activities they are involved in and whether the programme is useful to them.

Then explain that we will be doing a number of exercises to find out. We hope participants will find them interesting and enjoyable but if anyone feels uncomfortable at any time they are free to leave the session. Tell them that we will not be writing anyone's name down and we will never tell anyone what each child said. But we will be writing down many of their comments/ideas – so that their valuable ideas are not lost.

How will the information be used? We will be writing a report that includes their ideas plus the ideas of many other children and young people. The report will be used to help to advise on ways to help other children and young people who have to (live in camps, are affected by complex emergency etc.)

INTRODUCTIONS

The Facilitator and Co-Facilitator introduce themselves and then invite the group participants to introduce themselves. The ideal is to use a fun exercise to this.

EXERCISE 1 – PROGRAMME ACTIVITIES
What Activities you have done at this centre? What is most useful to you? (warm up exercise and practicing ranking)

- What activities have you done in this centre/programme?

List of the activities participants they have done on cards – either in written and/or objects or in picture form. If the group uses objects, please make a brief note of what each object represents.

Then get the participants to group smaller activities together to make big areas of activities – about 5 in total.

Put the activities in order of those that are most useful to you – stick them in order on the wall/ or on the ground. The Facilitator and Co-Facilitator ask:

  o Why have you chosen the top activities? What makes them particularly useful?
  o Why is the bottom ranked activity least useful?

Record all comments and responses, including any points about body language during the exercise.

  o We have come up with different activities that are most and least useful. Why do you think that may be?

The Co-Facilitator records responses.

- Did you participate in planning any of the activities?

To the whole group, the Facilitator asks whether any of the children were asked about which activities they wanted to do. Or how those activities were planned?

The Co-Facilitator records responses.

- Are there any activities you are not doing but would like to do?
Then thanks them and says we will come back to these. We will leave them on the wall/ground.

**EXERCISE 2: TYPES OF RISKS/DANGERS WE FACE LIVING HERE**

The Facilitator explains that we are going to consider the kinds of risks/dangers to your personal safety that you face living here.

Discuss first what we mean by risks/dangers to your safety i.e. the risk of getting hurt in some way, abused, exploited or separated from your family.

a) **List of risks/dangers on cards** – in pictures or words. Facilitator has large sheet made up as below

b) Then ask the group to think specifically about any risks/dangers from other people? The group produces around 5-6.

c) While the group is doing the ranking, the Facilitator and Co Facilitator prompt each sub group by asking why they have chosen to rank each risk in that way. And then record everything that is said verbatim.

d) Then ask whether the programme you are in has done anything about each risk/danger. If so, what has it done?

At the end, the group comes back together and the Facilitator and Co Facilitator ask of the sub groups ‘did anyone answer more than before’ to the questions? If yes, then ask:

- **Who or what made that aspect of your life change for the better?**

Then the Facilitator and Co Facilitator ask:

- **Has the programme been involved in any of these changes? If yes, how?**

And finally ask whether you, the Facilitator, can keep the individual sheets – nobody has recorded their name.
Annex 7

Questionnaire for UNICEF Child Protection Teams in Desk Study Countries

Name of Country Office:  
Name of Chief of Child Protection:  
Email address:

Sincere thanks to the Child Protection Team for completing this important questionnaire.

Please note that the questionnaire is confidential in the sense that any critical comments will not be attributed to individual countries so we would be grateful for frank and open responses. We have requested contacts only so that we can get back to you if we have any brief questions of clarification.

Please return the questionnaire directly to the Evaluation Team: CPIEVALUATION@gmail.com

You should expect an acknowledgement when you have submitted the questionnaire. To ensure that your contribution is not lost, if you do not receive an acknowledgement within 24 hours, please inform the Team Leader on maggiejbrown@gmail.com.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROTECTION OUTCOMES FOR CHILDREN AND WOMEN IN DISASTERS AND COMPLEX EMERGENCIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>What were the principal outcomes achieved by UNICEF programmes to protect children, adolescents and/or women in your country’s most recent emergency response?</strong> i.e. main changes/results achieved in protecting children across the life cycle including adolescents and/or women from violence, exploitation abuse and unnecessary family separation. If possible, distinguish between age groups and gender. <em>(N.B. We only require 2-3 phrases on each outcome)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Which programme components (i.e. types of projects or advocacy) do you think were most effective in protecting children/adolescents/women and why?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>Which types of partnerships were most effective in delivering positive outcomes in protecting children/adolescents/women and why?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>What were the main challenges in delivering outcomes and results?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Which if any of the following protection monitoring systems is in operation in your country – either managed directly by UNICEF or by partners?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring System</th>
<th>Is the data system Managed by UNICEF? Or by a Partner? (which partner)</th>
<th>Any comments on how the system is functioning (Reliable data? How data is used? Are there data showing trends over 2009/10/11 that the evaluation could analyze?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and Reporting Mechanism – MRM</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian Performance Monitoring System – tracking the CCCs including protection violations</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Protection Case Management System – CP IMS</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Based Violence Information Management System GBV IMS</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARA (SC Res 1888 and 1960) Sexual violence in conflict</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Do you know whether UNICEF and/or Protection Cluster and CP sub Cluster partners undertook a child protection assessment in country before planning programmes in the most recent emergency response? If yes, could you briefly explain the process, which tools were used and how the data was used? (and attach the assessment if possible)

Click here to enter text.

7. What were the principal protection risks to children and women during the last emergency?

Response:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Children 0-5 years</th>
<th>Children 6-11 years</th>
<th>Adolescents 12-18 years</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Both sexes</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specifically girls</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specifically boys</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific groups (e.g. disability, ethnic groups, the poorest - please specify characteristics of the group)</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STRENGTHENING CHILD PROTECTION SYSTEMS TO REDUCE PROTECTION RISKS

8. Has the UNICEF Child Protection Team supported a systems mapping process? Who led/is leading the process? Is the process helping to define which aspects should be strengthened to enhance protection in all phases (i.e. before crises, during response and in transition/development phases)? What are the principal resulting plans/actions?

9. Do you have any practical examples of how systems strengthening investments in a pre-emergency phase have contributed to more effective child protection response during an emergency? (For example, linking community based protection actors to formal district systems so when a crisis occurs, all actors are prepared).

10. Do you have any examples of how emergency response has been used as an entry point to drive protection systems strengthening in the post emergency (early recovery / Transition / development) phase? (For example, rapid response to separated children being used to create longer term case management systems; data gathering for emergencies driving longer term data systems).

11. In the context of strengthening capacity amongst government and non-government actors, do you know whether inter agency global tools and guidance on child protection in emergencies have been used/adapted for use in country? Please list the tools used. Do you have any examples of how they may have enhanced performance, especially at the level of frontline workers?

SUPPORTING POSITIVE SOCIAL CHANGE

12. Do you have any examples of social change strategies/interventions to target behavior and harmful practices related to violence and specifically GBV, particularly in emergencies?

13. Do you have evidence of change as a result of this work?

ADVOCACY

14. Do you have an advocacy strategy (written or otherwise) that addresses child protection issues in emergencies? If yes, could you describe the main objectives, audiences and achievements?

15. In the case of a complex emergency, do you consider that your CP Team, together with Senior Management, has an adequate analysis of the political issues driving the conflict and of how to be effective in advocating for enhanced protection and the Rule of Law? What do you think could be done to strengthen UNICEF advocacy in conflicts?

COORDINATION

16. If the CP sub Cluster and/or the GBV sub Cluster was activated during the last emergency in your country, what worked well and less well? Is there any aspect you would want to change for next time?

Click here to enter text.
PHASING AND RESPONSE TO EMERGENCIES

17. Does your country have an inter-agency preparedness plan for child protection? Was it led by or in consultation with government? If so, please could you attach a copy.
   Click here to enter text.

18. Are the CCCs and the actions by phase Preparedness, Response, Early Recovery and actions within the CCCs a useful framework in your context? Please explain.
   Click here to enter text.

FUNDING FOR CHILD PROTECTION

19. Funding for child protection tends to be lower than other sectors and can impede response capacity. In your most recent emergency response, did you have sufficient funding for an effective response? What percentage of appeal funding was achieved?
   Click here to enter text.

20. If the programme accessed short-term appeal or CERF funding, what examples do you have of the advantages and disadvantages of this type of funding, thinking across all phases preparedness, response, early recovery).
   Click here to enter text.

21. Do you have any comments or suggestions on how to increase funding for each phase preparedness, response, early recovery)?
   Click here to enter text.

SUPPORT FROM HEADQUARTERS, REGIONAL OFFICE and RR TEAMS

22. Have you received any visits from UNICEF New York Headquarters or the Regional Office to provide technical support for CPIE. Please list the visits received from 2009/12 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visits (year of visit)</th>
<th>HQ/ RO and approx. job title</th>
<th>Purpose of Visit</th>
<th>Duration of visit</th>
<th>Comments on outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. What was most and least useful about visits from HQ and the Regional Office?
   Click here to enter text.

24. Has your office had support from any Rapid Response Teams? Which ones, for how long, and how were they used? What did you find most/least useful?
   Click here to enter text.

INNOVATIVE PRACTICE, LESSONS LEARNED AND FINAL COMMENTS

25. Do you have any examples of creative or innovative practice in protecting children in emergencies that you would like the evaluation to include? For example, data collection on protection issues by SMS, innovative forms of community organization.
   Click here to enter text.

26. Do you have any other overview comments or lessons learned on UNICEF Programmes to Protect Children/Adolescents/ Women in Emergencies that you would like the evaluation to take into account?
   Click here to enter text.
Please could you also support the evaluation by supplying as many as possible of the following documents:

Annex B – Document List

- CPIE Assessments from 2009-2011
- Annual Workplans for CP or CPIE 2011
- List of partners in CPIE, separated by national/international, main project components
- Programme Monitoring Data (as requested) against CCCs, MTSP and country level indicators
- UNICEF Annual Report 2011
- Funding, HR and Partner data as below

Please could also provide the data on the page overleaf:

**CP partner agreements 2009, 2010, 2011** for child protection *in emergencies* (as in matrix below)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Partner</th>
<th>Date of agreement</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Amount of funding agreed</th>
<th>Type of programme (eg. GBV, CAAC, Systems building/PLACES)</th>
<th>Name of project</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partner 1</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner 2</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner 3</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FUNDING DATA**

Print out of funding applications and funding obtained for CPIE.

**PLEASE NOTE, WE WOULD BE GRATEFUL IF YOU COULD INCLUDE APPLICATIONS MADE BUT NOT FUNDED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Donor</th>
<th>Date of proposal</th>
<th>Amount of funding requested</th>
<th>Amount of funding agreed</th>
<th>Type of programme (eg. GBV, CAAC, Systems building/PLACES)</th>
<th>Date funds disbursed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donor 1</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor 2</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor 3</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HUMAN RESOURCES DATA**

- To assess surge in CPIE it would be helpful if HR could provide information on international and national staff recruited in Child Protection for the years 2009, 2010, 2011 (FT/TA and SSA) – matrix below.
- Also information on vacancies in CP (grade, job title, number months vacant) for the same period.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Nat/Int</th>
<th>Staffing Grade or SSA</th>
<th>Date of contract</th>
<th>Duration of contract</th>
<th>Posting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>e.g. CP Assistant</td>
<td>Nat</td>
<td>SSA</td>
<td>20th July 2010</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>Eg. Islamabad / Sindh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questionnaire for UNICEF Programme Partners in the Protection of Children and Women in Emergencies

This questionnaire aims to canvas the views and experiences of UNICEF partners implementing child protection projects in emergencies. Responses will be incorporated into a global evaluation of UNICEF’s programmes to protect children in emergencies. When completed, please email the questionnaire and any supporting documentation to:

CPiEQuestionnaire@gmail.com

We very much appreciate your support

SECTION 1: BASIC DATA

1. **Name of Country:**  
   Click here to enter text.

2. **Date:**  
   Click here to enter text.

3. **Is your organization an:**

   - International NGO
   - National NGO
   - Faith Based Organization
   - Research or Academic Body
   - Other (please explain below)

4. **Does your project focus on the protection of children or women?** (You can tick both if appropriate)

   - Children
   - Women

5. **Does your work relate to natural disasters or armed conflict/complex emergency?** (You can tick both if appropriate)

   - Natural Disaster
   - Armed conflict/Complex Emergency

6. **In which type of project has your organisation partnered with UNICEF** to protect children and/or women in emergencies? You can tick more than one box.

   - Support to Government Child Protection Services
   - Monitoring of grave violations (Sec Council 1612)
   - Psychosocial (e.g. child or women friendly/safe spaces)
   - Gender based violence
   - Release of children from armed forces/groups
   - Interim care
   - Socio-economic reintegration of vulnerable children
   - Family Tracing and Reunification
   - Lifeskills
   - Mine Risk Education
   - Other or have not partnered (please explain)

   Click here to enter text.
SECTION 2: PROTECTION ISSUES AND RISKS

7. What are/were the principal protection risks/threats for girls/boys/women in emergencies in the geographical areas where you work? (Thinking over the last 3 years)

Response:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Children 0-5 years</th>
<th>Children 6-11 years</th>
<th>Adolescents 12-18 years</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All children</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION 3: ASSESSMENT OR SITUATION ANALYSIS

8. Has your organization undertaken or participated in an assessment or situation analysis of protection issues for children and/or women in emergencies?
   Yes ☐    No ☐

If yes, please could you forward a copy of the assessment or reference to where we can find it?

9. Please could you also specify any tools, guides or technical orientation used to guide the assessment

Response: Click here to enter text.

10. Could you tell us what worked well and less well in the assessment process? How was the assessment used in project design or to adapt the project to a changing reality?

Response: Click here to enter text.

SECTION 4: PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

11. Please describe the main objectives and components of your project.

Response: Click here to enter text.

12. Which components were/are most/least effective and why?

Response: Click here to enter text.

13. Has your organization worked in disaster preparedness in child protection? If yes, what kinds of activities have been undertaken and do you have any examples of how preparedness has improved effectiveness during a crisis?

Response: Click here to enter text.

14. Have you introduced any innovative measures to protect children or women in emergencies? If yes, please give an example.

Response: Click here to enter text.

15. What was the total budget of your project? What % was funded by UNICEF?

Response: Click here to enter text.
16. If you were reaching children or women directly, **how many children/women did you reach** - girls, boys, women and age bands – 0-5, 6-11, 12-18) if possible).

Response:  Click here to enter text.

---

**SECTION 5: PROJECT OUTCOMES**

17. Please summarize the principal outcomes of the project for children or women (i.e. what difference the project made in children’s lives). (Please also attach any data, reports that you have in electronic version)

Response:  Click here to enter text.

18. Did the project achieve or contribute to changes in child protection systems (for example policy, legislation, national budget, structures, capacity, procedures)? (Again, please be specific and attach any reports).

Response:  Click here to enter text.

19. Did the project achieve or catalyse any changes in the protective role of communities? (e.g. establishment of Child Protection Committees, referral systems to government, non-government services). How was this achieved? Which aspects were successful and which were less successful? Again please be specific and attach any reports).

Response:  Click here to enter text.

20. Did the project contribute to changes in harmful practices (e.g. in relation to early marriage, violence in the home or community, female genital mutilation/ cutting)? How was this achieved? Which aspects were successful and which were less successful? Were the changes measured? Again please be specific and attach any reports).

Response:  Click here to enter text.

21. Did the project include the most vulnerable and hard-to-reach groups (e.g. in terms of poverty, disability, religious or ethnic group). How was this achieved? Which aspects were successful and which were less successful? How was inclusion measured? Again please be specific and attach any reports).

Response:  Click here to enter text.

22. Has your organisation engaged in advocacy for the protection of children/women that has not been included above? Or do you have any further achievements that are not already addressed?

Response:  Click here to enter text.

---

**SECTION 6: CAPACITY BUILDING**

23. Have you received any technical support from UNICEF? Please describe any training, technical guidelines or other form of support received. Which types of technical support have been most useful and why?

Response:  Click here to enter text.

24. Have you used any of the UNICEF or inter-agency guidelines? (E.g. guidelines on child friendly spaces, gender based violence, children associated with armed forces/groups, unaccompanied/separated children)? If so, which have you used and which did you find most useful and why?

Response:  Click here to enter text.
25. Do you have capacity building interventions for **frontline staff** (i.e. those working directly with children or women)? What form do these take and how have you gauged the effectiveness of capacity building?

Response: Click here to enter text.

### SECTION 7: INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

26. Do you use any **tools to manage information through your projects**? (E.g. the Child Protection Information Management System for case management; the Gender Based Violence Information Management System to collect data on the incidence of GBV; the Monitoring and Reporting Mechanism on the 6 Grave Violations in Armed Conflict). How has the data been managed/analysed and used? What has worked well and less well?

Response: Click here to enter text.

27. Have any **data systems been taken up by the government**? If so, which systems and how do they work in terms of data collection and analysis?

Response: Click here to enter text.

28. Did you undertake any systematic **project monitoring** to ensure that the project was on track against the objectives? Were any evaluations undertaken? Please supply copies of project monitoring reports or project evaluations.

Response: Click here to enter text.

### SECTION 8: COORDINATION

Has your organisation participated in the **Child Protection sub Cluster or CP Working Groups**? Or in the **GBV sub Clusters/Working Groups**? Or in the **Protection Cluster**? If yes, please state which of the sub Clusters and what worked well and less well in promoting a timely and effective response for children and women?

Response: Click here to enter text.

### SECTION 9: UNICEF AS A PARTNER IN PROTECTION RESPONSE

29. What worked well and less well in your **partnership with UNICEF**, thinking about achieving the best results for children and/or women?

Response: Click here to enter text.
30. In your opinion, what changes should be made to better protect children in emergencies by each of the duty bearers or actors: Government, UNICEF, other UN agencies, NGOs? Do you have any views on what should change to better protect women from gender based violence?

Response: Click here to enter text.

31. Any other observations?

Response: Click here to enter text.

Would you be willing to be contacted to clarify any points? If so, please could you include your name and email address:

Name: Click here to enter text.

Email: Click here to enter text.

Please send your completed questionnaire to: CPIEQuestionnaire@gmail.com

THANK YOU SO MUCH FOR YOUR HELP!
Annex 8

Types of Documentation Analysed

Reports

2. Reports by the UN Special Representative on Children and Armed Conflict: Annual and Country reports.
3. Proposals and reports to UNICEF by partners in desk study countries.

Assessments

4. Sample of Inter-Agency rapid assessments

Technical guidance


Evaluations

6. CP evaluations relevant to countries in the evaluation.

Data on CAAC

7. Data on mine/ERW casualties through Landmine Monitor

Global literature on child protection in emergencies

8. Key literature as referenced in footnotes.
Annex 9

Ranking of Risks for Children by Age, Sex and Conflict and Disaster

1. GIRLS/BOYS AGED 0 TO 5 YEARS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequ. Ref.</th>
<th>CONFLICT (Afghanistan, Colombia, Myanmar, N.West Pakistan, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, State of Palestine, Sudan)</th>
<th>DISASTER (Haiti, Pakistan, Philippines).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Girls and Boys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Family separation</td>
<td>Psychological Stress or Trauma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Denial education</td>
<td>Trafficking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Physical abuse</td>
<td>Difficult access to health care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mines, ERW, UXO</td>
<td>Drowning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Abduction/unauthorized adoption</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Neglect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Psychological Stress or Trauma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Child labour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sexual violence</td>
<td>Killing or maiming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>FGM</td>
<td>Lack of space for play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Killing or maiming</td>
<td>Abandonment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Lack of space for play</td>
<td>Sexual violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Abandonment</td>
<td>Trafficking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Trafficking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. **GIRLS/BOYS AGED 6 to 11 YEARS**

Risks for Girls and Boys aged 6-11 Years  
(Identified by UNICEF, Partners and Community Leaders and ranked by frequency of reference)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONFLICT (Afghanistan, Colombia, Myanmar, N.West Pakistan, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, State of Palestine, Sudan)</th>
<th>DISASTER (Haiti, Pakistan, Philippines)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GIRLS</strong></td>
<td><strong>BOYS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family separation</td>
<td>Family separation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damage to schools, displacement or insecurity leading to out of school children</td>
<td>Child labour (inc. forced labour)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical abuse</td>
<td>Damage to schools, displacement or insecurity leading to out of school children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child labour (inc. forced labour)</td>
<td>Physical abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual violence</td>
<td>Recruitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abduction</td>
<td>Abduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killing or maiming inc. shelling, bombing</td>
<td>Killing or maiming inc. shelling, bombing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trafficking</td>
<td>Trafficking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mines, ERW, UXO</td>
<td>Mines, ERW, UXO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Stress or Trauma</td>
<td>Psychological Stress or Trauma</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. ADOLESCENTS AGED 12 – 17 YEARS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risks Identified by Adolescents Aged 12-17 Years in Focus/Activity Groups</th>
<th>CONFLICT (Colombia, Pakistan, South Sudan)</th>
<th>DISASTER (Pakistan)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GIRLS</td>
<td>BOYS</td>
<td>GIRLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelling, bombing, armed combat, landmines, ERW</td>
<td>Shelling, bombing, armed combat, landmines, ERW</td>
<td>Floods, damage to homes and livelihoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological stress (depression, anxiety, loneliness)</td>
<td>Hunger, disease, lack of access to medical services (including during evacuation from conflict)</td>
<td>Fear of kidnapping, rape, forced marriage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual violence (inc. rape) harassment, abuse</td>
<td>General insecurity, lawlessness, threatening behaviour</td>
<td>General insecurity, violence, theft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunger, disease, lack of access to medical services (including during evacuation from conflict)</td>
<td>Schools damaged or closed</td>
<td>Separation from families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separation from families or death of parents</td>
<td>Child labour (including work duties in camps)</td>
<td>Risk of being swept away</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early and forced marriage</td>
<td>Generalized possession small arms</td>
<td>Disease because of unhygienic conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General insecurity, lawlessness, threatening behaviour</td>
<td>Psychological stress (depression, anxiety, loneliness)</td>
<td>Maternal death in pregnancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic conflict, violence, drunkenness</td>
<td>Accidents (car or others)</td>
<td>Psychological stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalized possession small arms</td>
<td>Flooods, damage to homes and livelihoods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of ID documentation</td>
<td>Separation from families or death of parents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floods, damage to homes and livelihoods</td>
<td>Domestic conflict, violence, drunkenness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment to AF/AG</td>
<td>Recruitment to AF/AG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination against girls</td>
<td>Loss of livelihood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced displacement</td>
<td>Drug trafficking/gangs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools damaged or closed</td>
<td>Child abuse in home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Annex 10

**Table of Protection Issues Relative to Country-level Programming**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protection issue</th>
<th>Type of programme intervention</th>
<th>Implemented in 7 or more countries</th>
<th>Implemented in 4-6 countries</th>
<th>Implemented in less than 4 countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grave violations (as reported in the MRM)</td>
<td>Recruitment/use</td>
<td>Monitoring and reporting on protection violations and advocacy through Security Council and CTFMR</td>
<td></td>
<td>Advocacy campaign on illegal detention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Killing/maiming by bombing shelling, cross fire, ERW etc.</td>
<td>Mine risk education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abduction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sexual violence in armed conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attacks on schools/hospitals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abduction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Denial of humanitarian access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dangers and injuries</td>
<td>Generalized insecurity, small arms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disaster preparedness with children and communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct risks in disasters (e.g. drowning)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical violence</td>
<td>Physical abuse, trafficking, abduction, forced displacement</td>
<td>Child protection networks linking to formal systems</td>
<td>Legal support services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Training child/woman friendly police</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender-based violence</td>
<td>Sexual violence, abuse or exploitation, trafficking,</td>
<td>Individual casework and counselling, referral for medical support</td>
<td>Empowerment through livelihoods and credit</td>
<td>Prevention measures such as fuel-efficient stoves, dignity kits, community alert systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Legal support</td>
<td>Advocacy and communication campaigns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Social norms programming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGM/C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Social norms programming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early/forced marriage</td>
<td>Child protection networks linking to formal systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosocial distress</td>
<td>Psychosocial distress</td>
<td>Age-appropriate activities in protective spaces: child-friendly spaces and other models (such as PLaCES* in Pakistan)</td>
<td>Individual counselling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child labour</td>
<td>Child labour</td>
<td>Social protection, livelihoods, credit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family separation</td>
<td>Family separation and alternative care</td>
<td>Tracing and reunification, alternative care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex 11

### Analysis of Inter-Agency Assessments:

Issues identified in relation to recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Assessment Name</th>
<th>Camp/off camp context</th>
<th>Issues raised not addressed in programme recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Jordan</td>
<td>Child Protection and Gender-Based Violence Sub-Working Group Jordan, 2013 <em>Findings from the Inter-Agency Child Protection and Gender-Based Violence Assessment in the Za’atari Refugee Camp</em>, Child Protection and Gender-Based Violence Sub-Working Group Jordan</td>
<td>Camp setting</td>
<td>All key issues addressed including security at lighting, WASH facilities, distribution points.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Pakistan</td>
<td>Multi Agency Rapid Assessment, Protection Cluster Working Group, 2012. Protection questions led by UNICEF</td>
<td>Camp setting</td>
<td>Two issues prioritised in the MIRA assessment were whether women and girls had separate WASH facilities and the percentage was found to be very low. However, this issue did not appear in the strategic priorities. Likewise the assessment identified ‘fighting at distribution points’ as a serious issue but there were no interventions recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **6** | Thailand | **Issue not addressed in recommendations.**  
Children 5-14 considered vulnerable to recruitment in camps, community areas, events. Not addressed in recommendations. |
| Off camp context and  
Drowning was identified as major risk to children, especially those under five but also under 10. One third of children can swim. No recommendations to prevent drowning. | |
|   |   |   |
| **7** | Tunisia | Recruitment considered to be a major risk, including forced recruitment. Not addressed in recommendations. Otherwise good practical recommendations. |
| Off camp context and  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Action Plans</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Other listed Parties – no Action Plan</th>
<th>Results of Action Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. National Liberation Army ELN 2. Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia FARC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>With Moro Islamic Liberation Front</td>
<td>Aug 1 2009</td>
<td>1. Abu Sayyaf Group (ASG) 2. Communist Party of the Philippines/New People’s Army</td>
<td>Very different context in which children grow up in communities associated with MILF as a socio religious identity and ideology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>With Armed Forces, SPLA</td>
<td>Revised March 12 2012</td>
<td>Sudan People’s Liberation Army</td>
<td>Release of children. Widely believed recruitment has stopped. Armed Forces Commanders training forces on children's rights.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23 See http://www.state.gov/j/ct/rls/other/des/123085.htm
2. JEM/PW  
3. Popular Defence Forces - PDF  
4. Pro Government militias  
5. Sudan Liberation Army - SLA (7 groups listed)  
6. Sudan People’s Liberation Movement - SPLM |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>Sudanese Armed Forces (plus Police Forces, Border Intelligence Forces, Central Reserve Police)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex 13:

**Selection of UNICEF Projects by costs and beneficiary numbers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project type</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Phrase on type of project</th>
<th>Number of children/women reached</th>
<th>Total cost</th>
<th>UNICEF Contribution</th>
<th>Cost per capita</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MGV; SRVC; FTR; LS</td>
<td>World Vision (Myanmar)</td>
<td>Reintegration, comms for CAAC</td>
<td>905,486 beneficiaries</td>
<td>Total budget for the project for children affected by armed conflict – 120,220 USD</td>
<td>(% funded by UNICEF – 100%)</td>
<td>33.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGV; PS</td>
<td>East Jerusalem YMCA (oPt)</td>
<td>PSS emergency teams</td>
<td>8,703 girls, 8,665 boys, 1,766 women TOTAL: 19,144</td>
<td>NIS 3,104,175 total budget, 88% funded by UNICEF</td>
<td>45.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGCPS; PS; LS</td>
<td>PCDCR (oPt)</td>
<td>PSS emergency teams</td>
<td>7,400 children aged 8-15 years (50 % boys, 50 % girls) 5,500 caregivers (70% women, 30% men) TOTAL: 12,900</td>
<td>1,298,158.42 NIS 100% UNICEF Contribution</td>
<td>28.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>CESVI (Somalia)</td>
<td>Enhance the delivery of Psychosocial support services. Reinforce child protection and response mechanisms.</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>1,215,035</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>12.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS; GBV</td>
<td>SWDC (Somalia)</td>
<td>Psychosocial Support for Women and Children affected by GBV and Armed Conflict</td>
<td>5,000 People (3,000 children and 2,000 family members)</td>
<td>43,870.00 US$</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>8.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBV</td>
<td>SFCC (Somalia)</td>
<td>GBV victim support and awareness raising</td>
<td>GBV survivors supported  • 1780 women  • 190 girls  • 4 boys Number of IDPs reached through awareness raising</td>
<td>$565,597</td>
<td>48% of the budget was funded by UNICEF</td>
<td>54.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project type</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Phrase on type of project</td>
<td>Number of children/women reached</td>
<td>Total cost</td>
<td>UNICEF Contribution</td>
<td>Cost per capita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBV; PS; LS</td>
<td>GRT (Somalia)</td>
<td>Strengthen Response Mechanism for High –Risk Groups and Survivors of GBV (Community-Based)</td>
<td>719 women 28 men TOTAL: 747</td>
<td>490,433.8 USD</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>656.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS; CFS; CPIE; CP Systems</td>
<td>CFSI (Philippines)</td>
<td>Protection intervention for vulnerable children and youth in Alsalam IDP camp-SD</td>
<td>6,380 (3-5 years) 130 youth</td>
<td>PhP 3,193,020.80 PhP 2,206,300.00</td>
<td>94% 98%</td>
<td>Budget unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS; GBV</td>
<td>World Vision (Sudan)</td>
<td>Community based child protection and prevention and response to GBV</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>$165,413</td>
<td>$134,325</td>
<td>399.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGCPS; PS; GBV; IC; SRVC</td>
<td>JSAC (Sri Lanka)</td>
<td>Mine risk education programme in proposed locations in Vavuniya District</td>
<td>Response over 24000 per district. 48,000 beneficiaries</td>
<td>Vavuniya: 23,426 US$ Kilinochchi: 32,896 US$</td>
<td>DONOR: UNICEF</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project type</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Phrase on type of project</td>
<td>Number of children/women reached</td>
<td>Total cost</td>
<td>UNICEF Contribution</td>
<td>Cost per capita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGCPS; MRE</td>
<td>EHED CARITAS (Sri Lanka)</td>
<td>Community based mine risk education &amp; victim assistance</td>
<td>27,500</td>
<td>LKR. 3,926,115.00</td>
<td>LKR 2,562,115.00 - 65%</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGCPS; PS; IC; SRVC; FTR; LS (for women headed families and their children) Prevention of Alcoholism; Child empowerment</td>
<td>ESCO (Sri Lanka)</td>
<td>(Not mentioned in the UNICEF CO QUESTIONNAIRE)</td>
<td>16,810</td>
<td>$165,090.66</td>
<td>UNICEF fund – Rs.19,710,692.00 Since 2010 to 2012 (90.5% OF TOTAL BUDGET) $149407.0454</td>
<td>9.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MGV: Monitoring of Grave Violations

FTR: Family Tracing and Reunification

LS: Lifeskills

SRVC: Socioeconomic Reintegration of Vulnerable Children

SGCPS: Support to Government Child Protection Services

PS: Psychosocial

RCAF/G: Release of Children from Armed Forces/Groups

IC: Interim Care