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DECEMBER 2016
1. INTRODUCTION

UNICEF’s Evaluation Office is commissioning a formative evaluation to examine UNICEF’s leadership role, strategies and programme performance to strengthen child protection systems. The evaluation is scheduled for implementation during 2017. This document outlines the scope of the evaluation, methodological options and operational modalities for a team of five to six consultants who will be conducting the evaluation under the guidance of a Senior Evaluation Officer at the Evaluation Office. The team will have significant interaction with an Evaluation Advisory Group which will be engaged throughout the evaluation process. The Evaluation Office is looking for institutions and individuals with deep commitment and strong background in evaluation and relevant subject matter to undertake the evaluation which has major implications for UNICEF’s future work and partnerships for strengthening child protection systems.

2. BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE

Evolving Context, Strategies and Investments

Child protection as a field of work within UNICEF has a long tradition, dating back to the Declaration of the Rights of the Child in 1959, and cemented through the Convention on the Rights of the Child in 1990. This area of work relates primarily to children’s right to be protected from violence, exploitation and abuse. Although the nature and extent of child protection problems and issues vary widely across various contexts, there is sufficient evidence to show that violations of children’s rights to protection are widely prevalent. For instance, six in ten children worldwide are regularly subjected to physical punishment by their caregivers and one in ten girls has experienced forced sexual acts at some point in her life. There are several countries where more than 50 per cent of girls undergo the harmful practice of female genital mutation.²

Historically, child protection efforts have focused on at-risk populations such as street children or single issues such as child trafficking or child labour. These were also seen as the contexts where children were more vulnerable to violence, exploitation and abuse. There was thus a general tendency to treat individual child protection concerns in isolation. Around the turn of the millennium, the realisation grew that such a way of operating fragments response and is inefficient: It creates parallel structures and duplication as well as pockets of unmet need. It became clear that the issue needs to be addressed more systematically.

The first milestone towards a new modus operandi was the Protective Environment Framework (PEF, 2002). The PEF defined eight interconnected elements that work individually and collectively to strengthen protection and reduce vulnerability.³ While neither the PEF nor UNICEF’s medium-term strategic plans 2002-2005 and 2006-2009 included any mention of CP “systems” per se, the elements of the PEF can be understood as including, and going beyond, the components of CP systems (see below).

---

¹ This document benefitted from inputs provided by a number of UNICEF child protection experts in Programme Division, the Office of Research and regional child protection advisors.


³ The eight elements of the Protective Environment Framework are: Governmental commitment to fulfilling protection of rights (including appropriate policies and budgets); Legislation and enforcement; Attitudes, traditions, customs, behaviour and practices; Open discussion, including the engagement of media and civil society; Children’s life skills, knowledge and participation; Capacity of those in contact with the child; Basic and targeted services; Monitoring and oversight.
The UNICEF Child Protection Strategy, adopted by the Executive Board in 2008, for the first time explicitly stressed the “development of appropriate child protection systems” as one of two key strategic objectives in this area of work. It also introduced a first definition of CP systems. Refined in 2010 and 2012, the definition is as follows:

**UNICEF Definition of Child Protection Systems**

“A CP system can be defined as: Certain formal and informal structures, functions and capacities that have been assembled to prevent and respond to violence, abuse, neglect and exploitation of children. A CP system is generally agreed to be comprised of the following components: human resources, finance, laws and policies, governance, monitoring and data collection as well as protection and response services and care management. It also includes different actors – children, families, communities, those working at subnational or national level and those working internationally. Most important are the relationships and interactions between and among these components and these actors within the system. It is the outcomes of these interactions that comprise the system”.

As the definition highlights, UNICEF’s systems approach stresses the need to address the whole of child protection in programming. Promoting a holistic view means taking a historical and contextualized approach and engaging with the full range of actors involved in protecting children’s rights in every given setting. UNICEF recognizes that every child protection system manifests a combination of cultural norms, standards of behaviour, history, resources and external influences that over time reflect the choices participants have made regarding their systems.

In principle, child protection systems seek to address the full spectrum of risk factors in the lives of all children and their families. They are a core foundation for building a protective environment to offset the multiple, and often interconnected, vulnerabilities faced by children. Almost without exception, countries globally have some form of legislation in place which includes explicit, or at times implicit, child protection provisions. As the boundaries of child protection systems may vary depending on country context, parts of a child protection system may appear in other sectors. As a result, child protection systems sometimes cut across part of the social welfare, education, health, justice, social protection and security sectors. However, they often fall short of international standards specific to the protection of children established by the Convention on the Rights of the Child and other international treaties. Also, the maturity of each element of a CP system – human resources, finances, standards, governance, monitoring and services – and the extent of their integration can vary.

Several organizations, including UNICEF, have devised methodologies for mapping and assessing child protection systems. These methodologies also support country teams to frame and cost a strategy to develop the CP system drawing on the results of the mapping process. CP system mapping has picked up particularly since 2012, and in 2015 alone, 37 countries were supported by UNICEF to map all or parts of their CP systems. As per the corporate website, the implicit theory of change underpinning this initiative is as follows: CP systems mapping and assessment (which is usually part of the mapping) “helps build consensus among government and civil society on the goals and components of such systems, their strengths, weaknesses and priorities upon which to act. This then translates into

---


5 It should be noted that according to many observers, UNICEF’s current definition does not adequately cover prevention and early intervention. Similarly, while it includes structures, functions and capacities, it overlooks that systems are created based on a set of principles and ideas.

improved laws, policies, regulations, standards and services protecting all children. It also leads to the strengthening of these systems with the financial and human resources necessary to deliver results for children.”

Child protection systems strengthening in UNICEF strategic plans

It wasn’t until 2009, when the medium-term strategic plan (MTSP) 2006-2009 was extended to 2011 and then 2013, that CP systems-strengthening work was operationalized in terms of organizational targets. In 2012, the updated MTSP results framework for child protection defined key results area 1 as: “Better child protection systems that include national laws, policies and services across sectors, in particular justice and social protection, to protect all children from violence, exploitation and abuse”.

The Strategic Plan (SP), 2014-2017 further underscored the systems approach as one of the two key pillars of child protection work to be undertaken by the organization. To achieve Outcome 6, “Improved and equitable prevention of and response to violence, abuse, exploitation and neglect of children”, UNICEF programming thus focuses on “strengthening of child protection systems and support for social change for improved protection of children” (SP, p. 7), in addition to social norms/social change work. A theory of change has been devised to visualize the programme-impact pathways (see Figure 1, page 9) and staff capacity-building initiatives have taken place to make sure the systems approach is well understood.

Although UNICEF’s investment in strengthening child protection systems varies by region and year, it is clear that substantive financial and human resources have been devoted in recent years. Expenditure for CP systems-strengthening work under the current SP period was US$54 million in 2014 and US$67.5 million in 2015. The majority of expenditure is allocated to (a) supporting work on laws and standards, national planning and budgeting as part of the enabling environment, and to (b) capacity building and service delivery to strengthen the supply side of the results framework.

---

7 See http://www.unicef.org/protection/57929_57990.html, accessed 19 September 2016. Mapping refers to a process of identifying the main country child protection risks and reviewing the scope and capacity of the existing child protection system, including its accountability mechanisms and resources. This results in an holistic overview of the child protection system, rather than a more classic vertical approach that looks at parts of the system as explicitly pertaining to a specific issue. As a dynamic system, assessment is part of the mapping exercise as judgements are made about, for example the boundaries of the system and its capacity to respond. The result of the assessment is the identification of priority actions that will improve the child protection system and ultimately lead to better results for children, be that a better result in a particular area (like a reduction in child marriage), or broader (such as having prevention services in place). These actions should be few and be ‘linchpins’ that can reverberate throughout the system to respond to the challenges that the mappings highlight.


9 KRA1 was previously defined as “Better national laws, policies, regulations and services across sectors to improve child protection outcomes, in particular justice for children, social protection systems, and services in place to protect, reach and serve all children, notably those identified as vulnerable to harm, marginalized, or in contact with the law”.

10 The theory of change is part of the SP, 2014-2017 and can be viewed in Figure 1, below. A webinar series geared towards UNICEF staff focused on the following topics: 1. Scope of CP system work; 2. Beginning with mapping; 3. Measurement; 4. And what next; 5. Obstacles: 6. Equity; 7. Themes; 8. Social Protection and Child Protection; 9. Typologies. In addition, there have been CP system meetings specifically for UNICEF staff in ROSA, WCAR and ESAR.

11 This figure excludes cross-thematic funds and operational or other costs. Cf. CP Annual Reports, 2014, p. 15 and 2015, p. 9.
Past evaluations

The global evaluation of UNICEF’s work to address violence against children \(^{12}\) had a limited but significant focus on examining child protection systems. The recommendations included the need to include social norms change initiatives within the systems framework and to generate further evidence on well-functioning child protection systems. In addition, a small body of targeted studies and evaluations at the country level informs this global evaluation. Of particular importance is the “Mapping and Assessing Child Protection Systems in West and Central Africa - Five Country Analysis Paper” (2011), the documentation of “Child Protection: Mapping and Assessing Eastern and Southern Africa” (2011), “Comprehensive national child protection systems: legal basis and current practice in Latin America and the Caribbean” (2013), “National Child Protection Systems in East Asia and Pacific: A review and analysis of mappings and assessments” (2014), the “Formative Evaluation – UNICEF’s Child Protection System Building Approach in Indonesia” (2015), the “Independent Multi-Country Evaluation of Results Area 1” (2015) from CEE/CIS as well as the series of case studies titled “Building national frameworks for child protection” (2016) which includes reports on Ghana, Indonesia, Kenya, Senegal and the United Republic of Tanzania. Another set of reviews of CP systems strengthening work in Nepal, Bhutan, Pakistan and Maldives is currently being contracted. All of the above help generate a better understanding of how UNICEF’s work influences the functioning of CP systems in various country contexts, as well as of government responses, engagement by other actors and additional factors that are contributing to success in protecting children from violence, exploitation and abuse.

New commitments and the need for evaluative evidence

In 2015, world leaders made a commitment to end all forms of violence against children by 2030, as part of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Well-functioning child protection systems are central to UNICEF’s mandate as an organization guided by the Convention on the Rights of the Child and they play a major role in support of Agenda 2030. The priorities to be achieved under three SDGs directly depend on success in strengthening CP systems. The three SDGs are: SDG 5 “Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls” (in particular: eliminating harmful practices), SDG 8 “Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all” (in particular: prohibition and elimination of child labour and child soldiers), and SDG 16 “Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels” (in particular: protection against violence, abuse, trafficking and exploitation). In addition, increasing access to child protection and other services will contribute significantly to meeting other goals including SDG 1 (poverty reduction), SDG 3 (health) and SDG 4 (education).

Despite the long evolution of UNICEF’s thinking and investments, no comprehensive evaluation has been undertaken to assess UNICEF’s strategies and programme performance – including the leadership and advocacy roles – with regard to strengthening child protection systems. This evaluation comes at a time when there is considerable momentum to address child protection issues and when UNICEF is preparing its next strategic plan for the period 2018-2021. The evidence generated from the evaluation will feed directly into (a) the implementation of the new strategic plan and (b) the further boosting of national as well international partnerships to strengthen child protection systems.

---

http://www.unicef.org/evaldatabase/index_VAC.html
3. PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

PURPOSE AND USE

The purpose of the evaluation is twofold: First, to inform the design and implementation of UNICEF programming in the child protection systems arena, including aspects related to quality and responsiveness, and second, to contribute to improving accountability for performance and results in strengthening child protection systems, particularly for addressing the protection rights of the most vulnerable children.

The evaluation will assess the past and current approaches to CP system strengthening and generate learning on effective approaches – including with regard to legal reform, use of upstream policy work, multi-sectoral engagement, financing, governance and coordination, capacity development/service delivery, data and knowledge management, and partnerships with both formal and informal sectors.

The findings and recommendations generated by the evaluation will be used to influence strategic direction, to inform theory and practice of child protection systems, and to build partnerships. The findings will be used in guiding the implementation of the SP, 2018-2021 and country programmes. More importantly, the evidence generated by the evaluation will provide a further opportunity to highlight the centrality of the child protection agenda within the sustainable development goals and guide UNICEF’s work with partners across all regions and various programme contexts to strengthen responsive child protection systems.

OBJECTIVES

The evaluation has the following specific objectives:

- Assess the appropriateness and coherence of UNICEF’s corporate approach stratégies and SP results/targets for strengthening national child protection systems.

- Examine the relevance and appropriateness of child protection systems-strengthening approaches and interventions that have been applied in various regions taking account of the range of country contexts (including upper/lower middle income and fragile settings) where UNICEF operates.

- Assess the performance of UNICEF country programmes -- using the evaluation criteria of effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability -- in strengthening national and decentralized child protection systems in selected contexts. This analysis will focus on both upstream/financial leveraging as well as decentralized/local level service practices involving formal as well as informal actors.

- Assess UNICEF’s leadership, guidance and technical support at all levels of the organization as well as the adequacy of UNICEF staffing/institutional capacity to respond to the lead role the organization is expected to play in strengthening national child protection systems.

- Provide forward looking lessons and recommendations regarding UNICEF’s leadership and advocacy, organizational policies, strategies and methodologies, regional and country-level response; and partnerships for strengthening child protection systems in various contexts where children are vulnerable to protection issues.
4. SCOPE AND EVALUATION QUESTIONS

SCOPE

The evaluation will assess UNICEF’s global, regional, and country-level strategies and efforts. It will trace UNICEF’s work in strengthening child protection systems work over the past decade with main focus on the period from 2012 to 2016. The analysis of results globally will focus largely on the targets and results of the SP, 2014-2017.

The country-level analysis will need to be situated within the particular country context and the national approach to child protection system approach that has evolved over the past decade. The evaluation will consider one or more programme cycles depending on country/programme context and investments made and will cover CP system strengthening efforts at national and sub-national levels considering both formal and informal actors.

The evaluation will assess UNICEF’s work in middle-income countries, least developed countries and fragile countries. While child protection systems strengthening is also ongoing in industrialized countries, these fall outside the scope of this evaluation due to UNICEF’s limited involvement in these settings. Similarly, the evaluation will exclude emergency response although it will examine UNICEF’s role and performance in strengthening child protection systems as part of recovery and reconstruction phases.

The key focus of the evaluation is at the national and sub-national models that are being implemented as part of child protection system (covering both prevention and response aspects) and the role and contribution UNICEF is making to strengthen such systems in various contexts. The detailed scope will need to be developed during the inception phase.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK ON CP SYSTEM

Various conceptualizations of child protection systems co-exist within UNICEF and with its key strategic partners such as Save the Children, World Vision, UNHCR and others. A common denominator between those conceptualizations is that, at the minimum, the following six elements (the first three are seen as the core components of a child protection system and the rest are key requirements to their functioning) need to be present in a child protection system:¹³¹⁴

1. **A robust legal and regulatory framework, as well as specific policies related to child protection**
   This includes regulations and standards compliant with the Convention on the Rights of the Child, other international standards and good practices.

2. **Effective governance structures, including coordination across government departments, between levels of decentralization and between formal and informal actors**
   Mechanisms must be in place to actualize the relationships between system components and actors, which may include those within the child protection sector and in different sectors at the same level or different levels working together to protect children. Equally important to ensure that timely and adequate resources are available for the system actors to act responsively.

3. **A continuum of services (spanning prevention and response)**

---


¹⁴ Helper diagrams of the “Contexts and Dynamics of Child Protection Systems” and of “Actors, Context and Components” of CP Systems can be found in: Wulczyn et al., “Adapting a Systems Approach to Child Protection”.
A well-functioning system must have preventive, early intervention and responsive services (including integration with justice/legal sector, education, health, welfare) delivered by involving formal and informal sectors, including a process of care which includes identification, referral, follow-up, response, etc.

4. **Minimum standards and oversight (information, monitoring and accountability mechanisms)**
   A child protection system must be accountable. Policy development, advocacy work and programming should be built on evidence-based information (research, data collection, etc.). Information systems that support case management, performance monitoring, and scale up.

5. **Human, financial and infrastructure resources**
   Effective resource management must be in place, such as enough skilled workers in the right places, adequate budget allocations, effective training and appropriate infrastructure (from vehicles to meeting rooms).

6. **Social participation, including respect for children’s own views, and an aware and supportive public**
   Communities, families and peers play a crucial role in promoting protective social practices and children’s empowerment. Access to civic education and to mechanisms that give adolescents a voice in decision-making make them more resilient to violence, abuse, neglect, and exploitation.

A key focus of the evaluation is to examine how UNICEF promotes, advocates for and contributes to the above CP system components (including possible gains/challenges in addressing them synergistically) in various contexts. Currently, UNICEF’s Child Protection Strategy and the SP, 2014-2017 provide organizational strategies and a results framework for child protection systems strengthening. Building on the CP strategy and recent experiences, the SP, 2014-2017 visualizes the following expected programme-impact pathway or theory of change for child protection.

**Figure 1: Schematic for Outcome 6 - Child Protection (Source: “Revised supplementary programme note on the theory of change for the UNICEF Strategic Plan, 2014-2017”)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT: Realizing the rights of every child, especially the most disadvantaged</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OUTCOME 6: Improved and equitable prevention of and response to violence, abuse, exploitation and neglect of children</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OUTPUT 1: Enhanced support and increased capacities of children and families to protect themselves and to eliminate practices and behaviours harmful to children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTPUT 2: Increased national capacity to provide access to child protection systems that prevent and respond to violence, abuse, exploitation and neglect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTPUT 3: Strengthened political commitment, accountability and national capacity to legislate, plan and budget for scaling up interventions that prevent and respond to violence, abuse and exploitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTPUT 4: Increased country capacity and delivery of services to ensure that children’s rights to protection from violence, abuse and exploitation are sustained and promoted in humanitarian situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTPUT 5: Increased capacity of governments and communities to identify and respond to human rights and gender dimensions of child protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTPUT 6: Enhanced global and regional capacity to accelerate progress in child protection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To assess the effectiveness of UNICEF’s work in strengthening CP systems, the evaluation will consider all six outputs, depending on their relevance/application in specific situations. The list of output indicators will be reviewed (during the inception phase) to determine their use in assessing UNICEF’s role and contribution in various contexts.

**EVALUATION FOCUS / QUESTIONS**

The evaluation will address the following main areas and questions:

**APPROPRIATENESS OF GLOBAL STRATEGY, STRATEGIC PLAN AND GUIDANCE ON STRENGTHENING CHILD PROTECTION SYSTEMS**

How appropriate, adequate, and coherent are the UNICEF global strategies, planned results (SP) and guidance documents for strengthening child protection systems? How adequate and useful is the theory of change (ToC) in the current SP for informing country programme design and for progress reporting? Are there other approaches to child protection system which should inform UNICEF’s strategies, plan and guidance?

**RELEVANCE AND APPROPRIATENESS OF COUNTRY PROGRAMME STRATEGIES AND PLANS**

To what extent is child protection system strengthening reflected in country programme documents as per country specific needs, development plans and priorities? How relevant and appropriate are the country programme strategies and interventions (including clarity of the theory of change/programme logic/indicators; multi-sectoral focus, targeting less reached and disadvantaged children; provision of social services; addressing gender equality including intra-household dynamics, supporting enabling environment)? How well-tailored and appropriate is UNICEF’s approach to strengthening child protection systems in specific contexts (fragile countries; least developed countries; middle-income countries).

**EFFECTIVENESS OF UNICEF COUNTRY PROGRAMMES IN CONTRIBUTING TO STRENGTHENING NATIONAL CHILD PROTECTION SYSTEMS; KEY FACTORS AND CONDITIONS LEADING TO PROGRAMME EFFECTIVENESS**

How effective are UNICEF country programmes in achieving concrete results for protecting children (outputs and where possible outcomes) through strengthened child protection systems considering both prevention and service delivery aspects? Which strategies and interventions have yielded most concrete results (outputs and outcomes)? What are UNICEF’s main contributions and how well do they match with the planned results?

How successful has UNICEF been in enhancing fiscal space for child protection systems and what have been the key experiences/lessons in leveraging national government and partner resources (upstream work and budget allocations)? What are the most effective national models that UNICEF has supported for the coordination and integration of child protection system in various formal and informal sectors? What are the lessons learned from capacity building of the justice/legal and social sectors (health, education, welfare) in various contexts? What has worked (or not) in sub-national/local level modelling and scale up of child protection/case management systems and in promoting community awareness and parental care and support?

What are the key conditions and enabling factors that are crucial for success? What is that UNICEF should not promote/undertake in the name of child protection system strengthening?

**LEADERSHIP, LEVERAGING AND PARTNERSHIPS**

How effective is UNICEF in global leadership and leveraging of partnerships to strengthen child protection systems? How effective is UNICEF’s regional leadership, guidance/support and leveraging role in various contexts?
PARTICIPATION, EQUITY AND GENDER EQUALITY

How adequate are the global frameworks and guidance with regard to (a) the participation of children in shaping child protection systems and (b) with regard to gender responsiveness of these systems? In strengthening child protection systems, to what extent do country programmes engage with and respond to specific protection related needs of boys and girls? How responsive are the child protection systems with respect to the needs of specific population groups (i.e. children with disabilities, migrant children, children affected by AIDS, etc.) that are considered to be particularly vulnerable? Are there any concrete results being achieved through models that involve children and families that can be highlighted for replication in certain contexts?

SUSTAINABILITY AND SCALE UP

To what extent has UNICEF contributed to enhancing emergency preparedness and strengthening the positive protective factors present at all levels of the system, formal and informal. How successfully has UNICEF leveraged the enablers of systems strengthening? To what extent have resilience-building strategies be integrated within the CP systems and preparedness plans?

To what extent have sustainability considerations (technical, financial, institutional) been integrated in programme design and implementation phases by UNICEF and its counterparts? How adequate is UNICEF’s approach and contribution with respect to direct support, upstream work and creation of enabling environments (including national ownership/institution development and national budget allocations) that are necessary for sustainability and scale-up? Are there any particular risks related to the sustainability of gains achieved in establishing responsive child protection systems?

KNOWLEDGE / DATA GENERATION, ASSESSMENTS AND USE

How adequately has UNICEF contributed to global efforts in generating and sharing relevant research knowledge/evidence, to data collection and analysis of CP systems strengthening and to monitoring and evaluation of the processes and results achieved by child protection systems? What are the lessons from the child protection and assessment and mapping initiatives and what has been their contribution in various contexts?

How can one measure the outcomes and impacts of the investments made in child protections systems? Are there areas that require strengthening including with regard to use of data or results of research and evaluation at the global, regional and country levels, in light of the SDG focus on child protection?

MANAGEMENT/OPERATIONS (INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY, RESOURCE ALLOCATIONS, EFFICIENCY)

How well has UNICEF allocated and managed human and financial resources for addressing child protection and for systems strengthening? How adequate are UNICEF’s financial and human resources and where, if any, are the key gaps that need to be addressed for CP systems strengthening? How adequate and efficient is UNICEF’s internal coordination including integration and convergence of various programme components / sectors to address child protection (this analysis will need to consider the fact that in some middle-income countries, there are particular advantages and potential synergies in integrating child protection and social protection)?

To what extent is UNICEF’s staff capacity adequate for providing leadership, advocacy and technical guidance/support at various levels of the organization and across all programme settings? What factors drive or constrain effective organizational performance? What needs to be done to address gaps, if any, in staff/institutional capacity for fulfilling the lead role UNICEF is expected to play at the field level toward well-functioning child protections systems?
The technical submissions are expected to propose sufficiently adequate design/methods covering the above eight groups of evaluation questions. More detailed design, methods and tools will be developed during the inception phase.

## 5. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

### EVALUATION DESIGN

At the organizational level, the evaluation will examine the theory of change underlying the strategies, results and targets outlined in the strategic plan for strengthening child protection systems. At the country level, the analysis will consider context-specific theory of change or programme logic and results and targets to assess UNICEF’s performance.

The broader evaluation framework (to be based on review of relevant internal and external documents) will need to define the scope of ‘child protection system’ or ‘systems’ and determine what falls ‘within/outside’ the system in various contexts. This will involve looking at the larger context (enabling factors) within which child protection interventions are situated, various components of the system, interactions among them and the boundaries within which the systems operate.

As child protection system components might vary by national contexts and governance modalities, the evaluation will use a flexible/adaptive approach by considering functions that various parts of a child protection system are expected to perform and assess the extent to which various actors have been supported/empowered to perform their roles. A key focus of the evaluation is thus to assess how effective UNICEF has been in contributing to both the establishment of and functioning of child protection system at the country level.

For the global, regional and country-level analysis, a detailed evaluation framework, including indicators, data sources and analytical methods will be developed during the inception phase covering all evaluation criteria/questions and sub-questions.

- For assessing UNICEF’s work at the country level, a sample of 24 countries will be identified using specific criteria (to be developed during the inception phase). The sample will include a mix of countries from various contexts including middle-income and fragile countries.

- From among the sample countries, a sub-sample of six countries will be selected for detailed data gathering and analysis as per the evaluation questions. These countries will represent a mix of programme contexts and successful/less successful experiences. Data collection from these countries will involve field visits (2 weeks max) by 1-2 team members using a detailed case study design approach. The team could be supported by 1-2 national consultants per case study country which would contribute to use of local expertise and evaluation capacity development.

The evaluation will use a mix of qualitative and quantitative data and analytical methods. This will include use of relevant approaches to analysing systems, their strengths and gaps and UNICEF’s role/contribution as an innovator. Specific methods and tools will be identified during the inception phase.

---

15 The proposed methodology is based on internal scoping and experience in designing similar evaluations. There will be a need to develop a detailed design, analytical methods and tools during the inception phase based on additional literature review and consultation.
DATA SOURCES

The evaluation will use robust, yet practical and innovative approaches to gather and analyze a variety of data from primary and secondary sources.

DESK REVIEW OF SECONDARY DATA AND DOCUMENTS

A list of relevant materials with links to electronic copies will be shared with the evaluation team during the inception phase. In addition, the team will be provided with survey data that are readily available from various sources, including UNICEF’s recent report “Hidden in Plain Sight”. 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 plan. Desk review and analysis will continue into the report-writing phase.

INTERVIEWS WITH KEY INFORMANTS

Interviews will be conducted at several levels and phases. A few external experts and stakeholders and key staff from HQ divisions and selected ROs and COs will be interviewed during the inception phase. In the implementation phase, interviews will be conducted with additional experts and staff including local level personnel involved in managing and supporting UNICEF 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, and programme managers and advisors at various levels. Interviews will also be held with staff of other UN agencies and organizations that contribute to and partner in relevant sectors at global or national levels.

FIELD OBSERVATION AND FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSIONS (CASE STUDY COUNTRIES)

The evaluation team will gather considerable quantitative and qualitative information through field visits and focus group discussions during the visit to the case study countries. Interviews and/or focus group discussions will be held with selected UNICEF/UN staff, programme participants, service providers, and decision-/policy-makers. Children and community members will be involved in focus group discussions and other approaches used in the evaluation, as appropriate. When organizing field visits and interviews, attention will be given to ensure gender balance and representation of all population groups. The analysis findings from the case study countries and the desk review countries will provide the substantive content for distilling synthesised findings for the main evaluation report.

USE OF QUESTIONNAIRE-BASED SURVEYS

It is expected that some of the data required for the evaluation will be gathered through use of electronic web-based survey. A broad-based survey of UNICEF staff and/or key external stakeholders could be designed. The other option is to send a questionnaire to UNICEF country offices in the sample (24) countries to provide readily available secondary data to respond to certain sub-questions/indicators within the scope of the evaluation. The technical submission is expected to propose such surveys, as well as indicate their broad scope and timing. The exact type and scope of the survey(s) will be determined during the inception phase. The evaluation team is expected to be familiar with electronic survey tools for yielding credible data under time and budget constraints.

Triangulation of data/findings from various sources. As noted above, the evaluation will use a mix of quantitative and qualitative data and information which will be determined during the inception phase. It will make selective use of triangulation to validate data and findings from various sources as this is a common approach in mixed-methods evaluations.
6. MANAGEMENT AND CONDUCT OF THE EVALUATION

EVALUATION MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE

The evaluation will be conducted by an external evaluation team to be recruited by UNICEF’s Evaluation Office (EO). The evaluation team will operate under the supervision of a dual-tiered evaluation management and oversight structure. Direct supervision is provided by a senior evaluation specialist at the EO, supported by an evaluation specialist. The Evaluation Office will be responsible for the day-to-day oversight and management of the evaluation and for management of the evaluation budget. It will assure the quality and independence of the evaluation and guarantee its alignment with UNEG norms and standards and ethical guidelines, provide quality assurance, checking that the evaluation findings and conclusions are relevant and recommendations are implementable, and contribute to the dissemination of the evaluation findings and follow-up on the management response.

The advisory organ for the evaluation is the Evaluation Advisory Group (EAG), bringing together a mix of UNICEF managers, advisors and external experts (to be confirmed) from among the key stakeholders. The EAG will be chaired by the EO Director (co-chaired by the evaluation manager) and will have the following role: a) contribute to the conceptualization, preparation, and design of the evaluation including providing feedback on the draft terms of reference, feedback and comments on the inception report and on the technical quality of the work of the consultants; b) provide comments and substantive feedback to ensure the quality of the draft and final evaluation reports; c) assist in identifying UNICEF staff and external stakeholders to be consulted during the evaluation process; d) participate in review meetings organised by the EO and with the evaluation team as required; e) play a key role in learning and knowledge sharing from the evaluation results, contributing to disseminating the findings of the evaluation and follow-up on the implementation of the management response.

EVALUATION TEAM PROFILE

The evaluation will be conducted by an institution. The proposed team consists of 3-4 senior-level consultants (team leader and 2-3 technical experts) who will have complementary expertise in the areas of evaluation and child protection (or related fields). It is desirable that at least two of the evaluators have a strong systems background (relating to systems with considerable human components even if this comes from other related backgrounds, e.g. health, education, social protection). The ideal consultants would have previously conducted major evaluations and/or applied research work in the area of child protection and/or social protection systems. To avoid conflict of interest, the team leader and members should not have been involved in designing and implementing child protection systems-strengthening work for UNICEF over the period evaluated. The evaluation experts will be supported by two more junior professionals: a research assistant and a data analyst. The team is expected to be balanced in terms of gender and geographic origin.

A TEAM LEADER (AT P5/D1 LEVEL) WITH THE FOLLOWING CREDENTIALS

- Strong team leadership and management track record and commitment to delivering timely and high-quality evaluation report;
- Extensive evaluation expertise (at least 10 years) of comprehensive scope with strong mixed-methods evaluation skills and flexibility in using non-traditional and innovative evaluation methods;
- Familiarity with UNICEF’s programming, policy and advocacy work and experience in evaluating multi-sectoral initiatives would be an asset;
- Background in child protection issues including sound knowledge of system aspects (theory and methodologies) or familiarity with systems thinking in other sectors, particularly health, education and social protection would be an asset;
- Knowledge of the UN’s human rights, gender equality and equity agendas and experience in applying these to evaluation;
• Good interpersonal and communication skills; ability to interact with various stakeholders and to concisely express ideas and concepts in written and oral form;
• Language proficiency: Fluency in English is mandatory; good command of French is desirable.

TEAM MEMBERS (2-3 EVALUATION / RESEARCH EXPERTS WITH THE FOLLOWING BACKGROUND)
• Significant experience in evaluation and/or policy research with background in child protection or related areas such as social protection (at least 5 years relevant experience);
• Experience in evaluating multi-sectoral programmes or initiatives and knowledge of systems approaches to evaluation;
• Experience in involving children (adolescents) and caregivers/ community members as a target group in conducting an evaluation;
• Strong conceptualization, analytical and writing skills and ability to work effectively in a team;
• Hands-on experience in collecting and analysing quantitative and qualitative data and their presentation by using infographics;
• Knowledge of the UN’s human rights, gender equality and equity agendas and application in evaluation;
• Commitment and willingness to work in a challenging environment and ability to produce quality work under limited guidance and supervision;
• Good communication and people skills; ability to communicate with various stakeholders and to express ideas and concepts concisely and clearly in written and oral form;
• Language proficiency: Fluency in English is mandatory; good command of French and/or Spanish is desirable.

RESEARCH ASSISTANT (1)
• At least 3 years of progressively responsible experience in both qualitative and quantitative data analysis;
• Experience in supporting senior evaluators in ensuring use of consistent interview protocols, templates for recording and reporting on interviews, standard case study report formats and a comparative table of findings;
• Familiarity with child protection related issues an advantage.

DATA ANALYST (1)
• At least 3 years of experience in knowledge management for evaluation, information technology and data management, use of infographics in report preparation;
• Expertise in handling collaborate teamwork software, online surveys, document repositories, bibliography software and databases;
• Commitment to handling back-office support and logistics as needed.

It is envisaged that the international team would be supported by 1-2 national consultants per case study country (to be recruited by the contracted institution) as that would reduce cost burden and also build local research/evaluation capacity. The national consultants will support the team members in various types of data collection and enumeration as per the orientation provided by the evaluation team members (experts).

EVALUATION PHASES AND DELIVERABLES

INCEPTION PHASE
A detailed evaluation methodology including a detailed evaluation framework will be developed based on further consultation, document review and exploration of possible approaches that will yield credible and timely evidence. The inception report will:
• Present the final set of evaluation questions and sub-questions within the proposed scope of the evaluation.
• Specify the detailed design of the evaluation, the tools (including methods and tools to assess child protection systems) that will be used for data collection and the analytical methods that will be used to respond to the evaluation questions.
• Detail the framework for analysing and synthesizing data collected from various sources including use of triangulation.
• Confirm the selection of countries for the desk review and case studies and formulate precise specifications of the scope and design of country case studies (including data collection methods and analysis).
• Present a detailed work plan, specifying the organization and time schedule for the evaluation process including country visits, analysis and report preparation.
• Present the approach to be used for quality assurance throughout the evaluation including of the country case study reports.

The deliverable for this phase will be a PowerPoint presentation, inception report with a summary and annexes. The inception report will provide the foundation for the rest of the evaluation. Accordingly, the evaluation will proceed to the next phase only after successful completion of the inception phase and approval of the inception report.

DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS PHASE

Data collection will start as part of the inception phase and continue through the field visits to the case study countries and interviews with various stakeholders. Detailed data collection and analysis plans will need to be developed for the desk review report, the case study reports and the synthesis report. Secondary data from various surveys and reports will constitute a key data source for the evaluation. Field visits to case study countries will be planned systematically in consultation with UNICEF CO counterparts. Briefing and debriefing meetings will be held with national reference groups which will be constituted in each of the participating countries.

Key deliverables for this phase will be the desk review report and the country case study reports.

FINAL DATA ANALYSIS AND REPORTING PHASE

The findings from the desk review and the country case studies will constitute the main data source for the synthesis report. Additional data gathered from the global and regional levels including interviews with non-UNICEF stakeholders will be used for preparing the final synthesis report. The draft synthesis report will be presented to the EAG for comments. The final synthesis report will be prepared, responding to comments provided on the draft report.

The final deliverable from this phase includes a detailed summary of evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations, a PowerPoint presentation, and the final evaluation report with an executive summary and annexes.

DISSEMINATION AND FOLLOW-UP PHASE

The EO and the EAG will develop a dissemination strategy and plan for the evaluation. This will include the provision of a management response which is mandatory for such evaluations. The evaluation team will be invited to present findings in a major dissemination workshop which will be organized after the completion of the evaluation.
2 CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK FOR CHILD PROTECTION SYSTEMS STRENGTHENING

2.1. Definition and Elements of a Child Protection System

(This information was hyperlinked to the two online surveys and sent to some key informants prior to their interviews)

In preparing for the global evaluation, key UNICEF stakeholders agreed to use the following definition of a child protection system:

A CP system can be defined as: Certain formal and informal structures, functions and capacities that have been assembled to prevent and respond to violence, abuse, neglect and exploitation of children. A CP system is generally agreed to be comprised of the following components: human resources, finance, laws and policies, governance, monitoring and data collection as well as protection and response services and care management. It also includes different actors – children, families, communities, those working at subnational or national level and those working internationally. Most important are the relationships and interactions between and among these components and these actors within the system. It is the outcomes of these interactions that comprise the system.16

To be fully functional, six elements need to be present in a child protection system.17 The first three are core components of the system and the latter three are key requirements to their functioning:

1. **A robust legal and regulatory framework, as well as specific policies related to child protection**
   This includes regulations and standards compliant with the Convention on the Rights of the Child, other international standards and good practices.

2. **Effective governance structures, including coordination across government departments, between levels of decentralization and between formal and informal actors**
   Mechanisms must be in place to actualize the relationships between system components and actors, which may include those within the child protection sector and in different sectors at the same level or different levels working together to protect children. Equally important to ensure that timely and adequate resources are available for the system actors to act responsively.

3. **A continuum of services (spanning prevention and response)**
   A well-functioning system must have preventive, early intervention and responsive services (including integration with justice/legal sector, education, health, welfare) delivered by involving formal and informal sectors, including a process of care which includes identification, referral, follow-up, response, etc.

16 “A Better Way to Protect ALL Children: The theory and practice of child protection systems”.
17 UNICEF Child Protection Resource Pack. The sixth element (social participation) was added in consultation with the Associate Director, Programme Division, and the Evaluation Advisory Group to reflect recent changes in thinking about CP systems.
4. **Minimum standards and oversight (information, monitoring and accountability mechanisms)**
   A child protection system must be accountable. Policy development, advocacy work and programming should be built on evidence-based information (research, data collection, etc.). Information systems that support case management, performance monitoring, and scale up.

5. **Human, financial and infrastructure resources**
   Effective resource management must be in place, such as enough skilled workers in the right places, adequate budget allocations, effective training and appropriate infrastructure (from vehicles to meeting rooms).

6. **Social participation, including respect for children’s own views, and an aware and supportive public**
   Communities, families and peers play a crucial role in promoting protective social practices and children’s empowerment. Access to civic education and to mechanisms that give adolescents a voice in decision-making make them more resilient to violence, abuse, neglect, and exploitation.

The following diagram is a graphic representation of the actors, contexts and components constituting the core of a Child Protection System.\(^{18}\)

### 2.2. Key UNICEF Interventions to Strengthen Child Protection Systems

(Source: CP Section/EO workshop 15 May 2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essential CP systems element</th>
<th>Key UNICEF interventions to strengthen the systems element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A robust legal and regulatory framework, as well as specific policies related to child protection</td>
<td>Advocacy and strategic/technical guidance towards national laws, regulations and policies that are compliant with the CRC and other human rights instruments, evidence based, and informed by international good practices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Effective governance structures, including coordination across government departments, between levels of decentralization and between formal and informal actors | • Advocacy and technical support for setting up and running national CP coordination structures (e.g. inter-ministerial committees); ensuring the participation of the justice and law enforcement sectors in those structures and ensuing actions.  
• Advocacy and technical support for incorporating systems strengthening interventions within “issue-driven” coordination bodies.  
• Technical and financial support to set up case management and information management systems, for use by all systems actors regardless of degree of formality and centralization/decentralization. |
| A continuum of services (spanning prevention and response) | Support to specific tertiary (and secondary) government prevention and response services for children who have experienced (or at risk of) violence, exploitation or abuse and those without parental care, depending on context:  
• Support to response services (delivery structures and capacities):  
  o Institutions: Shelters, daycares, etc.  
  o Processes: SOPs, referral mechanisms  
  o People: capacity development for CP professionals  
• Support to prevention services:  
  o Parenting programmes  
  o Communication for behaviour change |
| Minimum standards and oversight (information, monitoring and accountability mechanisms) | Advocacy and technical assistance to  
• setting up independent oversight and accountability structures and mechanisms, e.g. national ombudspersons, human rights/child rights tribunals  
• governments to establish clear accountability and oversight systems within their own system, e.g. through hiring child protection experts, setting up inspection units, management information systems and quality assurance systems |
| Human, financial and infrastructure resources | Advocacy, technical and financial assistance to establish CP cadres/posts that require professionals with certain qualification (social service workforce strengthening), e.g. through  
• operational guidance to legislation which specifies the roles of personnel, and associated qualifications;  
• direct capacity development actions such as CP curriculum development for police academies, JD development for MI/MJ, in-service training for social service workforce and parapsychologists, etc.  
Advocating for donor support for CP systems strengthening. |
| Social participation, including respect for children's own views, and an aware and supportive public | Advocacy and technical support for ensuring participation of children and adolescents based on evolving capacities and age – particularly from the point of seeking children’s own views (GC 14), e.g.  
• policy, legal development,  
• case management practices/protocols  
• management of own case (best interest determination)  
Promoting community engagement to protect children from violence, exploitation and abuse (link with prevention, outcome 3)  
Justice for children. |
3.3. Rating System to Assess Progress Towards Child Protection Systems Strengthening

(This rating system was used to assess “effectiveness” in the six in-depth country case studies as well as in the final evaluation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating Scale</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No progress</td>
<td>UNICEF contributions have not yet led to any identifiable progress towards the outcome. In principle, even if all outputs have been achieved, there may be no progress towards the outcome, if broader supporting factors are not present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited Progress</td>
<td>UNICEF has contributed to a low level of progress towards the outcome, a level which appears unlikely to be sufficiently sustained or scaled up to lead towards its realization in the foreseeable future. In principle, even if outputs have been achieved, there may be a low level of progress towards the outcome, if broader supporting factors are not present. Compared with a No Progress score, some factors can be identified that suggest progress, but this is not sufficient to predict that the outcome can be reached in the foreseeable future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Progress</td>
<td>UNICEF has contributed to a verifiable level of progress towards the outcome, at a level which shows some possibility of being sufficiently sustained or scaled up to lead towards the outcome. In principle, even if outputs have been achieved, there may still be a moderate level progress towards the outcome, if broader supporting factors are only weakly present. Compared with lower scores, several factors can be identified that suggest progress, with a possibility that the outcome can be reached in the foreseeable future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong Progress</td>
<td>UNICEF has contributed to a level of progress which looks likely to be sustained or scaled up in a definite movement towards the outcome. Outputs have been achieved and the national child protection environment is sufficiently supportive to suggest that the outcome could be attained in the foreseeable future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>UNICEF has contributed towards verified attainment of the intermediate outcome, for which all requirements have been met.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# 3 EVALUATION MATRIX

## Global and Regional Level Questions

### Evaluation Criteria: Effectiveness, Coherence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Question</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Data Collection Methods</th>
<th>Data Analysis Methods</th>
<th>Potential Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: How effective is UNICEF in global leadership and leveraging of partnerships that strengthen child protection systems?</td>
<td>Global, regional, country level strategic planning documents and reports. (HQ, RO, CO). Key UNICEF and non-UNICEF stakeholders' perceptions. Academic publications and conference reports produced or supported by UNICEF. Non-academic CPSS-related research produced by UNICEF at all three levels. Evidence of convening different groups related to CPSS (conferences, events, including online such as webinars, online gateway). Literature on CPS from international development community and academia citing UNICEF contribution, meeting minutes, outputs, conference presentations.</td>
<td>Key informant interviews (KIIs), in person or remote, with UNICEF global, regional and CO stakeholders. KIIs with stakeholders in international development community and institutions engaged in child protection systems. Review of CPSS-related documents. Country case studies. KIIs with national stakeholders in country case studies. Desk review, surveys and questionnaires.</td>
<td>Content analysis of interviews. Content analysis of documents using common template. Meta-analysis of existing evaluations and reviews. Theory–based analysis of actual vs. intended progress towards results and influencing factors. Descriptive statistics of survey data. Triangulation of evidence from different data sources.</td>
<td>UNICEF is convenor, coordinator or key contributor to relevant global, regional and national CPSS-related events. UNICEF is active participant in and contributor to global and regional CPSS-related networks. External and internal stakeholders' perception that UNICEF is a leader and convenor for CPSS-related activities and programmes. Partnerships and networks have been created at all levels (global, regional, national, sub-national) and across sectors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: How appropriate, adequate, and coherent are UNICEF global strategies, planned results and guidance documents for strengthening child protection systems?</td>
<td>Strategic planning documents; HQ: MTSP 2006-2013, SP 2014-2017, SP 2017-2021, and annexes (results frameworks, ToC, integrated budget, etc.), mid-term reviews of the SPs, etc.; ROs: Regional strategies, results frameworks, etc.; COs: Country Programme Documents, Programme Strategy Notes, results frameworks, etc. UNICEF global,</td>
<td>Review of CPSS-related strategic documents. UNICEF global, regional and CO KIIs. KIIs (national stakeholders). Online surveys and questionnaires.</td>
<td>Content analysis of documents using common template. Meta-analysis of existing evaluations and reviews. Content analysis of interview data. Descriptive statistics of survey data. Triangulation of evidence from different data sources.</td>
<td>UNICEF, governments, other duty-bearers and counterparts, and implementing partners share a common understanding of the systems approach to child protection. Stakeholders have shared vision on longer-term goals, boundaries, complexities, possible pathways to success, responsibilities and financial commitment involved to maintain a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question</td>
<td>Data Sources</td>
<td>Data Collection Methods</td>
<td>Data Analysis Methods</td>
<td>Potential Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: How effective is UNICEF’s regional leadership, guidance/support and</td>
<td>Regional and country level guidance documents, reports. Key stakeholders’</td>
<td>UNICEF regional and country-level KIs.</td>
<td>Content analysis of interviews.</td>
<td>well-functioning CP systems. UNICEF programmes are considered to be aligned or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supporting and leveraging role in helping to strengthen child protection</td>
<td>perceptions. Meeting minutes, websites, and other evidence from various (sub)</td>
<td>Review of CPSS-related documents produced at the regional level. Online surveys and</td>
<td>Content analysis of documents using common template. Meta-analysis of existing</td>
<td>coordinated with other sectoral systems. CPS guidance is considered coherent,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>systems at the national level?</td>
<td>regional CPS-related events and groups. Regional CPSS-related research</td>
<td>questionnaires.</td>
<td>evaluations and reviews. Theory–based analysis of actual vs. intended progress</td>
<td>relevant to different contexts, resilient and adaptive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>efforts and publications. Observations from RO visits.</td>
<td></td>
<td>towards results and influencing factors. Descriptive statistics of survey data.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Triangulation of evidence from different data sources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: How adequately has UNICEF contributed to: Global efforts in generating</td>
<td>Global, regional, country level strategic planning, results-reporting,</td>
<td>UNICEF HQ, regional and CO KIs. Review of CPSS-related documents produced at all three</td>
<td>Content analysis of interviews.</td>
<td>An increasing body of expert literature, analyses, tools, guidelines and data on all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and sharing relevant research knowledge/evidence; data collection and</td>
<td>expenditure and monitoring documents. Key UNICEF and non-UNICEF stakeholder</td>
<td>levels. Skype interviews with non-UNICEF key informants (researchers, experts,</td>
<td>Content analysis of documents using common template. Meta-analysis of existing</td>
<td>aspects of CPSS is made available both within the organization and for non-UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>analysis of CPSS; and monitoring and evaluation of the processes and results</td>
<td>perceptions. Academic and conference-related reports and research. Research</td>
<td>representatives of other CP actors). Online surveys and questionnaires.</td>
<td>evaluations and reviews. Theory–based analysis of actual vs. intended progress</td>
<td>stakeholders. Research is well grounded in practical experience and fed back into</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achieved by child protection systems?</td>
<td>produced by UNICEF at all three levels. Evidence of convening different</td>
<td></td>
<td>towards results and influencing factors. Descriptive statistics of survey data.</td>
<td>the organization in an accessible way. Online materials are regularly updated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>groups related to CPSS (global)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Triangulation of evidence from different data sources.</td>
<td>including relevant and practical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question</td>
<td>Data Sources</td>
<td>Data Collection Methods</td>
<td>Data Analysis Methods</td>
<td>Potential Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Questions</td>
<td>conferences, events, including online events such as webinars. Contributions to and use of online knowledge gateways. In-country observations.</td>
<td>Key UNICEF stakeholders' perceptions at HQ, regional and particularly at the national level. Global, regional and country level reports with particular relevance for financial reporting and staffing processes. Reports on CPSS-related programming including financial and staffing aspects. In-country observations. SMQs, COARs, expenditure reporting.</td>
<td>Content analysis of interviews. Content analysis of documents using common template. Meta-analysis of existing evaluations and reviews. Theory-based analysis of actual vs intended progress towards results and influencing factors. Statistical analysis. Triangulation of evidence from different data sources.</td>
<td>Innovations and developments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question</td>
<td>Data Sources</td>
<td>Data Collection Methods</td>
<td>Data Analysis Methods</td>
<td>Potential Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7: How successful has UNICEF been in initiating, supporting and advocating</td>
<td>Key UNICEF stakeholders, particularly at the national level. Desk review of CO</td>
<td>Document review. KIs - UNICEF (country). KIs – Government and implementing partners.</td>
<td>Qualitative comparative analysis. Content analysis of interviews. Content analysis of</td>
<td>Evidence of increasing national resources devoted to CPSS, or of protection of CPSS in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for systems reform? Where/how have funds been allocated? To what extent has</td>
<td>reports and documentation related to CPSS. Non-UNICEF informants (CPS</td>
<td>KIs and FGDs with civil society and community stakeholders and/or adolescents. Online</td>
<td>documents using common template. Meta-analysis of existing evaluations and reviews.</td>
<td>case of declining government budgets. Strength of documented government commitment to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF been able to take a leadership role in generating partnerships and in</td>
<td>stakeholders, representatives of other sectors (education, health, social</td>
<td>surveys and questionnaires. Data collation for QCA according to common template.</td>
<td>Theory–based analysis of actual vs. intended progress towards results and influencing</td>
<td>resource CPS. Explicit national budgeting of CPSS from range of government agencies and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leveraging national government and partner resources?</td>
<td>services, humanitarian agencies, etc.). In-country observations.</td>
<td></td>
<td>factors. Descriptive statistics of survey data. Triangulation of evidence from</td>
<td>of external partnerships with civil society to supplement statutory programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stakeholder perceptions. Service providers’ perceptions. Evidence of</td>
<td></td>
<td>different data sources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strengthened national CP policies and implementation systems to prevent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and respond to violence, abuse,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8: How effective are UNICEF country programmes, in terms of prevention and</td>
<td>Key UNICEF stakeholders, particularly at the national level. Desk review of CO</td>
<td>Document review. KIs - UNICEF (country). KIs – Government and implementing partners.</td>
<td>Qualitative comparative analysis. Content analysis of interviews. Content analysis of</td>
<td>Outcome level: Evidence of increased national capacity to manage CPSS as per the six</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>response, in achieving concrete results for protecting children (outcomes)</td>
<td>reports and documentation related to CPSS. Non-UNICEF informants (CPS</td>
<td>KIs and FGDs with civil society and community stakeholders and/or adolescents. Online</td>
<td>documents using common template. Meta-analysis of existing evaluations and reviews.</td>
<td>dimensions. Impact level: National reports and statistics show improved services and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>through strengthened child protection systems?</td>
<td>stakeholders, representatives of other sectors [education, health, social</td>
<td>surveys and questionnaires. Data collation for QCA according to common template.</td>
<td>Theory-based analysis of actual vs. intended progress towards results and influencing</td>
<td>coverage, with more children better protected. Vulnerable children better incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>services, humanitarian, etc.]). In-country observations.</td>
<td></td>
<td>factors. Descriptive statistics of survey data. Triangulation of evidence from</td>
<td>into national CPS, with reduction in recorded cases of unprotected children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stakeholder perceptions. Service providers’ perceptions. Evidence of</td>
<td></td>
<td>different data sources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strengthened national CP policies and implementation systems to prevent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and respond to violence, abuse,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Key Question

**9: To what extent have sustainability considerations (technical, financial, institutional) been integrated in CPS-related programme design and implementation phases by UNICEF?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Question</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Data Collection Methods</th>
<th>Data Analysis Methods</th>
<th>Potential Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Participation, Equity and Gender Equality Question

**10: To what extent do national programmes supported by UNICEF and related to child protection systems-strengthening a) engage with boys and girls of different ages, especially those considered particularly vulnerable, marginalized and from minority groups and b) take into account and respond to their specific protection-related needs?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Question</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Data Collection Methods</th>
<th>Data Analysis Methods</th>
<th>Potential Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


United Nations, Committee on the Rights of the Child on the right of the child to freedom from all forms of violence, General Comment No. 13 (2011), CRC/C/GC/13 of April 18, 2011.


## 5 KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Analysis</th>
<th>Category of Organization</th>
<th>Number of persons interviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Global</strong></td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other UN</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bilaterals</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional</strong></td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government representatives</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côte d’Ivoire</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government representatives</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other civil society</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adolescents</td>
<td>2 focus groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other UN</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government representatives</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adolescents</td>
<td>2 focus groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bilaterals</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government representatives</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other UN</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government representatives</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adolescents</td>
<td>2 focus groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government representatives</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other UN</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government representatives</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other civil society</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government representatives</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Analysis</td>
<td>Category of Organization</td>
<td>Number of persons interviewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>Government representatives</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other UN</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government representatives</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bilaterals</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adolescents</td>
<td>4 focus groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6 CASE STUDY SAMPLING PROCESS

Criteria for case study sample selection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional representation</td>
<td>A maximum of four cases in total per UNICEF region, with one country of combined mission per region (except CEE/CIS).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme size</td>
<td>Include some of the biggest country programmes, through combined, country, or desk plus remote case studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development context</td>
<td>Include a mix of Least-Developed Countries (LDCs), upper- and lower-middle-income countries (MICs), and countries in fragile situations. Consider special development conditions (small island developing states) and major emerging national economies (BRICS).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming context</td>
<td>Include different levels of programme maturity, as identified through key performance indicator (KPI) and strategic monitoring question (SMQ) ratings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder information needs</td>
<td>Exclude, as mission countries, countries that were covered by the in-depth case studies in the 2015 VAC evaluation (Bangladesh, Ghana, Tanzania, Mexico), those recently/currently undergoing complementary reviews (Indonesia, Bhutan, Maldives, Nepal and Pakistan), and countries already well covered by other studies and evaluations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation fatigue</td>
<td>Avoid countries where COs are already receiving two or more missions in 2017 related to other EO-commissioned evaluations (Bolivia and Ethiopia).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security issues</td>
<td>Avoid countries for which travel would require special clearance from the Designated Official (Afghanistan, Cameroun, Colombia, Democratic Republic of Congo, Haiti, Iraq, Israel/West Bank/Gaza, Libya, Mali, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, South Sudan, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Ukraine, Yemen).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table above shows the number of countries selected for each of the positive criteria (i.e. the criteria that specify the inclusion, as opposed to exclusion, of countries in certain categories).

Table on Number of sample countries by criterion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th># of countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America and Caribbean (LAC)</td>
<td>3 (+1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central and Eastern Europe (CEE/CIS)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td># of countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asia and the Pacific (EAP)</td>
<td>4 (+1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern and Southern Africa (ESA)</td>
<td>4 (+1^19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East and North Africa (MENA)</td>
<td>3 (+1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asia (SA)</td>
<td>3 (+1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West and Central Africa (WCA)</td>
<td>3 (+1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Typology**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typology</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper-Middle Income</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower-Middle Income</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income/LDC</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragile States</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRICS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Offices**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offices</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country offices</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional offices</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Joint programmes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Joint programmes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joint Programmes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Case study types**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case study types</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Combined (RO + CO)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Mission</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk review and remote interviews</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk review</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^19 The regional office based in Kenya (ESARO) was visited but Kenya was not counted as a case study country.
7 DATA COLLECTION TOOLS

7.1. Interview protocols

Face-to-face, group and remote interviews with key stakeholders were based on qualitative, open-ended questions; that is, respondents provided responses in their own words. This provided in-depth information about their perceptions, insights, attitudes, experiences or beliefs regarding CPS.

Evaluators asked the same questions of different individuals or informant categories to compare their responses and analyse how the differences reflected on the issue discussed.

The items included in this interview checklist are exhaustive and generic. The list was intended to help the evaluators develop semi-structured interviews and was therefore adapted depending on each country context and CPS implementation pattern; the position and engagement with CPS of the respondent; and the results of previous interviews with other stakeholders, in order to help focus each interview.

I. Example of introduction to the interview

Thank you for participating in this interview. My name is <insert name>. I am one of the consultants conducting the Strengthening CPS Evaluation on behalf of Baastel, the firm selected by UNICEF to conduct the evaluation.

The purpose of this interview is to help us better understand the CPS, its results and effects in <specify name of the country>. In order to do so, I would like you to answer some questions based on your experience and perspective as a stakeholder in the CPS.

UNICEF’s Evaluation Office has commissioned this formative evaluation to examine UNICEF’s leadership role, strategies and programme performance to strengthen child protection systems. Your participation in this interview is entirely voluntary. Your name will not be associated with your responses. Whether or not you decide to participate and what you tell us will not affect your continued employment or future funding from UNICEF in any way. You are free to decline to answer any question, or to stop the interview at any time without penalty. We feel that your participation will not incur any risks, nor will there be any direct benefits to you other than helping UNICEF. Your participation will take about HOURS/MINUTES. If you have any questions or concerns, please contact NAME at NUMBER.

Do you have any questions before we begin?

Can you tell me a bit about any past postings or experiences, within or outside UNICEF, that allow you to reflect on different child protection systems, their development and any lessons learned from other countries and regions?

II. Evaluation topics to be addressed, depending on specific position and profile of the respondent.

(Note: not every respondent was asked questions in every area. Each interview was tailored to cover areas about which the respondent was expected to have experience and knowledge.)

Appropriateness of global strategies and guidance on strengthening child protection systems

- How useful and adequate are the UNICEF global strategies and guidance documents for strengthening child protection systems? In what ways?

- Are there other approaches to child protection system which should inform UNICEF’s strategies, plan and guidance?

Relevance and appropriateness of Country Programme Strategies and Plans
To what extent is child protection system strengthening reflected in country programme documents as per country specific needs, development plans and priorities?

How well-tailored and appropriate is UNICEF’s approach to strengthening child protection systems in specific contexts (fragile countries; least developed countries; middle income countries).

Effectiveness of UNICEF Country Programmes in contributing to strengthening National CPS

To what extent are UNICEF country programmes achieving or contributing towards results for protecting children (outputs and where possible outcomes) through strengthened child protection systems, considering both prevention and service delivery aspects?

- Have some strategies and interventions demonstrated particularly strong contributions results (outputs and outcomes)?

- What are UNICEF’s main contributions and how well do they match with the planned results?

Has UNICEF supported any national models for the coordination of child protection systems that have proved particularly effective in building on the benefits of approaches with varying degrees of formality?

What has worked (or not) in sub-national/local level modelling and scale up of child protection/case management systems and in promoting community awareness and parental care and support?

What are the lessons learned from capacity building of the justice/legal and social sectors (health, education, welfare) in various contexts?

How successful has UNICEF been in promoting budget opportunities and leveraging existing resources for child protection systems and what have been the key experiences/lessons in leveraging national government and partner resources (upstream work and budget allocations)?

What are the key conditions and enabling factors that are crucial for success?

What is it that UNICEF should not promote/undertake in the name of child protection system strengthening?

Leadership, leveraging and partnerships

How effective is UNICEF in global leadership and leveraging of partnerships to strengthen child protection systems?

How effective is UNICEF’s regional leadership, guidance/support and leveraging role?

Participation and gender equality

How adequate are the global frameworks and guidance with regard to:

- the participation of children in shaping child protection systems and

- gender responsiveness of these systems?

In strengthening child protection systems, to what extent do country programmes engage with and respond to specific protection related needs of boys and girls?

How has UNICEF advocated and influenced the development of child protection systems that are more responsive and flexible with respect to the needs of specific population groups (i.e. children with disabilities, migrant children, children affected by AIDS, etc.) that are considered to be particularly vulnerable?

Are there any concrete results being achieved through models that involve children and families that can be highlighted for replication in certain contexts?
Sustainability and scale-up

- To what extent have sustainability considerations (technical, financial, institutional) been integrated in programme design and implementation phases by UNICEF and its counterparts?
  - How adequate is UNICEF’s approach and contribution with respect to direct support, upstream work and creation of enabling environments (including national ownership/institutional development and national budget allocations) that are necessary for sustainability and scale up?
  - Are there any particular risks related to the sustainability of gains achieved in establishing responsive child protection systems?

- To what extent has UNICEF contributed to enhancing emergency preparedness and strengthening the positive protective factors present at all levels of the system, formal and informal?
- To what extent have resilience-building strategies been integrated within the CP systems and preparedness plans?

Knowledge/data generation, assessment and use

- How adequately has UNICEF contributed to global efforts in generating and sharing relevant research knowledge/evidence, to data collection and analysis of CP systems strengthening and to monitoring and evaluation of the processes and results achieved by child protection systems?

- How has UNICEF measured the outcomes and impacts of the investment made in CPS?

Management/Operations

- How well has UNICEF allocated and managed human and financial resources for addressing child protection and for system strengthening?
- Are the key gaps that need to be addressed for CP system strengthening?
- How adequate and efficient is UNICEF’s internal coordination including integration and convergence of various programme components / sectors to address child protection?
- To what extent is UNICEF’s staff capacity adequate for providing leadership, advocacy and technical guidance/support at various levels of the organization and across all programme settings?

- What factors drive or constrain effective organizational performance?

- What needs to be done to address gaps, if any, in staff/institutional capacity for fulfilling the lead role UNICEF is expected to play at the field level toward well-functioning child protections systems?

7.2. Focus group discussions

PARENTAL CONSENT FORM FOR CHILD’S RESEARCH PARTICIPATION

Research Initiative: STRENGTHENING CHILD PROTECTION SYSTEMS: A COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION OF UNICEF’S STRATEGIES AND PROGRAMME PERFORMANCE

ADOLESCENT PARTICIPATION COMPONENT

1. Principal Investigator: -------- and --------------
Your child is being asked to take part in a group discussion as part of an evaluation of UNICEF’s work in country X. This form has important information about the reason for doing this evaluation, what we will ask your child and the way we will use information from your child if you choose to allow your child to participate.

2. Why are we doing focus group discussions with adolescents?
Your child is being asked to participate as a member of the (NGO X Programme or service) in a focus group discussion about this programme/service as a child protection measure. NGO X is a partner organization supported by UNICEF. The focus group discussion will encourage adolescent participants in programme/service to share their points of view about the relevance and effectiveness of these programmes/services within their communities.

3. What will my child be asked to do if my child is in this study?
Your child will be asked to respond to a series of questions or come up with related questions of their own. They do not have to answer any question and will not be pressured to answer. The researchers will not ask any personal or sensitive questions, but enquire about their perceptions of the programmes and services that they are involved in, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adolescent-Participation Evaluation Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there relevant and appropriate services or programmes available in my community (or nearby) to protect adolescent girls and boys from violence, exploitation mistreatment and abuse?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What issues do you or your friends face in your community that related to the services provided here?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Do adolescents you know feel safe/secure/protected in your community, if not why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What services or programmes do adolescents in your community need?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What services do they use? Why or why not?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What services are missing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the case of NGO X how effective are these services for both adolescent girls and boys...in terms of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are adolescents like you awareness of these services or programmes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Do these services help connect youth with other needed services and support? How?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Can adolescents access these services? How?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are there groups of adolescents who you know cannot access these services if they wanted to? (some examples: boys and girls, adolescents with disabilities, or adolescents from diverse ethnic/cultural groups?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What about adolescent parents and working adolescents, or other marginalized adolescent groups?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Do you think that NGO X services are helping to change or improve adolescents’ lives? If so how? If not why not?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What more is needed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How and to what extent have you, as adolescents, been involved in the design, implementation and evaluation of these services?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Which adolescents have been involved, or left out of these processes? Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Do you feel your viewpoints are upon by decision-makers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In what ways can your participation in protection services be improved?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Time and Confidentiality:
Participants should be 12-18 years of age. If deemed appropriate by NGO partners, girls and boys will participate in separate focus group discussions. Their participation should take about 60-90 minutes.

Your child’s participation will not be videotaped. The researchers will take notes that will not include their name or identity, but will include their age, gender, community and NGO affiliation only. Only the principal researchers will be able to review their comments and their identity will never be linked with the comments or perceptions that they share.
Participants will be asked to respect each other’s confidentiality by not discussing each other’s responses once they leave the focus group circle.

4. What are the possible risks to my child of participating?

To the best of our knowledge, the things your child would be asked to talk about in this focus group discussion will have no more risk of harm than the risks of everyday life. Participating in a learning activity about the value of the programmes and services they are involved in and how these connect to other social services and support systems may be positive, stimulating and empowering for your child.

On the other hand, your child may experience the following, which the researchers will endeavour to mediate:
• Your child may get tired during the session. Your child can rest/take a break at any time.
• Your child may feel emotional when answering some of the questions. Your child can tell the researcher at any time if he/she wants to take a break or stop participating. The NGO partner will have on hand a social worker/psychologist who can help your child to understand and talk about any strong feelings that arise.

5. What are the possible benefits for my child or others?

Your child will not have any material benefit from participating in the research, nor will it cost anything but their time. Participation is strictly voluntary. However, as a result of participating in an interesting discussion on issues that concern them, there may be positive benefits such as a feeling of better understanding of child protection issues and a sense of personal empowerment. This information gathered will result in recommendations to UNICEF which may be used to help other children and young people in the future.

6. How will the information collected be shared?

Results of this study will be used in a limited manner, in direct reporting and presentations to UNICEF itself and its partner organisations. We may wish to use direct quotes from your child, but your child's identify will be kept strictly confidential.

An exception to our promise of confidentiality is that we need to report evidence of child abuse, exploitation or neglect. We will not ask about child abuse, exploitation or neglect, but if your child tells us about child abuse, exploitation or neglect we will need to report that information to the appropriate authorities.

What are my child’s rights as a research participant?

Participation in this study is voluntary. Your child may withdraw from this study at any time -- you and your child will not be penalized in any way or lose any sort of benefits for deciding to stop participation.

If your child decides to withdraw from this study, the researchers ask that the information already collected from your child can be used.

Who can I contact if I have questions or concerns about this research study?

If you or your child have any questions, you may contact the researchers directly:
1. Researcher 1 (full contact information)
2. Researcher 2 (full contact information)

Parental Permission for Child’s Participation in Research

I have read this form and the research has been explained to me. I have been given the opportunity to ask questions and my questions have been answered. If I have additional questions, I have been told whom to contact. I give permission for my child to participate in the research study described above and will receive a copy of this Parental Permission form after I sign it.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent/Legal Guardian's Name (printed) and Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Person Obtaining Parental Permission</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UNICEF CPS Evaluation CO

Introduction

Dear respondent,

Welcome to this self-completion survey, which is part of the evaluation of UNICEF’s strategies and programme performance in strengthening Child Protection Systems (CPS). CPSs are defined as follows:

*Certain formal and informal structures, functions and capacities that have been assembled to prevent and respond to violence, abuse, neglect and exploitation of children. A CP system is generally agreed to be comprised of the following components: human resources, finance, laws and policies, governance, monitoring and data collection as well as protection and response services and care management. It also includes different actors – children, families, communities, those working at sub-national or national level and those working internationally. Most important are the relationships and interactions between and among these components and these actors within the system. It is the outcomes of these interactions that comprise the system.* Source: United Nations Children’s Fund, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, Save the Children and World Vision, Conference Report: ‘A Better Way to Protect ALL Children: The theory and practice of child protection systems’ (New York: UNICEF, 2013), p. 3.

We are very pleased you accepted our invitation to participate. No country will not be singled out in analysis or reporting. All data will be aggregated by region, level of development (LDC vs. MICs), size of country programme, size of CP programme or other relevant markers. Your participation will not incur any risks, nor will there be any direct benefits to you other than helping UNICEF. Your participation will take about 15 minutes.

The survey was designed and is managed by an independent team of consultants from Le Groupe-conseil Baastel, the firm contracted by UNICEF to conduct the evaluation. UNICEF Evaluation Office has reviewed and approved the questionnaire.

While answering the questions below, please note that the evaluation is focused on the last decade, with a particular interest in the period between 2012 to the present.

This questionnaire is institutional, not individual. So please answer each question based on your office’s experience. All questions refer to the country of your duty station not your home country. Please feel free to consult with relevant colleagues. Evaluating UNICEF’s CPS approach is a complex endeavour, which the evaluation team is approaching through a variety of methods. In addition to this survey, we are conducting interviews, reviewing documents, and carrying out field missions to develop country case studies. The results of this survey will complement these other methods by providing valuable quantitative data on how key stakeholders in offices like yours experience UNICEF’s approach to CPS strengthening. In addition, the evaluation team would like to stress the importance of the open-ended questions that are included in the survey along with the quantifiable “scale questions.” We strongly encourage you, on behalf of your country office, to provide explanations and detail where this opportunity is provided by the open-ended questions.
UNICEF CPS Evaluation CO

Opening questions

* 1. Which country do you work in?

* 2. What is your office's overall impression of UNICEF’s Child Protection Systems (CPS) approach (click here for more details)?

* 3. Overall, to what extent is the CPS approach integrated in the work your office does on a daily basis?

  Very integrated, it affects every aspect of our work

  Integrated

  Somewhat integrated

  Not integrated at all, we do not use the CPS approach in our work

  N/A; Do not know

Comments, details, explanations, examples of how CPS is integrated in your daily work: (optional)
UNICEF CPS Evaluation CO
Results - National

* 4. To what extent has UNICEF influenced national stakeholders to use a CPS approach in child protection work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did not influence at</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greatly influenced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influenced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat influenced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National government

National level

stakeholders (other than government)

Comments, details, explanations, examples, suggestions: (optional)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>* 5. How well-aligned is UNICEF’s global CPS approach (click here for more details) with the Child Protection objectives of the stakeholders listed below?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very aligned</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your CO

National government in the country where you work

Comments, details, explanations, examples (e.g. CO’s opinion on the alignment with the national government organizations) - Optional
* 6. How satisfied is your office with UNICEF’s contribution to global learning from the processes and results achieved by CPS?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge generation</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very dissatisfied</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge sharing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection and analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments, details, explanations: (optional)

* 7. How aligned are the UNICEF strategies and interventions listed below with the CPS objectives in the country where your CO is located?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consolidating the legal and regulatory framework</th>
<th>Very aligned</th>
<th>Aligned</th>
<th>Misaligned</th>
<th>Very misaligned</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consolidating governance/coordination structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of services (spanning prevention and response)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting/reinforcing minimum standards and oversight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidating human, financial and infrastructure resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting social participation and respect for children’s own views</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments, details, explanations, examples: (optional)
* 8. How effective is UNICEF in influencing national government to enhance its engagement and financial contribution to CPS?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
<th>Very ineffective</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engaging in CPS (including evidence of system reforms)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial contribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments, details, explanations, examples: (optional)

* 9. How effective is UNICEF in influencing other stakeholders (international and national organizations) to enhance their engagement and financial contribution to CPS?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
<th>Very ineffective</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engaging in CPS (including evidence of system reforms)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial contribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 10. Overall, how effective is UNICEF’s country programme in contributing towards the achievement of concrete CPS results for the protection of children?

- Very effective
- Effective
- Ineffective
- Very ineffective
- Do not know

Comments, details, explanations, examples at output and outcome levels, lessons learned, best practices and challenges: (optional)

* 11. What are the top three enabling environment or critical success factors for effective CPS at the country level?

* 12. What are the top three barriers or bottlenecks to effective CPS?
13. Now please consider the sustainability of CPS results over time. How well integrated are the following elements in UNICEF’s CPS programme design?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Very integrated</th>
<th>Integrated</th>
<th>Somewhat integrated</th>
<th>Not at all integrated</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National ownership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening national institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National budget allocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fostering coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify below)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. And, how well integrated are the following elements in UNICEF’s CPS programme implementation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Very integrated</th>
<th>Integrated</th>
<th>Somewhat integrated</th>
<th>Not at all integrated</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National ownership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening national institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National budget allocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fostering Coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replication, scaling up and mainstreaming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify below)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 15. To what extent do the CPS programmes your CO has supported to date engage directly with boys and girls?

  Engage a lot; Engage; Somewhat engage; Do not engage at all; Do not know
Institutional Efficiency of UNICEF

* 16. What is your office’s level of satisfaction with the balance between results achieved and the resources invested by UNICEF to address CPS?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Human resources</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very dissatisfied</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments, details, explanations: (optional)

* 17. Based on your office’s experience, does UNICEF have in place all of the institutional units necessary to support delivery of intended results in CPS?

Yes
Some units
No
Do not know

If not or only some, what else do you think is needed? You can also add details and comments: (optional)

* 18. Overall, how would you rate UNICEF’s internal coordination efforts with regard to the following aspects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Convergence of CP programme components towards a CPS</th>
<th>Very efficient</th>
<th>Efficient</th>
<th>Inefficient</th>
<th>Very inefficient</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordination across CO-RO-HQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-sectoral coordination (CP-Health-Social Protection-Education, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
* 19. To what extent does your office consider that UNICEF has integrated emergency preparedness measures where relevant across its CPS work?

Integrated a lot
Integrated
Somewhat integrated
Did not integrate at all
Do not know

Comments, details, explanations: (optional)

* 20. Consider the protection needs of different children and how UNICEF responds to them in your country. To what extent are the CPS efforts supported by your CO responsive to the different needs of girls and boys?

Very Responsive
Responsive
Somewhat Responsive
Not responsive at all
Do not know

Comments, details, explanations, examples of how CPS efforts are differentiated and adapted to the needs of boys and girls: (optional)
21. And to what extent are CPS efforts supported by your CO responsive to the different needs of children of different ages or levels of maturity (e.g. children and adolescents)?

* Very responsive
* Responsive
* Somewhat responsive
* Not responsive at all
* Do not know

Comments, details, explanations, examples of how CPS efforts are differentiated and adapted to the needs of boys and girls: (optional)

22. To what extent are CPS efforts supported by your CO addressing the needs of particularly vulnerable children?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Address a lot</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Somewhat address</th>
<th>Do not address at all</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children with disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children affected by HIV/ AIDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-nationals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify below)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. Are there any lessons learned, best practices, challenges or any other points from your office's experience with UNICEF’s work on supporting CPS that you would like to share with us?

*End - Thank you very much for responding to this survey.*
7.4. Survey for partners

UNICEF CPS Evaluation Partners
Introduction

Dear respondent,

Welcome to this self-completion survey, which is part of the evaluation of UNICEF’s strategies and programme performance in strengthening Child Protection Systems (CPS). CPSs are defined as follows:

Certain formal and informal structures, functions and capacities that have been assembled to prevent and respond to violence, abuse, neglect and exploitation of children. A CP [Child Protection] system is generally agreed to be comprised of the following components: human resources, finance, laws and policies, governance, monitoring and data collection as well as protection and response services and care management. It also includes different actors – children, families, communities, those working at sub-national or national level and those working internationally. Most important are the relationships and interactions between and among these components and these actors within the system. It is the outcomes of these interactions that comprise the system. Source: United Nations Children’s Fund, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, Save the Children and World Vision, Conference Report: ‘A Better Way to Protect ALL Children: The theory and practice of child protection systems’ (New York: UNICEF, 2013), p. 3.

We are very pleased you accepted our invitation to participate. This evaluation is of high importance as one of its main objectives is to support and accompany stakeholders - such as UNICEF staff around the world but also representatives of Government and implementing partner organizations such as yourself - in a learning process to improve CPS work and ultimately improve the quality of life for all children.

No country will be singled out in analysis or reporting. All data will be aggregated by region, level of development (LDC vs. MICs), size of the UNICEF country programme, size of CP programme or other relevant markers. Your participation will not incur any risks, nor will there be any direct benefits to you other than helping UNICEF. Your participation will take about 10 minutes.

The survey was designed and is managed by an independent team of consultants from Le Groupe-conseil Baastel, the firm contracted by UNICEF to conduct the evaluation. UNICEF Evaluation Office has reviewed and approved the questionnaire.

While answering the questions below, please note that the evaluation is focused on the last decade, with a particular interest in the period between 2012 to the present.

This questionnaire is institutional, not individual. So please answer each question based on your organization’s experience. Please feel free to consult with relevant colleagues. Evaluating UNICEF’s CPS approach is a complex endeavour, which the evaluation team is approaching through a variety of methods. In addition to this survey, we are conducting interviews, reviewing documents, and carrying out field missions to develop country case studies. The results of this survey will complement these other methods by providing valuable quantitative data on how key stakeholders (partners of the UNICEF country offices, like your organization) approach CPS. In addition, the evaluation team would like to stress the importance of the open-ended questions that are included in the survey along with the quantifiable “scale questions.” We strongly encourage you, on behalf of your organization, to provide explanations and detail where this opportunity is provided by the open-ended questions.

If you have any questions or comments please email the consultant managing the survey at the following address: alexandre.daoust@baastel.com
UNICEF CPS Evaluation Partners

Opening questions

* 1. Which country do you work in?

* 2. Does your organization promote a Child Protection Systems approach or does it focus more on particular issues affecting children?
   - Child Protection Systems approach
   - Focus on particular issues
   - Do not know

Comments, details, explanations, examples: (optional)
UNICEF CPS Evaluation Partners
UNICEF Contribution to CPS

* 3. To what extent is UNICEF’s approach to Child Protection Systems (click here for more details) aligned with the approach of your organization?

   Very aligned
   Aligned
   Misaligned
   Very misaligned
   N/A Do not know

   Comments, details, explanations, examples: (Optional)

* 4. To what extent has UNICEF contributed towards a strengthened approach to Child Protection System in your country?

   Contributed extensively
   Contributed
   Somewhat contributed
   Did not contribute
   Do not know

   Comments, details, explanations, examples of how UNICEF has contributed to this objective: (optional)
5. To what extent has UNICEF influenced the approach to Child Protection System in your country to make sure it is responsive to the different needs of girls and boys?

- Influenced a lot
- Influenced
- Somewhat influenced
- Did not influence
- N/A Do not know

Comments, details, explanations, examples: (optional)

6. To what extent has UNICEF influenced the approach to Child Protection System in your country to make sure it is responsive to the different needs of particularly vulnerable children?

- Influenced a lot
- Influenced
- Somewhat influenced
- Did not influence
- Do not know

Children with disabilities

Comments, details, explanations: (optional)

Children affected by HIV/ AIDS

Comments, details, explanations: (optional)

Non-nationals

Comments, details, explanations: (optional)

Other (please specify below)

Comments, details, explanations: (optional)
7. How satisfied is your organization with UNICEF’s contribution to national learning about Child Protection Systems?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very dissatisfied</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge sharing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection and analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments, details, explanations: (optional)

8. To what extent are the Government institutions and agencies responsible for child protection in your country working in a coordinated manner (amongst each other)?

- Very coordinated
- Coordinated
- Somewhat coordinated
- Not coordinated
- Do not know

Comments, details, explanations, examples of how the government is coordinated: (optional)

9. To what extent is Government work on child protection coordinated with the work of other relevant bodies, such as NGOs, academia and community-based organizations?

- Very coordinated
- Coordinated
- Somewhat coordinated
- Not coordinated
- Do not know

Comments, details, explanations, examples of how CPS is coordinated at national level: (optional)
* 10. Has the Government in your country increased its financial contribution to promoting and managing the Child Protection System approach in recent years?

   Yes
   No

Comments, details, explanations, examples: (optional)
* 11. If so, to what extent has UNICEF influenced the government to do so?
   - Influenced a lot
   - Influenced
   - Somewhat influenced
   - Did not influence
   - Do not know

   Comments, details, explanations, examples: (optional)

* 12. How would your organization rate UNICEF’s level of expertise in helping the Government and other stakeholders strengthen the national approach to Child Protection System in your country?
   - Very high
   - High
   - Low
   - Very low
   - Do not know

Details and comments: (optional)

13. Finally, are there any other comments you would like to make about the role and performance of UNICEF with regard to the Child Protection System in your country?

*End - Thank you very much for responding to this survey.*
7.5. Data protocol for qualitative comparative analysis

(Data were compiled from existing documents by the QCA consultants, one data sheet for each of the 24 case study countries, to answer the following questions. See evaluation report, section 2.3.)

0 Background and backstory

Conditions: UNICEF investments

1. Policy Dialogue and Advocacy
1.1a What types of policy advocacy for CP systems does UNICEF carry out in your country?
1.1b Why? Can you provide some examples or details?
1.2a How would you rate UNICEF's power to convene a broad range of child protection systems actors at national level?
1.2b Why? Can you provide some examples or details?
1.3a Does UNICEF conduct system mapping in your country?
1.3b Explain or clarify the above answer:
1.4a Is UNICEF generating public discussions on highly sensitive child protection issues in your country?
1.4b Why? Can you provide examples?
1.5a Does UNICEF strongly support a national plan of action for children in your country?
1.5b Why? Can you provide examples or clarify?
1.6a Is UNICEF conducting legal reviews and analyses?
1.6b To what extent? How? Can you provide examples?
1.7a Is UNICEF developing a strategy to strengthen CP systems?
1.7b Is it advanced or not? Please clarify
1.8a Is UNICEF developing costed national action plans for children?
1.8b To what extent? How? Can you provide some examples?

2. Expertise technical assistance

In your country:
2.1a What types of advice is UNICEF providing on legislative reform? E.g. very broad, or highly specific and technical, etc.
2.1b To what extent? How? Can you provide some examples?
2.2a What is the level of policy advice UNICEF is providing? E.g. High / low
2.2b Can you provide some examples? (e.g. on child care, child justice, etc.) Why is it high or low?

3. Evidence generation and research

In your country:
3.1a What types of child protection data collection and analysis does UNICEF support?
3.1b To what extent? How? Can you provide examples?
3.2a Does UNICEF support child protection budget and/or public expenditure analysis and tracking?
3.2b To what extent? How? Can you provide some examples?
3.3a What types of child protection studies and research does UNICEF support? (for example, scoping studies on emerging issues, online child sexual exploitation, etc.)
3.3b To what extent? How? Can you provide some examples?

4 Capacity

In your country:
4.1a Is UNICEF conducting capacity development initiatives for CP systems actors?
4.1b To what extent? How? Can you provide some examples?
4.2a Is UNICEF designing social work curricula?
4.2b To what extent? How? Can you provide examples?
4.3a Is UNICEF supporting knowledge exchange between key systems actors?
4.3b To what extent? How? Can you provide examples?
4.4a Is UNICEF developing the capacity of system actors at national and district levels?
4.4b To what extent? How? Can you provide some examples? Any comments or clarifications?
4.5a Is UNICEF developing training manuals?
4.5b To what extent? How? Can you provide some examples?
4.6a Is UNICEF strengthening the social workforce? For example, does it train social service workforce on CP, organise exchange visits, provide technical assistance, etc.
4.6b What is the level and ambition of the support of the social welfare workforce? Can you provide some examples?

5. Coordination partnerships
In your country:
5.1a What types of coordination mechanisms is UNICEF developing?
5.1b What is the level of support? Can you provide examples?
5.2a What kind of linkages has UNICEF supported between departments and ministries?
5.2b To what extent has it done so? How? Can you provide some examples?
5.4a What is the level of collaboration between UNICEF sections on child protection: social protection, education, ECD, C4D, health?
5.4b Why? Can you clarify and / or provide some examples?
5.5a Does UNICEF support the strengthening of CPMIS and other administrative data systems?
5.5b To what extent? In what ways? Can you provides some examples and / or expand
5.7a Is UNICEF designing a case management system?
5.7b How? Can you clarify?

6a. Financial support for services and infrastructure
In your country:
6.2a Is UNICEF funding coordination mechanisms?
6.2b To what extent? How? Please clarify
6.3a Is UNICEF providing financial support to specific initiatives, such as child helplines? [ALSO IN SERVICE DELIVERY??]
6.3b To what extent? How? Can you provide some examples?
6.4a Is UNICEF funding infrastructure that ensures children have the right to be heard in judicial and administrative proceedings?
6.4b To what extent? How? Can you provide some examples?
6.5a Is UNICEF funding independent oversight mechanisms?
6.5b To what extent? How? Can you provide some examples?
6.6a Is UNICEF raising funds from other donors for child protection systems strengthening?
6.6b To what extent? How? Can you provide some examples?

6b. Leveraging public resources
In your country, is UNICEF leveraging public resources for child protection systems?
6.1a Is UNICEF conducting budget and public expenditure analysis?
6.1b To what extent? How? Can you provide some examples?
6.7a Is UNICEF leveraging funds from other UNICEF sections for child protection (e.g. for prevention)?
6.7b To what extent? How? Can you provide some examples?

7. Service delivery
In your country:
7.1a Is UNICEF supporting Child protection services at local level?
7.1b To what extent? How? Can you provide some examples?
7.2a Is UNICEF supporting District-level programme coordination and administration?
7.2b To what extent? How? Can you provide examples?
7.3a Is UNICEF supporting implementation of CP laws?
7.3b To what extent? How? Can you provide some examples?
7.4a Is UNICEF supporting districts in the process of identifying children in need of care and protection?
7.4b To what extent? How? Can you provide some examples?
7.5a Is UNICEF strengthening quality of CP services?
7.5b To what extent? How? Can you provide some examples?
7.7a Is UNICEF supporting a system of multi-sectorial service offer?
7.7b To what extent? How? Can you provide some examples?
7.8a Is UNICEF supporting a nationwide referral system?
7.8b To what extent? How? Can you provide some examples?
7.9a Is UNICEF supporting a coordination structure for VACW?
7.9b To what extent? How? Can you provide some examples?
7.10a Is UNICEF supporting modelling of child care systems, for example identifying bottlenecks?
7.10b To what extent? How? Can you provide some examples?

8 Minimum Standards and Quality Control
In your country:
8.1a What types of accountability mechanisms is UNICEF supporting? (eg high level / low level)
8.1b To what extent? How? Can you provide some examples?
8.2a Is UNICEF strengthening M&E, monitoring of child rights?
8.2b To what extent? How? Can you provide examples?
8.3a Does UNICEF commission social audit?
8.3b How? When? Can you add anything?

9 Children’s Participation
In your country:
9.1a Does UNICEF support and / or has established child helplines?
9.1b Can you provide some details? For example, do they include M&E?
9.2a Does UNICEF support children’s engagement at various levels? For example, legislative reform, systems design, membership in committees, etc.
9.2b To what extent? Can you provide some details or examples?

X. Community-based protection
5.3a What kinds of linkages has UNICEF supported between the formal, district-level child protection system and community-based child protection structures?
5.3b Are these linkages strong? How has UNICEF developed them? Can you provide some examples and expand?
5.6a Is UNICEF collaborating with CAD for social and behaviour change interventions?
5.6b To what extent? How? Can you provide some examples?
7.6a Is UNICEF supporting community-based child protection programmes?
7.6b To what extent? Can you provide some examples?
7.11a Is UNICEF supporting the engagement of children and adolescents at the community level and in schools?
7.11b To what extent? How? Can you provide some examples?

Enablers and explanatory factors: Context indicators

10 Context Actors
In your country:
10.1a Are there bodies that are able to lobby for greater investments in child protection systems? For example, departments and associations of social work, lawyers’ associations and human rights bodies, etc.
10.1b To what extent? Who are they? Can you expand / provide some details?
10.2a Are there strong horizontal linkages between child protection, social protection, education, health, law enforcement and justice sectors? Or just among some of these?
10.2b Why? Can you explain or provide some details?
10.3a Are there strong vertical linkages between formal CPS, community protection mechanisms and interventions for social and behaviour change?
10.3b Why? Can you explain or provide some details?
10.4a Is there an independent human rights commission (or similar oversight body). (Source: Source: OHCHR website, CO information)
10.4b Please specify which body / bodies:

11 Context Indicators
11.1 Government Effectiveness – WGI
11.2 Regulatory Quality – WGI
11.3 Control of Corruption – WGI
11.4 Voice and Accountability – WGI

HDI and GNI were added later

Outcomes: Country-level child protection systems components
12 Regulatory framework
12.1 PR28. Does the justice system comply with the minimum standards laid down in the Beijing Rules of Justice?
12.2 PR29. Does the country have an alternative care policy in line with the 2009 Guidelines for the Alternative Care of Children which would include all of the elements listed in [Footnote 11]? 
12.3 PR30. Does the country have legislation that recognizes children's right to be heard in judicial and administrative proceedings (both criminal and non-criminal) affecting the child, either directly or through a representative or an appropriate body (in line with Art. 12, paragraph 2 of the CRC)? 
12.4 SI30. Does the country have laws that prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex, ethnicity, disability and/or religious affiliation? If yes, list all that apply in remarks column.

13 Governance structures
13.1a Does the lead Ministry have a HIGH/LOW status? 
13.1b Why? Can you explain or provide some details? 
13.2a Are there power struggles between different child protection departments and actors? 
13.2b To what extent? Why? Can you clarify or provide some examples? 
13.3a Are there SOPs and referral mechanisms? 
13.3b To what extent? Why? Can you clarify or provide some examples?

14 Services
14.1 PR15. Has the country identified and acted during the year on areas requiring strengthening in national child protection systems [as reflected in State budgets, policy papers or legislation or/and in systems mapping]? (If yes, specify area in remarks column.) 
14.2 PR17. Which of the statements on the Child Protection System in your country is most likely true? Option 1 - Child protection system has either preventive or response service; Option 2 - Child protection system has both preventive and response services but do not work well together; Option 3 - Child Protection system has both preventive and responsive services and there is a framework for coordination; Option 4 - Child Protection system has both preventive and responsive services that are fully aligned and complementary 
14.3 SI2. Does the country have a social protection system? 
14.4 PR22. Is the system biased towards detention and other custodial remedies? (This is irrespective of whether diversion and non-custodial options exist in the country.)

15 Minimum standards
15.1 SI29. Does the country have legal and paralegal services available to support children in claiming redress to violation of their rights? 
15.2a Are there bodies providing independent oversight and accountability mechanisms for quality control of child protection systems (e.g. child ombudsman, human rights commission, supreme court, etc.)? 
15.2b If yes, which ones? 
15.3a Are there systems for supervision and monitoring of child protection systems? 
15.3b Can you clarify and provide some details?

16 Resources
16.1 PR16. Did the public expenditure for child protection, as indicated in the State budget, change from two years prior? Indicate in remarks column the expenditure for child protection and the total public expenditure in the State’s currency. Option 1 - Increased; Option 2 - Maintained; Option 3 - Decreased; Option 4-Not Available 
16.2 SI8. Rate the country capacity to develop, implement and finance integrated social protection systems on a scale of 1 (lack of capacity) to 5 (very strong capacity). (Capacities should be considered at both national and sub-national levels.) 
16.3a Are there adequate numbers of skilled social service workforce? 
16.3b Why? Can you explain or provide some details? 
16.4a Is the allocation of public resources foc4r Child Protection HIGH / LOW? 
16.4b Why? Can you explain or provide some details?

17 Participation
In your country: 
17.2a Is there child participation in CP committees at community and / or district level? 
17.2b To what extent? Why? Can you clarify or provide some examples? 
17.3a Does the law recognise children’s right to be heard in judicial and administrative proceedings affecting the child? 
17.3b To what extent? Why? Can you clarify or provide some examples? 
17.4a Are admin procedures child-friendly, for example police- or court-related?
17.4b To what extent? Why? Can you clarify or provide some examples?
17.5a Are there functioning child helplines and complaints mechanisms that are accessible to children?
17.5b To what extent? Why? Can you clarify or provide some examples?
17.6a Do children meet in the community and/or at school to address child protection issues?
17.6b To what extent? Why? Can you clarify or provide some examples?
17.7 SI15. Are strong efforts being made by government counterparts/UNICEF partners to ensure children/adolescents define issues and priorities to feed into the development agendas at local, subnational or national levels.
17.8 SI16. Does the country have mechanisms for public engagement to influence development agendas in the local, subnational or national plans?
17.9 PR21. Is the country using child-friendly procedures and approaches for dealing with justice for children (both the criminal and administrative justice activities, including investigative and court procedures)?
17.10 Functioning and accessible child helpline (source? Check with CO)
8 DATA ANALYSIS DETAILS PERTAINING TO THE QUALITATIVE COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

Appendix A: Dataset presenting all values of all conditions analysed
(available on request: see first worksheet of Excel file named “ALL”)

Appendix B: Truth Tables and Prime Implicants Chart of the initial long models
(available on request: see last 4 worksheets of Excel file named “ALL”)

Appendix C: Solutions of the Boolean minimizations for the short models in algebra form

a) First analysis of overall outcome tested on all cases, against 11 conditions (leading to 4, 6a, 8, X).

POSITIVE OUTCOME (11 cases):
4CAP*6afindown*8MINSTQLTCTRL (101-45% of 11 cases = 5 countries: Mongolia, Armenia, Romania, South Africa, Thailand)
4CAP*6afindown*XCOMMPART (10-1 27% of 11 cases = 3 countries: Mongolia, Fiji, Moldova)
4CAP*8MINSTQLTCTRL*XCOMMPART (1-11 36% of 11 cases = 4 countries: Mongolia, El Salvador, Sri Lanka, Zimbabwe)
4cap*6afindown*8minstqltctrl*xcommpart (0000 10% of 11 cases = 1 country: Morocco)

NEGATIVE OUTCOME (13 cases):
4cap*6AFINDOWN*8minstqltctrl (010-5 cases: Cote d'Ivoire, DRC, Sudan, Uganda, Afghanistan)
4cap*8minstqltctrl*XCOMMPART (0-01 5 cases: Cote d'Ivoire, DRC, Sudan, Uganda, Pakistan)
6AFINDOWN*8minstqltctrl*XCOMMPART (-101 7 cases: Cote d'Ivoire, DRC, Sudan, Uganda, Guatemala, Lebanon, Myanmar)
4cap*6AFINDOWN*XCOMMPART (0-1 5 cases: Cote d'Ivoire, DRC, Sudan, Uganda, Ethiopia)
4CAP*6afindown*8minstqltctrl*xcommpart (1000 2 cases: Nigeria, Peru)
4CAP*6AFINDOWN*8MINSTQLTCTRL*xcommpart 1110 1 case: Uzbekistan)

b) Second “4+3” analysis, tested on all cases (4, 4.6, 5.7, 6a, 8, X, 11)

POSITIVE OUTCOME, complex solution:
4CAP*5.7CASEMG*6afindown*11CTXINDS (110-1 6 cases: Armenia, Mongolia, Romania, South Africa, Fiji, Moldova)
4CAP*6afindown*8MINSTQLTCTRL*11CTXINDS (1-011 5 cases: Armenia, Mongolia, Romania, South Africa, Thailand)
4CAP*5.7CASEMG*6AFINDOWN*8MINSTQLTCTRL (1111-3 cases: El Salvador, Sri Lanka, Zimbabwe)
4cap*5.7casemg*6afindown*8minstqltctrl*11CTXINDS (00001 1 case: Morocco)

POSITIVE OUTCOME, intermediate solution:
11CTXINDS*4cap (0-0 11 case: Morocco)
11CTXINDS*8MINSTQLTCTRL (-11 7 cases: Thailand, Armenia, Mongolia, Romania, South Africa, El Salvador, Sri Lanka)
11CTXINDS*6afindown*5.7CASEMG (-10-1 6 cases: Armenia, Mongolia, Romania, South Africa, Fiji, Moldova)
8MINSTQLTCTRL*6AFINDOWN*5.7CASEMG*4CAP (1111-3 cases: El Salvador, Sri Lanka, Zimbabwe)
NEGATIVE OUTCOME, intermediate solution:
11ctxinds*4cap (0---0 7 cases: Pakistan, Ethiopia, Afghanistan, Cote d'Ivoire, DRC, Sudan, Uganda)
11ctxinds*5.7casemg (0--0 7 cases: Pakistan, Uzbekistan, Afghanistan, Cote d'Ivoire, DRC, Sudan, Uganda
11ctxinds*8minstqltctrl (---0 8 cases: Pakistan, Afghanistan, Cote d'Ivoire, DRC, Sudan, Uganda, Myanmar, Nigeria)
8minstqltctrl*6AFINDOWN (--10- 8 cases: Afghanistan, Cote d'Ivoire, DRC, Sudan, Uganda, Myanmar, Guatemala, Lebanon)
8minstqltctrl*5.7casemg*4CAP (10-0- 1 case: Peru)

c) New 11 condition-model tested on all cases (leading to 1, 6a, 6b, 8, 11)

POSITIVE OUTCOME, complex solution:
1POLDADV*6afindown*11CTXINDS (10—1 6 cases: Thailand, Mongolia, Romania, South Africa, Fiji, Moldova)
6afindown*6bfinup*8minstqltctrl*11CTXINDS (-0001 2 cases: Morocco, Moldova)
6AFINDOWN*6bfinup*8MINSTQLTCTRL*11CTXINDS (--1011 2 cases: Sri Lanka, El Salvador)
6afindown*6BFINUP*8MINSTQLTCTRL*11CTXINDS (--0111 4 cases: Armenia, Mongolia, Romania, South Africa)
1POLDADV*6AFINDOWN*6BFINUP*8MINSTQLTCTRL*11ctxinds (11110 1 case: Zimbabwe)

POSITIVE OUTCOME, intermediate solution:
11CTXINDS*8MINSTQLTCTRL (--11 7 cases: Thailand, Armenia, Mongolia, Romania, South Africa, Sri Lanka, El Salvador)
11CTXINDS*6bfinup*6afindown (-00-1 3 cases: Morocco, Thailand, Fiji)
11CTXINDS*6afindown*1POLDADV (10—1 6 cases: Thailand, Fiji, Mongolia, Romania, South Africa, Moldova)
8MINSTQLTCTRL*6BFINUP*6AFINDOWN*1POLDADV (1111- 1 case: Zimbabwe)

NEGATIVE OUTCOME, complex solution:
6AFINDOWN*6bfinup*11ctxinds (-10-0 8 cases: Uzbekistan, Ethiopia, Afghanistan, Cote d'Ivoire, DRC, Myanmar, Sudan, Uganda)
1poldadv*6bfinup*8minstqltctrl*11ctxinds (0-000 6 cases: Afghanistan, Cote d'Ivoire, DRC, Myanmar, Sudan, Pakistan)
1POLDADV*6AFINDOWN*6bfinup*8minstqltctrl (1100- 3 cases: Guatemala, Lebanon, Uganda)
1POLDADV*6afindown*6BFINUP*8minstqltctrl*11ctxinds (10100 1 case: Nigeria)
1poldadv*6afindown*6BFINUP*8minstqltctrl*11CTXINDS (00101 1 case: Peru)

NEGATIVE OUTCOME, intermediate solution:
11ctxinds*6bfinup (--0-0 9 cases: Pakistan, Uzbekistan, Ethiopia, Afghanistan, Cote d'Ivoire, DRC, Myanmar, Sudan, Uganda
11ctxinds*8minstqltctrl*6afindown (--0-0 2 cases: Pakistan, Nigeria)
8minstqltctrl*6bfinup*6AFINDOWN (--100- 8 cases: Afghanistan, Cote d'Ivoire, DRC, Myanmar, Sudan, Uganda, Guatemala, Lebanon)
8minstqltctrl*6BFINUP*6afindown*1poldadv (0010- 1 case: Peru)

d) Analysis of 11 condition-model tested on subset of 17 “safe” cases, leading to seven simple models of 3 conditions each, with roots 1 & 3 (advocacy & evidence) and 6a & 6b (the two types of financial resources):

1 3 6a

8 Successful cases:
3EVIDRES*6afindown (-10 7 cases: Armenia, Fiji, Moldova, Mongolia, Romania, South Africa, Thailand)
1POLDADV*3EVIDRES (11- 7 cases: Zimbabwe, Fiji, Moldova, Mongolia, Romania, South Africa, Thailand)

9 Unsuccessful cases:
1poldadv*3evidres (00-5 cases: Pakistan, Afghanistan, Cote d'Ivoire, DRC, Sudan)
3evidres*6AFINDOWN (-01 6 cases: Afghanistan, Cote d’Ivoire, DRC, Sudan, Lebanon, Uganda)
1poldadv*6AFINDOWN (0-1 6 cases: Afghanistan, Cote d’Ivoire, DRC, Sudan, Myanmar, Uzbekistan)

1 3 6b

Explanations of positive outcome:
1POLADV*3EVIDRES (11-7 cases: Moldova, Mongolia, Romania, South Africa, Zimbabwe, Fiji, Thailand)
3EVIDRES*6BFINUP (-11 6 cases: Moldova, Mongolia, Romania, South Africa, Zimbabwe, Armenia)

Pathways to negative outcome:
3evidres*6bfinup (-00 7 cases: Afghanistan, Cote d’Ivoire, DRC, Pakistan, Sudan, Lebanon, Uganda)
1poldadv*6bfinup (0-0 7 cases: Afghanistan, Cote d’Ivoire, DRC, Pakistan, Sudan, Myanmar, Uzbekistan)

1 3 11

Success:
1POLADV*3EVIDRES (11-7 cases: Fiji, Moldova, Mongolia, Romania, South Africa, Thailand, Zimbabwe)
3EVIDRES*11CTXINDS (-11 7 cases: Fiji, Moldova, Mongolia, Romania, South Africa, Thailand, Armenia)

Lack of success:
1poldadv*11ctxinds (0-0 7 cases: Afghanistan, Cote d’Ivoire, DRC, Pakistan, Sudan, Myanmar, Uzbekistan)
1POLADV*3evidres (10-2 cases: Uganda, Lebanon)

1 6a 6b

Pathways to success:
1POLADV*6afindown (10-6 cases: Moldova, Mongolia, Romania, South Africa, Fiji, Thailand)
6afindown*6BFINUP (-01 5 cases: Moldova, Mongolia, Romania, South Africa, Armenia)
1POLADV*6BFINUP (1-1 5 cases: Moldova, Mongolia, Romania, South Africa, Zimbabwe)

Pathways to lack of success:
1poldadv*6bfinup (0-0 7 cases: Afghanistan, Cote d’Ivoire, DRC, Myanmar, Sudan, Uzbekistan, Pakistan)
6AFINDOWN*6bfinup (-10 8 cases: Afghanistan, Cote d’Ivoire, DRC, Myanmar, Sudan, Uzbekistan, Lebanon, Uganda)

3 6a 6b

Positive cases:
3EVIDRES*6afindown (10-7 cases: Armenia, Moldova, Mongolia, Romania, South Africa, Fiji, Thailand)
3EVIDRES*6BFINUP (1-1 6 cases: Armenia, Moldova, Mongolia, Romania, South Africa, Zimbabwe)

Negative cases:
3evidres*6bfinup (0-0 7 cases: Afghanistan, Cote d’Ivoire, DRC, Lebanon, Sudan, Uganda, Pakistan)
6AFINDOWN*6bfinup (-10 8 cases: Afghanistan, Cote d’Ivoire, DRC, Lebanon, Sudan, Uganda, Myanmar, Uzbekistan).

4 6a 6b

This model is basically identical to the previous one. Success is explained by:
4CAP*6afindown (10-7 cases: Armenia, Moldova, Mongolia, Romania, South Africa, Fiji, Thailand)
4CAP*6BFINUP (1-1 6 cases: Armenia, Moldova, Mongolia, Romania, South Africa, Zimbabwe)

Lack of success is explained by:
4cap*6bfinup (0-0 6 cases: Afghanistan, Cote d'Ivoire, DRC, Sudan, Uganda, Pakistan)
6AFINDOWN*6bfinup (-10 8 cases: Afghanistan, Cote d'Ivoire, DRC, Sudan, Uganda, Lebanon, Myanmar, Uzbekistan)

6a 6b 11

Success:
6afindown*11CTXINDS (0-1 7 cases: Armenia, Moldova, Mongolia, Romania, South Africa, Fiji, Thailand)
6AFINDOWN*6BFINUP*11ctxinds (110 1 case: Zimbabwe)

Lack of success:
6bfinup*11ctxinds (-00 8 cases: Pakistan, Afghanistan, Cote d'Ivoire, DRC, Myanmar, Sudan, Uganda, Uzbekistan)
6AFINDOWN*6bfinup (10- 8 cases: Lebanon, Afghanistan, Cote d'Ivoire, DRC, Myanmar, Sudan, Uganda, Uzbekistan)

e) Analysis of 6 condition model synthesising the above 1 (advocacy) 3 (evidence) 4 (capacity) 6a (financial resources bottom up) 6b (financial resources top down) 11 (context indicators):

Success:
1POLDADV*3EVIDRES*4CAP*6afindown*11CTXINDS (1110-1 6 cases Fiji, Moldova, Mongolia, Romania, South Africa, Thailand)
3EVIDRES*4CAP*6afindown*6BFINUP*11CTXINDS (-11011 5 cases Armenia, Moldova, Mongolia, Romania, South Africa)
1POLDADV*3EVIDRES*4CAP*6AFINDOWN*6BFINUP*11ctxinds (111110 1 case: Zimbabwe)

Lack of success:
1poldadv*3evidres*4cap*6bfinup*11ctxinds (000-00 5 cases: Afghanistan, Cote d'Ivoire, DRC, Sudan, Pakistan)
3evidres*4cap*6AFINDOWN*6bfinup*11ctxinds (-00100 5 cases: Afghanistan, Cote d'Ivoire, DRC, Sudan, Uganda)
1poldadv*3EVIDRES*4CAP*6AFINDOWN*6bfinup*11ctxinds (011100 2 cases: Myanmar, Uzbekistan)
1POLDADV*3evidres*4CAP*6AFINDOWN*6BFINUP*11CTXINDS (101101 1 case: Lebanon)

f) Analysis of 5 condition model synthesising the above 1 (advocacy) 3 (evidence) 6a (financial resources bottom up) 6b (financial resources top down) 11 (context indicators):

Successful pathways:
1POLDADV*3EVIDRES*6afindown*11CTXINDS (110-6 cases: Moldova, Mongolia, Romania, South Africa, Fiji, Thailand)
3EVIDRES*6afindown*6BFINUP*11CTXINDS (-1011 5 cases: Moldova, Mongolia, Romania, South Africa, Armenia)
1POLDADV*3EVIDRES*6AFINDOWN*6BFINUP*11ctxinds (111110 1 case: Zimbabwe)

Unsuccessful pathways:
1poldadv*3evidres*6bfinup*11ctxinds (00-00 5 cases: Afghanistan, Cote d'Ivoire, DRC, Sudan, Pakistan)
1poldadv*6AFINDOWN*6bfinup*11ctxinds (0-100 6 cases: Afghanistan, Cote d'Ivoire, DRC, Sudan, Myanmar, Uzbekistan)
1POLDADV*3evidres*6AFINDOWN*6bfinup (1010-2 cases: Lebanon, Uganda)

g) Analysis of 4 condition model synthesising the above (1, 3, 6a, 6b):

Successful pathways:
1POLDADV*3EVIDRES*6afindown (110-6 cases: Moldova, Mongolia, Romania, South Africa, Fiji, Thailand)
3EVIDRES*6afindown*6BFINUP (-101 5 cases: Moldova, Mongolia, Romania, South Africa, Armenia)
1POLDADV*3EVIDRES*6BFINUP (11-1 5 cases: Moldova, Mongolia, Romania, South Africa, Zimbabwe)
Unsuccessful pathways:
1poldadv*3evidres*6bfinup (00-0 5 cases: Afghanistan, Cote d’Ivoire, DRC, Sudan, Pakistan)
1poldadv*6AFINDOWN*6bfinup (0-10 6 cases: Afghanistan, Cote d’Ivoire, DRC, Sudan, Myanmar, Uzbekistan)
1POLDADV*3evidres*6AFINDOWN*6bfinup (1010 2 cases: Lebanon, Uganda)

Appendix D: Venn diagrams of the short models

First analysis of overall outcome tested on all cases, against 11 conditions (leading to 4, 6a, 8, X).
Second “4+3” analysis, tested on all cases (4, 4.6, 5.7, 6a, 8, X, 11)

New 11 condition-model tested on all cases (leading to 1, 6a, 6b, 8, 11)
Analysis of 11 condition-model tested on subset of 17 “safe” cases, leading to 7 simple models of 3 conditions each, with roots 1 & 3 (advocacy & evidence) and 6a & 6b (the two types of financial resources):

1 3 6a

1 3 6b
Analysis of 5 condition model synthesizing the above (1 (advocacy) 3 (evidence) 6a (financial resources bottom up) 6b (financial resources top down) 11 (context indicators):
Analysis of 4 condition model synthesizing the above (1, 3, 6a, 6b):

Appendix E: Supersubset analysis (necessity & sufficiency analysis)

Overall outcome tested on 24 cases:

No single condition is necessary, although 91% of the successful cases present investments in capacity and 82% of the successful cases show investments in evidence and research. In the second iteration, 11 context indicators and 5.7 case management joined 3 evidence and 4 capacity in the group of “almost” necessary conditions for success: 91% of successful cases present a positive value of context indicators and 82% of successful cases present a positive value of 5.7 Case Management.

Below is the list of necessary disjunctions (or logical unions of conditions) for the outcome. The number represents the percentage of successful cases out of all the cases covered by the configuration. The most significant ones are highlighted. We can see all of them in the Venn diagram except the one with ServDel.

1. x7servdel+X9CHPART 0.154
2. x6afindown+XCOMMPART 0.154
3. x6afindown+X9CHPART 0.077
4. x6afindown+X8MINSTQLTCTRL 0.615 (green cases are either at the top or inside the central horizontal rectangle)
The second iteration added the following disjunctions to the necessity analysis:

1. $X4\text{CAP}+x4.6\text{work}$
2. $X4\text{CAP}+x5.7\text{casemg}$
3. $X4\text{CAP}+X11\text{CTXINDS}$
4. $X4.6\text{WORK}+X11\text{CTXINDS}$
5. $X5.7\text{CASEMG}+x6\text{afindown}$
6. $X5.7\text{CASEMG}+x\text{commpart}$
7. $X5.7\text{CASEMG}+X11\text{CTXINDS}$
8. $X6\text{AFINDOWN}+X11\text{CTXINDS}$
9. $X8\text{MINSTQLTCTRL}+X11\text{CTXINDS}$

$X4\text{CAP}+x5\text{coopartn}$

$X3\text{EVIDRES}+X4\text{CAP}$

$X3\text{EVIDRES}+X9\text{CHPART}$

$x3\text{evidres}+X4\text{CAP}$

$x3\text{evidres}+X9\text{CHPART}$

$x\text{1poldadv}+X4\text{CAP}$

$X1\text{POLDAV}+X9\text{CHPART}$
As for the subset sufficiency analysis of single conditions, no single condition is sufficient by itself, but the chances of success are particularly high with workforce strengthening (83% success rate) and minimum standards and quality control (when UNICEF invests in this, 80% of cases are successful). These values can also be seen below.

Annex F: Excel tables with data from the subset analysis of single conditions compared

(available on request: see second worksheet of Excel file names “seconddataset”
### Appendix G: Country context indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>HDI</th>
<th>GNI per capita 2018</th>
<th>GNI per capita (HDR)</th>
<th>WB classification 2018</th>
<th>Fragility</th>
<th>Civil society index</th>
<th>Control of Corruption</th>
<th>Government Effectiveness</th>
<th>Political Stability and Absence of Violence/Terrorism</th>
<th>Regulatory Quality</th>
<th>Rule of Law</th>
<th>Voice and Accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>0.479</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>1,871</td>
<td>LIC</td>
<td>2.75*</td>
<td>Repressed</td>
<td>-1.56</td>
<td>-1.22</td>
<td>-2.75</td>
<td>-1.33</td>
<td>-1.62</td>
<td>-1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>0.743</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>8,189</td>
<td>UMIC</td>
<td>Obstructed</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-0.62</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cote d'Ivoire</td>
<td>0.474</td>
<td>1,540</td>
<td>3,163</td>
<td>LMIC</td>
<td>3.53*</td>
<td>Obstructed</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>-0.90</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>0.435</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>LIC</td>
<td>3.08*</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>-1.33</td>
<td>-1.51</td>
<td>-2.20</td>
<td>-1.32</td>
<td>-1.61</td>
<td>-1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>0.680</td>
<td>3,560</td>
<td>7,732</td>
<td>LMIC</td>
<td>Obstructed</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>0.448</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>1,523</td>
<td>LIC</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
<td>-1.57</td>
<td>-1.10</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>-1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>0.736</td>
<td>4,970</td>
<td>8,245</td>
<td>UMIC</td>
<td>Obstructed</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>0.640</td>
<td>4,060</td>
<td>7,063</td>
<td>UMIC</td>
<td>Obstructed</td>
<td>-0.74</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>0.763</td>
<td>8,310</td>
<td>13,312</td>
<td>UMIC</td>
<td>Under review</td>
<td>-0.97</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>-1.56</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>0.699</td>
<td>2,180</td>
<td>5,026</td>
<td>LMIC</td>
<td>Obstructed</td>
<td>-0.96</td>
<td>-0.62</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>0.735</td>
<td>3,290</td>
<td>10,449</td>
<td>LMIC</td>
<td>Obstructed</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>0.647</td>
<td>2,863</td>
<td>7,195</td>
<td>LMIC</td>
<td>Obstructed</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>0.556</td>
<td>1,190</td>
<td>4,943</td>
<td>LMIC</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>Repressed</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
<td>-0.98</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
<td>-0.87</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>-0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>0.527</td>
<td>2,080</td>
<td>5,443</td>
<td>LMIC</td>
<td>Obstructed</td>
<td>-1.04</td>
<td>-1.09</td>
<td>-1.85</td>
<td>-0.92</td>
<td>-1.05</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>0.550</td>
<td>1,580</td>
<td>5,031</td>
<td>LMIC</td>
<td>Repressed</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
<td>-2.47</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
<td>-0.83</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>0.740</td>
<td>5,970</td>
<td>11,295</td>
<td>UMIC</td>
<td>Obstructed</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>0.740</td>
<td>9,970</td>
<td>14,519</td>
<td>UMIC</td>
<td>Narrowed</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>0.666</td>
<td>5,430</td>
<td>12,087</td>
<td>UMIC</td>
<td>Narrowed</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>0.766</td>
<td>3,840</td>
<td>10,789</td>
<td>LMIC</td>
<td>Obstructed</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>0.490</td>
<td>2,379</td>
<td>3,846</td>
<td>LMIC</td>
<td>2.51*</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>-1.61</td>
<td>-1.41</td>
<td>-2.38</td>
<td>-1.49</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>-1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>0.740</td>
<td>5,960</td>
<td>14,519</td>
<td>UMIC</td>
<td>Under review</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>-0.93</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>Income Class</td>
<td>Political Status</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>0.493</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1,670</td>
<td>LIC</td>
<td>-1.06</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
<td>-0.72</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>0.701</td>
<td>1,980</td>
<td>5,748</td>
<td>LMIC</td>
<td>-1.20</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>-1.62</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>0.516</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>1,588</td>
<td>LIC</td>
<td>-1.28</td>
<td>-1.16</td>
<td>-0.61</td>
<td>-1.72</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H: Country context factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year of CP systems mapping</th>
<th>2014-17 CPS spending</th>
<th>CPS spending as a % of total CP spending</th>
<th>Under 18 population in thousands</th>
<th>Country type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>9,758,776</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>17,744</td>
<td>Conflict-affected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>2,509,787</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>Pre-existing CPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cote d’Ivoire</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>144,856</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>11,689</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>41,553</td>
<td>Conflict-affected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>433,035</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2,153</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>49,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>3,689,980</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>303</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>3,427,306</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>7,047</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>6,801,587</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>Conflict-affected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>2,527,365</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>Pre-existing CPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>811,247</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>1,017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2,321,665</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>11,491</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>3,874,441</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17,485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>4,114,722</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>93,965</td>
<td>Federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>2012-16</td>
<td>19,999,426</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>79,005</td>
<td>Federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>1,519,192</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>10,454</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>5,439,287</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3,667</td>
<td>Pre-existing CPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>668,080</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>19,428</td>
<td>Pre-existing CPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>617,768</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6,020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1,231,912</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>18,971</td>
<td>Conflict-affected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>7,662,624</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>14,961</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>5,221,031</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>22,807</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1,706,384</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>10,386</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>2015?</td>
<td>31,276,184</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>7,726</td>
<td>Pre-existing CPS?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I: Dataset for 2nd iteration

| CaseID | 1PolDA | 2BUL | 3Col | 4GUA | 5Ind | 6Sri | 7Sud | 8Swa | 9Tanz | 10Tan | 11Tanz | 12Tanz | 13Tanz | 14Tanz | 15Tanz | 16Tanz | 17Tanz | 18Tanz | 19Tanz | 20Tanz | 21Tanz | 22Tanz | 23Tanz | 24Tanz |
|--------|--------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|-------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| 1.Afghanistan | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2.Armenia | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3.Cote d’Ivoire | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4.ROC | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5.Ecuador | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 6.Ethiopia | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7.Fiji | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 8.Guatemala | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 9.Lebanon | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10.Moldova | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 11.Mongolia | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 12.Morocco | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 13.Myanmar | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14.Nigeria | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 15.Pakistan | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 16.Peru | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17.Romania | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 18.South Africa | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 19.Sri Lanka | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 20.Sudan | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 21.Thailand | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 22.Uganda | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 23.Uzbekistan | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 24.Zimbabwe | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
## 9 CHILD PROTECTION SYSTEMS STRENGTHENING: KEY EVENTS [E], INITIATIVES [I] AND DOCUMENTS [D]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Global UNICEF (partly inter-agency)</th>
<th>Global other agencies</th>
<th>West and Central Africa</th>
<th>Eastern and Southern Africa</th>
<th>Eastern Europe and Central Asia</th>
<th>Middle and North Africa</th>
<th>East and South Asia</th>
<th>South Asia</th>
<th>East and Pacific</th>
<th>Asia and the Pacific</th>
<th>Latin and Caribbean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Inter-American Children’s Institute. ‘National Child Protection System’ [D]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Mapping of UNICEF Efforts towards Child Australia Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Global UNICEF (partly inter-agency)</td>
<td>Global other agencies</td>
<td>West Central Africa</td>
<td>Eastern and Southern Africa</td>
<td>Eastern Europe and Central Asia</td>
<td>Middle and North Africa</td>
<td>East Asia and the Pacific</td>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>Latin America and the Caribbean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Protection Indicator Development and Data Collection</td>
<td>Alliance for Children and Youth</td>
<td>‘Inverting the Pyramid: Enhancing systems for protecting children’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Bucharest meeting on CPS [E]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Global child protection strategy: pillar on systems [D]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>Save the Children ‘A ‘Rough’ Guide to Child Protection Systems [D]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Advancing child-sensitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Global UNICEF (partly inter-agency)</td>
<td>Global agencies</td>
<td>West Central Africa</td>
<td>Eastern and Southern Africa</td>
<td>Eastern Europe and Central Asia</td>
<td>Middle and North Africa</td>
<td>East Asia</td>
<td>South Asia</td>
<td>East and Pacific</td>
<td>Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Adapting a systems approach to child protection [D]</td>
<td>Interagency CP system meeting (UNHCR hosted) [E]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PEPFAR: social welfare workforce strengthening conference [E]</td>
<td>WHO: Monitoring the Building Blocks of Health Systems: A handbook of indicators and their measurement strategies [D]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Global CP system mapping and assessment toolkit (D)</td>
<td>Events where conceptual clarity and toolkit were presented to academics and practitioners for feedback: International Forum on Child Welfare [E]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Concept Note on Child Protection Systems Monitoring and Evaluation: Discussion Paper [D]</td>
<td>SAIEVAC mission statement: prevent and respond to all forms of neglect, abuse, exploitation and violence against children through a comprehensive CPS at regional and national level where governments, civil society and children are empowered to share experience, formalize linkages and reinforce cooperation to end violence against children.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[SAIEVAC](http://www.saievac.org)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Global UNICEF (partly inter-agency)</th>
<th>Global agencies</th>
<th>West and Central Africa</th>
<th>Eastern and Southern Africa</th>
<th>Eastern Europe and Central Asia</th>
<th>Middle and North Africa</th>
<th>East and South Asia</th>
<th>Eastern Europe and Central Asia</th>
<th>Middle and North Africa</th>
<th>East and South Asia</th>
<th>Latin and Caribbean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Save the Children. 'Building rights-based national child protection systems: A concept paper to support Save the Children's work' [D]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Save the Children: Strengthening National Child Protection Systems in Emergencies through Community-based Mechanisms [D]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CPWG/Save the Children. 'Child Protection Systems in Emergencies: Discussion paper [D]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Global UNICEF (partly inter-agency)</td>
<td>Global other agencies</td>
<td>West Central Africa</td>
<td>Eastern and Southern Africa</td>
<td>Eastern Europe and Central Asia</td>
<td>Middle and Africa</td>
<td>East South Asia</td>
<td>East and Pacific Asia</td>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expert Consultation on Strengthening National Child Protection Systems in Sub-Saharan Africa [E]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Columbia University led Inter-Agency Working</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Global UNICEF (partly inter-agency)</td>
<td>Global other agencies</td>
<td>West and Central Africa</td>
<td>Eastern and Southern Africa</td>
<td>Eastern Europe and Central Asia</td>
<td>Middle and North Africa</td>
<td>South Asia</td>
<td>East and Pacific</td>
<td>Asia the</td>
<td>Latin and Caribbean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Fonds Suisse pour des projets de protection de l'enfance. Child Protection Systems: An international comparison of 'good practice examples' of five countries [D]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>7th European Forum on the rights of the child focused on CPS in the EU. UNICEF supported tools for assessing CPS in EU countries. Follow-up conference in 2013 [I/E/D]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Global UNICEF (partly inter-agency)</td>
<td>Global other agencies</td>
<td>West Central Africa</td>
<td>Eastern and Southern Africa</td>
<td>Eastern Europe and Central Asia</td>
<td>Middle and North Africa</td>
<td>East and South Asia</td>
<td>East and Pacific</td>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>Latin and Caribbean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>EmBrace. Early Discussion and Gap Analysis on Resilience [D]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Global UNICEF (partly inter-agency)</td>
<td>Global other agencies</td>
<td>West Central Africa and Eastern Southern Africa</td>
<td>Eastern Europe and Central Asia</td>
<td>Middle and North Africa</td>
<td>South Asia</td>
<td>East and Pacific Asia</td>
<td>Latin America and the Caribbean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Global UNICEF (partly inter-agency)</td>
<td>Global agencies</td>
<td>West and Central Africa</td>
<td>Eastern and Southern Africa</td>
<td>Eastern Europe and Central Asia</td>
<td>Middle and North Africa</td>
<td>South Asia</td>
<td>East and Pacific Asia</td>
<td>Latin America and Caribbean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alliance for CPHA: “Adapting to learn, learning to adapt”: Overview of and considerations for child protection systems strengthening in emergencies [D]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Critical reflections on child protection [E/D]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Case management weekly MIS development meeting [D]</td>
<td>Adoption of ECOWAS Strategic framework for strengthening</td>
<td>Integrating case management for vulnerable children [D]</td>
<td>Regional CP Network Meeting (included sessions on system strengthening)</td>
<td>‘Victims are not Virtual’ [D]</td>
<td>Diversion not detention: A study on diversion and other alternative measures for Regional Meeting of Integral Child Protection Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Global UNICEF (partly inter-agency)</td>
<td>Global other agencies</td>
<td>West Central Africa</td>
<td>Eastern and Southern Africa</td>
<td>Eastern Europe and Central Asia</td>
<td>Middle and North Africa</td>
<td>South Asia</td>
<td>East and Pacific Asia</td>
<td>Latin and America the Caribbean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>g CP system [E/D]</td>
<td>g work and migration) [E/D]</td>
<td>children in conflict with the law in East Asia and the Pacific [D]</td>
<td>authorities, in Mexico [E]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ending institutionalisation and strengthening</td>
<td>Role of The Hague Conventions in Cross-</td>
<td>3rd justice for children workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Global UNICEF (partly inter-agency)</td>
<td>Global other agencies</td>
<td>West Central Africa</td>
<td>Eastern and Southern Africa</td>
<td>Eastern Europe and Central Asia</td>
<td>Middle and North Africa</td>
<td>South Asia</td>
<td>East and Pacific Asia</td>
<td>Latin America and the Caribbean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>family and community based care for children in Europe and beyond [D]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Border Child Protection in South Asia [E]</td>
<td>(focused on civil matters, justice and social workers as participants) [E]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Conference Towards Implementing INSPIRE: Seven strategies for ending violence against children [E]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analysis of the Legal Framework for Child Protection in South Asia [D]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Structural Violence against Children in South Asia [D]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>