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Executive summary

Child Frontiers was commissioned by UNICEF Philippines in late 2014 to evaluate the relevance, protective and restorative effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the child-friendly spaces (CFS) implemented as part of the emergency response to Typhoon Haiyan (Yolanda), which struck the Visayas region in November 2013. The timing of this formative evaluation, well over a year after the typhoon hit land, offers an important opportunity to reflect on the CFS approach and to analyse what could be replicated or done more effectively in future emergencies. The overarching purpose is to help strengthen child protection programming responses during emergencies in the Philippines and internationally and inform current and future policy and practice of UNICEF, partner agencies and national and local authorities.

The evaluation had the following four specific objectives:

1. Examine how CFS contributed to child protection programming in the context of relief and recovery in emergencies.
2. Assess the role of UNICEF-supported CFS as a response and protection mechanism:
   a. in the context of the affected areas
3. Determine the extent to which the CFS programme integrated principles, such as equity, gender sensitivity, inclusivity, community participation and human rights, and then actually implemented them in practice.
4. Document the lessons, good practices and challenges in the establishment and implementation of CFS.

This evaluation aims to contribute to the global evidence base and critically examine the CFS strategy in emergency settings, which is an increasingly standard response employed in humanitarian situations. Although UNICEF commissioned this evaluation, the findings are relevant for all stakeholders, including the Government of the Philippines and partner NGOs. The evaluation is presented in a spirit of constructive learning and the strengthening of child protection strategies in emergencies.

The scope of the evaluation spanned the 12-month period from the beginning of the initial emergency relief operation in November 2013 through the early recovery and rehabilitation phases in November 2014. A total of 84 UNICEF-supported CFS in 20 municipalities located in Region VI and Region VIII, among the worst affected areas, were analysed by the evaluation team through direct visits or participation in the survey. The evaluation was designed to comply with internationally recognized research and evaluation standards and was based on an iterative methodology using qualitative and quantitative data collection tools. An unfortunate series of challenges and limitations were encountered and are outlined in the report; however, they did not diminish or invalidate the overall findings or conclusions in any significant way.
Information collected from various sources, triangulated and analysed by the evaluation team, reflect a high level of consistency across regions, sites and respondents, indicating that the findings presented here are a realistic representation of the overall CFS experience in response to Typhoon Haiyan.

**Evaluation findings**

**UNICEF humanitarian response**

The scale and degree of devastation of Typhoon Haiyan were unprecedented for the Philippines, prompting a high-level response from the Philippine Government, civil society and international organizations. The UNICEF immediate response team (IRT) deployment, which covered all programme sectors and support staff, including cluster coordinators and communication officers, fulfilled many of its stated objectives. Challenges were encountered, however, towards ensuring that the understanding of the local context was adequately reflected in the response strategy and in capitalizing on the significant existing capacity in the Philippines and potential national partnerships. A ‘substitution’ modus operandi, in which international organizations largely drove the humanitarian response, seems to have prevailed.

**Evolution of the child protection response**

The evaluation found that the core elements of the child protection response strategy, including the decision to implement CFS, were largely determined by international IRT experts prior to arriving in the typhoon-affected areas. At the time of the disaster, comprehensive information on the child protection context in the Philippines that could be used to inform programmatic choices and the Interagency Strategic Response Plan was limited.

The CFS component of the Typhoon Haiyan child protection response evolved in their development, leaving the evaluation team to find two distinct models. Corresponding with the immediate emergency relief phase, the first model, referred to as generation I CFS for this evaluation, were set up by international NGOs in evacuation centres and in severely affected communities. UNICEF provided supplies only. The generation I CFS were implemented with the objectives of providing a safe location and psychosocial support and assisting in the re-establishment of normalcy in children’s lives. Their existence was limited and short-lived. A good practice emerging from this evaluation is that the simplicity and timing of the generation I CFS allowed this intervention to successfully address limited but much-needed challenges during the immediate emergency relief phase.

As the relief response took shape, both the UNICEF and the Interagency Strategic Response Plans were finalized. The CFS in those plans accounted for one part of the wider child protection emergency response, articulated around six main interventions. The objectives of CFS described in those plans differed from generation I CFS, specifically with the aim of combining emergency response elements with long-term child protection system strengthening. The rationale and the actual means by which these aims would be achieved were not clearly elaborated, although they were understood to represent a long-standing strategic goal of UNICEF. Due to delays in signing the programme cooperation agreements
with partners and reliance on supplies (such as tents), the majority of spaces were set up from June 2014 onward, more than six months after the typhoon struck. The evaluation refers to these spaces as generation II CFS.

It is commendable that agencies wanted to ensure that the emergency child protection response contributed to national system strengthening. However, the generation II CFS objectives do not appear to have been achieved because the actual content of the CFS and its functions were not fully conceptualized or adapted to the context. The protection needs of boys and girls, especially those of adolescents, were not elaborated or well understood and hence inadequately addressed. The ability of CFS to strengthen community protection systems or enhance mechanisms to receive and respond to reports of abuse, neglect, exploitation or violence against children was limited.

**Coordination**

The national and regional Child Protection Working Groups (CPWG) were mandated to coordinate activities for strengthening the protection of children in affected areas, with a special focus on issues that resulted from or were exacerbated by the disaster. However, the leadership of the CPWGs and other technical working groups lacked experience to strategically address common limitations of the CFS that have been documented in emergency contexts elsewhere. The inconsistent and relatively weak leadership of the working groups resulted in the inability of agencies involved in the CFS implementation to find effective ways to address challenges that the implementation process encountered. Compounding the situation, CFS ended up under the sole purview of child protection agencies, with little collaboration with agencies in other relevant sectors, such as education.

**CFS programme management**

The CFS component of the child protection strategy response was implemented between January and April 2014 through the programme cooperation agreements with international NGO and local government partners. This period represented the transition from the emergency to the recovery phases. Delays in finalizing those agreements and coordination with partners were critical factors in determining the way the child protection response to Typhoon Haiyan unfolded. By the time the last of the agreements were signed in the March/April 2014 post-relief phase, their content was not entirely relevant – they included approaches that were no longer needed, such as emergency safe areas for children to play and psychosocial support. This mismatch in needs and services resulted in confusion among implementing agencies, CFS staff, beneficiaries, communities and local authorities regarding the purpose, activities and overall CFS strategy.

Intense pressure to spend funds and to ensure visibility resulted in the programme cooperation agreements being implemented even though they may no longer have been the most appropriate strategy. Relationships between UNICEF and implementing agencies do not appear to have evolved into full partnerships with a shared sense of collective responsibility, accountability or ownership. As a result, there was limited common reflection on the relevance and appropriateness of CFS at the later stage of the response effort.
Results and perception of CFS effectiveness

During the relief phase, CFS served as a useful and discrete child protection response that required minimal physical resources and were effective in the immediate aftermath of the typhoon. Children were provided with a safe place to play, socialize and learn. The CFS allowed parents and other community members to focus on rebuilding their homes, livelihoods and neighbourhoods. In general, CFS were overwhelmingly popular with communities, beneficiaries and caregivers and sent a strong positive signal to them that the national and international community were physically there to provide support in a time of crisis, the importance of which should not be underestimated.

However, once the routine aspects of everyday life were re-established, the CFS services provided were similar in content and quality to those provided by schools and day-care centres. Although CFS set up in the later phase were appreciated for their recreational aspects, their overall purpose and objectives were less clear. After schools and government day-care centres began to reopen, the need for safe places for children to go while parents dealt with recovery efforts became much less pressing.

Setting up the UNICEF-supported CFS

The implementation of generation II CFS in response to Typhoon Haiyan faced significant challenges: the degree of involvement of local authorities and communities in CFS design and implementation, the types of beneficiaries involved and the capacity of CFS to have a meaningful role in child protection or to strengthen the child protection system. Specific challenges were encountered in terms of human resources: CFS with more complex objectives needed staff with higher skills. Finding enough skilled staff to manage and facilitate the large number of CFS envisioned in the roll-out plan proved to be a tremendous challenge. Staff admitted to often feeling unprepared to support the functions of the CFS, which, despite the training efforts of all agencies, were still unclear.

The engagement with communities prior to the establishment of each CFS was largely limited to providing information about the CFS plan and obtaining permission from local authorities. This appears to have been the extent of the engagement with barangay officials and local community members in CFS design, planning and implementation. The question of whether CFS was the most appropriate strategy to meet mutually agreed and endorsed objectives did not seem to be at the core of this preliminary exchange with communities.

The CFS activities were designed for younger children with little to no specific programmes for adolescents, even though this age group was identified to be at risk in the programme review and joint needs assessment conducted by the CPWG education cluster in January 2014. Limited effort was made to identify and provide support to families and children in difficult circumstances. Across evaluation locations, CFS generally did not utilize a comprehensive family perspective or invest effort to ensure substantive community engagement. Community members not directly involved with the CFS knew little about its objectives or activities. From mid-2014, UNICEF and implementing agencies began to address programme shortcomings – primarily to improve partners’ capacities to include and support children with disabilities and developing initiatives targeting adolescents.
CFS and child protection

For the typhoon-affected areas, the UNICEF-supported CFS were designed to minimize violations of children’s rights, which often increase dramatically in emergency situations. These include, among others, their right to survival, protection, development and participation. The CFS provided an immediate child protection function as a safe space for children during a time of crisis. Even though the provision of psychosocial support was overwhelmingly perceived as a strong point of CFS, few actually offered activities specifically designed to provide psychosocial support, aside from the intrinsic benefit of structured games and recreational activities. Despite the absence of substantive psychosocial support services, this was identified as a main focus throughout the implementation experience, even when this need was less pronounced when the immediate crisis abated.

When asked to appraise the value of the CFS, consulted communities consistently stated that the provided services did not address their child protection needs and priorities, such as the pressing risks faced by adolescents, including teenage pregnancy. CFS were not tailored to address child protection concerns that were identified in the Visayas region even before Typhoon Haiyan struck (specifically ‘vices’ and challenging behaviours, peer violence, child abuse, rape and family problems), which likely increased in prevalence and severity after the disaster.

Despite aspirations to do so, CFS did not appear to be part of a functioning child protection response mechanism, and staff were not systematically trained to identify vulnerable children or conduct outreach to those in need of assistance. As a result, few actual child protection cases were detected. Despite the visibility of posters and banners depicting referral pathways, these did not appear to be used and were not mentioned by community members or CFS staff. CFS staff and beneficiaries consistently stated that child protection was not a primary role of the CFS.

Beyond medical care and possible arrest or reprimand of a perpetrator of abuse, the availability of services to child victims remained unclear. The findings of this evaluation, however, suggest that the surge deployment of social workers at the municipality level, as an alternative to or as part of the CFS approach, might have improved child protection work, a hypothesis that merits further exploration.

Closure or handover of CFS

Parents, children and local officials expected the CFS to continue and were disappointed when activities abruptly stopped. Challenges were exacerbated by limited community involvement from the beginning. Despite enthusiasm for the CFS at the local level, the expectation of implementing partners that CFS could be sustained by local authorities and communities without international agency funding and technical support often proved unjustified, especially because the CFS strategy, functions, long-term purpose or envisioned evolution were not mutually agreed upon or clearly communicated at any point in the process, combined with the absence of funds at the local level. The CFS closure and handover process was often confusing and contradictory, with community expectations poorly managed and no clear exit strategy articulated.
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Monitoring, evaluation and quality improvement

The monitoring and evaluation framework for the CFS response effort was fragmented among the partners. The data collection process was unclear, and monitoring was unsystematic and appears to have followed different benchmarks developed by the implementing agencies. In instances where assessments and reviews were conducted, the findings and recommendations do not appear to have been acted upon. For example, a programme review and joint needs assessment conducted as early as January 2014 by the CPWG education cluster in Regions VI and VII revealed many findings consistent with this evaluation’s conclusions.

Conclusions

Typhoon Haiyan left an immense trail of devastation and created a major challenge for the Government and international humanitarian organizations, stretching their capacity and performance. As a result, the use of CFS as a child protection response to the disaster created by Typhoon Haiyan was only partially successful. The evaluation found that CFS may be relevant and appropriate as an initial response to a natural disaster but may not always be relevant and appropriate for subsequent phases. In the case of Typhoon Haiyan, the assumption that CFS can effectively combine immediate emergency response with child protection system strengthening proved to be unrealistic.

With regard to the themes of CFS relevance, appropriateness, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability, the evaluation found:

Relevance
The relevance of the strategy to implement CFS as the primary child protection response to Typhoon Haiyan does not seem to have been considered in depth in the immediate aftermath of the disaster. Questions related to the overall objectives of the strategy, why a CFS strategy was selected, what child protection results or outcomes the CFS aimed to achieve and whether the specific approach adopted (focus on younger children and the strong emphasis on supplies and tents, for example) was the most effective in the Philippine context were not examined in detail or reflected in how the CFS were implemented.

Appropriateness
In the Haiyan-affected areas of the Philippines, the CFS were an appropriate means of providing basic support to children through structured supervised recreational activities, the reintroduction of everyday routines and the restoration of a sense of normalcy among community members of all ages. Generation I CFS in the initial relief phase were most appropriate because they provided essential services. Generation II CFS, which attempted to integrate emergency response, psychosocial support and child protection systems strengthening, lacked conceptual clarity. The generation II CFS services do not appear to have matched either the expectations of communities or the stated overall response objectives.

Effectiveness
CFS were seen by locals as a positive and constructive sign in the immediate aftermath of the typhoon that the outside community was sending help. Generation I CFS were recognized as effective in providing psychosocial support. They were valued primarily for
providing opportunities for children to play and interact with their peers. From a wider child protection perspective, however, the limited engagement with and involvement of the community diminished their effectiveness. CFS appear to have only reached out to involve families and children most in need to a limited extent; parents and caregivers were not routinely involved as beneficiaries. Additionally, the needs of adolescents, marginalized children and children with disabilities were not specifically addressed by either generation I or II CFS. In later stages, other programmes not directly linked to CFS began to deal with those needs.

Efficiency
The overall child protection programme response was relatively efficient in mobilizing supplies and making them available to partners for immediate use in the first wave of CFS. Specifically to CFS implementation, the delay in finalizing the programme cooperation agreements were universally considered to be unacceptable in an emergency, even less so in a disaster of this size and where special operating procedures were in use. From the programme side, the overemphasis on supplies was problematic and inefficient; the provision of basic services should not have been delayed due to the lack of kits or tents.

Sustainability
A key question is whether CFS are meant to be sustainable in the long term or whether their primary and most effective function is during the immediate aftermath of an emergency. Generation I CFS were not intended to be sustainable structures. The majority were closed within three months after serving the essential relief phase objectives. At the time of the evaluation, most of the generation II CFS were still operating but were about to close or transition. The rationale for the longer-term operation of the CFS and the transition to community management by evolving into a new type of community structure does not appear to have been thought through in the child protection Strategic Response Plan. Similarly, the exit strategy or handover processes were not clarified with community members when the CFS were established, thus undermining their sustainability.

Overall, the evaluation found that the CFS response to Typhoon Haiyan followed largely predetermined strategies and a standardized approach presumed applicable to all large-scale humanitarian emergencies globally. Limitations identified by the evaluation include: lack of sufficient recognition of the Filipino context and capacities, insufficient assessment of and response to local child protection needs, lack of strategic leadership, significant delays in finalizing agreements with partners and the use of standardized, predesigned approaches. In the immediate aftermath of the disaster, the CFS strategy served a needed and appreciated purpose. Beyond that period, the limitations resulted in the CFS becoming less relevant for the Philippine context, particularly several months after the relief phase had concluded.

Lessons learned
The evaluation team identified the following lessons for consideration in future emergency situations:

- International expertise cannot replace local knowledge, experience and understanding of a context.
- Predetermined standardized child protection and CFS programme responses are problematic. Developing a solid understanding of the needs and what might strengthen or undermine existing systems is as essential as prepositioning supplies.
The common acceptance of CFS as an automatic child protection response in an emergency situation is problematic. When the establishment of CFS is objectified as an end goal, the potential capacity of this strategy to achieve child protection outcomes is often lost. Emphasis on the physical establishment of a physical space at the expense of their actual function overshadows consideration of other potentially more appropriate strategies.

International commitments, standards and guidance should guide – but not dictate – locally adapted and emergency-specific child protection response plans.

The almost exclusive focus on establishing CFS limits opportunities for maximizing the potential of this strategy through linkages to broader child protection and other sectors. Lack of analysis of how the CFS can contribute, interact and complement broader child protection initiatives and other sectors (education, health, WASH and shelter) decreases opportunities for positive outcomes for children and families.

Needs evolve according to situations. Evacuation centres and camps might need child-friendly spaces in the long term, while communities generally re-establish safe areas, play spaces and routines relatively quickly after a natural disaster.

A strategy to use CFS as the response in all situations, from the emergency relief to recovery to rehabilitation periods, is misplaced. As a strategy that responds to relief, recovery and long-term reconstruction situations, CFS have evident limitations because one size does not fit all. Strategic responses need to be developed based on a phased approach, in which different strategies are utilized and adapted to evolving needs and context.

Child-friendly spaces can contribute to positive changes for children and families when kept simple and focused on serving specific needs related to the relief emergency phase. Basic CFS can be implemented in large numbers because they require few resources, staff capacity and supplies. Extending the duration of CFS in subsequent emergency phases loses relevance unless this is based upon a strong rationale, strategy and solid theory of change grounded in the local context. However, longer-running CFS are likely to increase in complexity and require more skills, resources and supplies to operate, posing challenges for setting up and/or operating the concept at large scale.

CFS might not need to be sustainable if their functions are only necessary in specific circumstances. For example, if CFS are understood to be most effective in providing immediate psychosocial support to children and communities, they might be time bound to the relief phase.

Organizations should hold each other accountable within the CPWG through a rigorous monitoring and evaluation framework. Above all, organizations should be accountable for the achievement of specified child protection results, not only the content of a stipulated programme cooperation agreement. They should feel a common sense of responsibility to ensure that strategies and programmes are constantly assessed and adapted to do this.

The CFS challenges documented in this evaluation were consistent with lessons learned from other emergency situations and echo the large body of guidance on CFS implementation. A key common finding is that implementing CFS effectively and appropriately is difficult and therefore might not be the most appropriate strategy for many situations. This also suggests that previous lessons were either not reviewed when planning for a new situation or, worse, ignored.
Recommendations

Based on the overall analysis of the reviewed literature, interviews, group discussions and survey responses, the following recommendations are offered to stakeholders working with or considering future use of child-friendly spaces in an emergency situation.

Specific recommendations for CFS as a response to Typhoon Haiyan

This evaluation was intended to serve a formative function. However, the timing of this report coincides with the termination of the CFS experience in response to Typhoon Haiyan. Given this reality, it is recommended that UNICEF Philippines and implementing partners:

- Phase out the current CFS activities without any specific pressure on communities to sustain them.
- Where interest has been expressed and NGOs have the capacity and resources to do so, support communities to transition CFS to appropriate centres for youth and recreation that are designed to address identified community needs.
- Support communities and local government units (in terms of capacity or identifying alternative ways to cover the same functions) who want to sustain CFS.

Recommendations for CFS as a child protection strategy in emergency situations in the Philippines

CFS can be a useful strategy. But it also can distract from the comprehensive child protection response in a time of emergency. In light of the endorsement of CFS as a strategy for child protection in emergencies by the Government of the Philippines and with the promotion of national guidelines on CFS, it is recommended that respective government agencies and UNICEF Philippines:

- Carry out a study to shed light on the child protection system, its components, appropriateness and its functioning. The study should involve comprehensive analysis of the present child protection system’s appropriateness to the context as well as an in-depth understanding of what communities and families typically do to prevent and respond to threats to children’s well-being. The study should be an opportunity to build a common understanding among government and non-government stakeholders on the analysis of the system. This is an essential first step in any effort to strengthen the child protection system and should be prioritized.
- Ensure that the CFS concept is understood to be one of a range of strategic options available to respond to child protection needs in emergencies.
- The Council for the Welfare of Children and the Department of Social Welfare and Development should adapt the national CFS guidelines, making them less prescriptive and more as operating principles. Additionally, the guidelines can be strengthened by including the following specific considerations:
  - Clarify whether CFS is a strategy that can achieve the articulated child protection outcomes. Specify those outcomes in the first deliberation on whether to use the CFS strategy, and never lose sight of them.
  - Explain in detail how the CFS will bring about the needed child protection outcomes.
  - Explain in detail what the CFS strategy offers that existing services or agents cannot provide (even if they are supported or built up during the emergency situation).
  - Consider whether CFS could be used as a central platform for the delivery of a range of critical services for children, linked to other child protection responses (for example, unaccompanied and separated children, children who have been maltreated, families with multiple problems).
  - Clarify the lifespan and explain how CFS will be closed down or transition to other management.
Promote, within the national guidelines and in practice, increased clarity and specific guidance on the process involved in setting up a CFS (if CFS is determined to be the most appropriate strategy), particularly in terms of engagement and involvement with communities and beneficiaries. This evaluation found that this clarity is a critical factor for successful CFS implementation, if only by the correlation between the absence of it and the difficulties the CFS implementation encountered.

Ensure that the Government is adequately supported to lead the child protection strategic response. The CPWG and UNICEF should adhere to the next series of suggestions.

Recommendations for national and international agencies involved in child protection in emergency programmes in the Philippines and globally

When joining a humanitarian emergency response in designing child protection strategies, government agencies, UNICEF and other international organizations (together in the CPWG) are recommended to:

- Develop locally adapted and emergency-specific child protection response plans that are guided – but not dictated by – international guidelines, standards and commitments.
- Design the child protection response that is relevant and appropriate for the specific context and type of emergency. This is standard knowledge, but rarely is it deeply considered. To truly respond to need and circumstance, agencies should:
  - Carry out a child protection needs assessment.
  - Reflect on local data and contextual understanding in the plans under development.
  - Use both primary and secondary data (pre-emergency data) in designing and monitoring CFS.
  - Consider the expected results in relation to the needs, the available capacities and the opportunities to implement programmes.
  - Maintain focus on the child protection outcomes. Avoid the establishment of CFS as the objective of the child protection response programme. It’s not the tent but what goes on inside that only matters.
  - If CFS are selected as part of the child protection response strategy, clearly state how it will contribute to the overall intended child protection results and how it will integrate with the other programmes (including broader child protection, education, health and shelter).
- Adopt a phased development of the strategic child protection response to humanitarian emergencies. The plan should be incrementally detailed but adapted as additional information becomes available and as the evolving situation changes.

Recommendations for UNICEF management of the humanitarian response

- Design and inform the mobilization and deployment of the immediate response team to maximize partnerships and existing capacities, avoiding substitution of national leadership and staff. This requires careful planning and gradual disengagement following the relief phase.
- Streamline processes with adequate space for flexibility and options for operations in an emergency:
  - Improve the socialization of the simplified standard operating procedures and ensure an increased understanding of the available options, especially to ensure reasonable timing for signing programme cooperation agreements.
  - Ensure that management is in a position to override procedural obstacles in the interest of the relief response.
Recommendations for international agencies involved in child protection in emergency responses globally

UNICEF and international NGOs are recommended to:

- Work towards the realization of a collective sense of responsibility built on programmatic and strategic coordination. Specifically:
  - Ensure experienced and qualified child protection in emergency staff are assigned to cluster coordination.
  - Work with other sectors, especially education, on sharing strategies and jointly establishing CFS. Avoid competition between sectors or working in silos.
  - Be transparent about individual organizations’ needs for visibility, scale and programme implementation. Ensure a collective sense of responsibility to achieve outcomes for children and communities, focusing on the outcomes and measuring change in the lives of children and families.

- Strengthen partnerships through strategic and regular dialogue that focuses on how to continuously improve programmes to achieve the articulated child protection outcomes.
- Conduct regular reviews of the overall child protection response plan, in which the contributions of all programme components towards the articulated child protection outcomes are assessed and continuously verified.

Finally, the evaluation recommends that UNICEF and partners, possibly through the CPWG, organize a forum to discuss the following issues and agree on a way forward in the use of CFS as a child protection emergency response globally.

- What factors determine whether a standardized emergency response strategy should be used and is appropriate in different contexts?
- Is it truly possible or opportune to carry out assessments during emergencies? If so, at what stage can this be done, and what type of assessment should be conducted?
- What are the advantages of using international guidelines and standards, and how could they be strengthened or further improved for flexible application?
- Why is CFS the primary global child protection response in emergencies?
  - What are possible alternative strategies to CFS, and why have they not been considered or deployed?
  - Why does CFS often appear to become an objective in and of itself in the child protection emergency response, even in different settings? How can this be avoided?
- What is required to ensure that CFS are integrated into and appropriate for the contexts in which they operate, the communities in which they are placed, the families with whom they are supposed to interact with and the children they are designed to serve?
Recommendations specific to the design and implementation of child-friendly spaces

If CFS are selected as the response strategy in an emergency situation, government agencies, UNICEF and international organizations (together in the CPWG) are recommended to:

- Clearly spell out the CFS rationale, expected results and functions. To do this:
  - Identify needed outcomes and assess whether CFS is the best strategy to achieve these outcomes in the given context.
  - Spell out the relevance and added value of CFS in a specific context: What does the CFS contribute that is not already there?
  - Give a realistic lifespan of strategies, such as CFS, that respond to the specified functions. Organizations should be open to the idea that CFS might be a short-term rather than long-term endeavour.
  - Consider whether CFS is the most useful option in the relief phase, and consider limiting implementation to this time frame (approximately three months).
  - Develop a clear and realistic exit or handover strategy that is discussed and agreed with beneficiaries, local partners and communities at the outset.

- Define and distinguish the CFS types or models, while being explicit on their expected outcomes:
  - For the relief phase, keep the CFS model simple, requiring minimal capacity building for immediate implementation and limited dependency on supplies (generation I CFS).
  - Adapt the function of the CFS implemented after the relief phase – phase out emergency-related activities and increase specific child protection functions in a complementary relationship with the existing child protection system (generation II CFS).

- Maintain CFS beyond a relief phase only if the circumstances require it. For example, if its functions cannot be carried out in other ways; such circumstances would be evacuation centres, situations of protracted social instability, natural hazards affecting the safety of spaces for play and socialization, among others.

- If the CFS strategy is mandated to serve a long-term function, develop a solid theory of change before entering the recovery phase to explain how the CFS is able and intended to contribute to the articulated long-term outcomes.

- If the CFS strategy is considered to be the most appropriate strategy for the relief phase, ensure that it does not replace, overlap or undermine any existing function of the child protection system in the context. This requires functional knowledge of the child protection system at the local level.

- If such functions of the child protection system are severely weakened or non-operational, ensure that the CFS, along with the child protection response programme, address these gaps from the beginning.

CFS implementation and management

- In all circumstances, conduct a community-level assessment to ensure that the strategies adopted are adapted to the specific characteristics and needs of children and families. The assessment of the situation could be staged and carried out incrementally.

- Establish dialogue with potential beneficiaries and communities from the outset to verify whether the CFS is genuinely needed, desirable and appropriate or if a different approach would be more effective.

- If CFS is determined to be the most appropriate strategy for the emergency context, then during the relief phase, focus on establishing its minimal functions from the beginning (providing recreation, safe space, psychosocial support) and for all children.

- Establish CFS in coordination with communities (not only local authorities) and be proactive in the community.

- CFS staffing should be realistically considered during the planning phase. Weigh the numbers and capabilities of staff to be recruited against the envisioned objectives of the CFS; the more complex the model, the more specialized and skilled its staff needs to be.
1. Introduction

On 8 November 2013, super Typhoon Haiyan became one of the most powerful tropical storms ever recorded, striking the Visayas region of the Philippines and causing massive death and destruction. Ultimately, some 8,000 people died, 14 million people were affected and 4.1 million were displaced. The typhoon (known in the Philippines as Yolanda) resulted in catastrophic damage to housing and infrastructure. Schools were occupied as evacuation centres and lives and livelihoods were seriously disrupted, with enduring effects that will take years to repair and rebuild. Haiyan landed in the wake of two other emergencies, a 7.2 magnitude earthquake that struck Bohol (October 2013) and the displacement of more than 100,000 people in Zamboanga del Norte Province due to armed conflict (September 2013).¹

The scale of the disaster resulted in needs that stretched the capacity of the Philippine Government. United Nations agencies quickly mobilized in response to an early government request for assistance. The Philippine Government and the Humanitarian Country Team launched the cluster approach in Tacloban and Guiuan municipality (Region VIII), in Roxas City (Region VI) and, partially, in Borongan City. On 12 November 2013, the Humanitarian Country Team issued the Interagency Humanitarian Action Plan and Flash Appeal for a six-month period (9 November 2013 to 10 May 2014), with a total appeal amount of US$301 million, of which the UNICEF component was US$34.3 million (revised upwards to US$61.5 million in mid-November 2013).²

Two multiple cluster/sector initial rapid assessments (MIRAs) were carried out: MIRA 1 and MIRA 2, in November and December, respectively. These appraisals informed the Interagency Strategic Response Plan released on 6 December 2013 for a 12-month period (November 2013 to November 2014), replacing the Interagency Humanitarian Action Plan. The Interagency Strategic Response Plan total appeal was US$791 million, of which the revised UNICEF component was US$130 million (increased from an initial US$119 million).³

The total estimated number of affected children ranged from nearly 4.6 million to more than 6.7 million (between 10 November 2013 and 7 February 2014). After a disaster of this magnitude, violations of children’s rights often increase dramatically. These include, among others, their right to survival, protection, development and participation. The UNICEF response efforts were designed to strengthen the protection of children’s rights, and fundraising proved successful. A UNICEF real-time evaluation in July 2014 characterized the typhoon response as ‘resource led’, which was confirmed by several respondents in this evaluation.⁴

---

¹ UNICEF, 2014a, p. 3.
² UNICEF, 2013a, b.
³ UNICEF, 2014a, b.
⁴ UNICEF, 2014b.
In December 2014, one year after Typhoon Haiyan hit the Philippines, the UNICEF response was reported to have provided nearly 1.4 million people with access to safe water, vaccinations against measles to nearly 1.8 million children, learning materials to almost 625,000 children and psychosocial support to more than 58,000 children. Over the course of 2014, UNICEF reported reaching 43,907 children through 171 newly established child-friendly spaces (CFS), with around 80 per cent of children in affected areas registered in a CFS. The latest internal monitoring results, however, suggest that UNICEF supported a revised total of 280 CFS.

A UNICEF review of the CFS conducted in January 2014, concluded that although community members and children viewed these spaces positively, the strategy’s role in early recovery, child protection system strengthening and in providing a harmonized approach to protecting the well-being of all children had not been well established. From that review, UNICEF recognized that important questions remained, for example, on the role of CFS in an emergency response in the Philippines and more specifically its role in protecting children in typhoon-affected areas. Following the 2014 review, UNICEF Philippines began to consider the need to evaluate the CFS strategy in its Typhoon Haiyan response. The findings presented here, commissioned at the end of December 2014, are the result of that evaluation.

1.1 Evaluation purpose

The purpose of this formative evaluation is to help strengthen the child protection programming response during emergencies in the Philippines and to inform the current and future policy and practice of UNICEF as well as national and local authorities regarding the use of child-friendly spaces. The overall objective was to determine the relevance, protective and restorative effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of UNICEF-supported CFS by drawing on the experiences and lessons from the Typhoon Haiyan period. These insights are also intended to contribute to the expansion of the global evidence base on child protection in emergencies and enhance learning on the conceptualization and implementation of CFS.

Specifically, this evaluation had four objectives:

1. Examine how CFS contributed to child protection programming in the context of relief and recovery in emergencies.

2. Assess the role of UNICEF-supported CFS as a response and protection mechanism in the aftermath of Typhoon Haiyan:
   a. in the context of the affected areas

---

5 UNICEF, 2014c, pp. 2–3.
7 Information provided by UNICEF in a spreadsheet, last updated on 10 March 2015.
8 UNICEF, 2014e, p. 4.
9 UNICEF, 2014e.
10 Guidelines for Child-Friendly Spaces in Emergencies, field-testing version developed and reviewed by the Global Education Cluster, the Global Protection Cluster Child Protection Area of focus, the Inter-Agency
3. Determine the extent to which the CFS integrated principles, such as equity, gender sensitivity, inclusivity, community participation and human rights, and were actually implemented in practice.

4. Document lessons, good practices and challenges in the establishment of and implementation of CFS.

1.2 Evaluation scope

The scope of the evaluation spanned the 12-month period from the beginning of the initial emergency relief operation in November 2013 through the early recovery and rehabilitation phases, until November 2014. Although this evaluation focused primarily on communities in the affected areas, attention was also given to the national and strategic aspects of the UNICEF Philippines’ child protection programme. This approach allowed for an assessment of the complementarity and coherence of CFS within UNICEF’s wider child protection and emergency child protection programmes.

To collect evidence and reach rigorous conclusions, a total of 84 UNICEF-supported CFS in 20 municipalities were reached (either through team visits or through direct and indirect survey administration) and involved in this evaluation. The municipalities selected were in Region VI and Region VIII, which were among the worst affected by the typhoon. The CFS that were reviewed were implemented by local government units (LGUs), ChildFund International, Plan International, World Vision or Save the Children.

1.3 Evaluation team

The evaluation team comprised four international researchers from Child Frontiers, ten Filipino researchers from the University of the Philippines of the Visayas and Southern Leyte State University, complemented by two national research assistants. Two research teams were assembled, each consisting of one international researcher, five national researchers and one national research assistant and each assigned a region.

1.4 Evaluation ethics

This evaluation was designed to comply with internationally recognized research and evaluation standards.\(^{11}\) The ethical principles derived in part from a framework of requirements laid out by Emanuel et al.\(^{12}\) The evaluation framework set high standards to enable trust to be established quickly between the research team and participants, thus encouraging participants to answer questions openly and in a way that promotes the accuracy of the findings but is sensitive to their well-being. As described in the

---

\(^{11}\) These principles are an adaptation of the OECD DAC (2010) evaluation criteria.

\(^{12}\) Emanuel et al., 2004. The research was not clinical in nature, but the strict ethical guidelines associated with clinical research were appropriate, given the sensitive nature of the research topic and the likelihood that a number of research participants will be in positions of relative vulnerability.
accompanying evaluation inception report (Annex IV), the evaluation was designed to have social and scientific value; elicit robust and valid findings; ensure the fair selection of participants and guarantee their protection and welfare throughout; ensure that all participation is on a voluntary basis; and promote transparency and independence towards the greatest level of objectivity possible.

Team members received specialized training on the ethical guidelines and principles of the evaluation as well as the Statement of Commitment on Eliminating Sexual Exploitation and Abuse by UN and Non-UN Personnel. All team members were required to sign a researcher code of conduct prior to involvement in the data collection.

1.5 Evaluation methodology

To fulfil a formative function, this evaluation built upon the evidence collected, the analysis conducted and the conclusions and recommendations developed in an iterative manner. This approach created multiple opportunities to review and analyse the expanding data set, thus informing the direction and analysis of the later stages of the research. It involved daily debriefings, ongoing analysis of emerging findings and adjustment of tools throughout the data collection process. The iteration of participatory analysis and consideration of findings with staff from several organizations involved in the CFS experience, especially UNICEF, occurred primarily during the formal, planned validation meetings at the regional and national level and through a series of meetings and interviews with UNICEF staff in Manila and at the regional level at different stages of the data collection process.

To carry out this evaluation, a combination of qualitative and quantitative data collection methods were used, including: a comprehensive desk review, group discussions (involving different community groups, including CFS beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries, children and adults), group interviews (with CFS staff and community groups, including CFS beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries), semi-structured interviews at the community level (with programme staff and local authorities) and at the national level (including with government officials, programme staff and national counterparts), a survey involving CFS managers, and validation meetings at both the regional and national levels.

To reach convincing and robust conclusions that can be considered representative of the experience of the CFS implementation in response to the Typhoon Haiyan – without covering the totality of UNICEF-supported CFS – the evaluation was constructed as an incremental process of identification, analysis, verification and validation of hypotheses taking shape around the evaluation criteria and core questions. Based on a consistent picture that emerged from the desk review, an in-depth investigation of how CFS were set up and developed in communities (micro analysis) was then undertaken. This process was conducted in four sites (two per region), fulfilling agreed criteria for capturing potentially different experiences. This intense, granular analysis expanded the depth of understanding and expanded the hypotheses previously formed.

On this basis, the investigation was then expanded to a larger number of informants and CFS in six sites (three per region). This macro analysis allowed confirmation of the hypotheses, where consistencies among emerging findings were evident; other threads of
inquiry were also added at this point. Building on the emerging findings, a survey of 74 CFS (of the 164 still operating at the time of the evaluation) was conducted to verify the generalizability of the findings from the micro and macro analyses.

The selection of the micro and macro evaluation sites was purposive and based on the following inclusion criteria:

- both active and inactive CFS (with access to former staff and beneficiaries in the case of inactive CFS);
- CFS opened before March 2014 and CFS opened after that date;
- urban and rural, accessible and less accessible;
- a range of implementing partners (Plan International, ChildFund International, Save the Children, Handicap International and LGUs);
- CFS typology (fixed structure, semi-permanent structure, mobile);\(^\text{13}\)
- a range of geographical and administrative locations within Regions VI and VIII; and
- varying sizes of barangay population (large, medium and small).

The evaluation process unfolded as follows.

**Desk review:** More than 200 documents were reviewed, including interagency, UNICEF and documents from implementing NGOs – CFS guidelines, training manuals and child protection standards, evaluation reports, needs assessments, programme cooperation agreements, situation reports, activity reports and strategy documents.

**Micro analysis (four sites):** In-depth analysis of four CFS (two active and two inactive) was carried out to determine how CFS interact with children and other beneficiaries. The research teams bolstered the information received from authorities and staff with the perspectives of community members, families and children. This approach enabled the research teams to gauge the fit between CFS and the needs and expectations of those using their services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Micro analysis sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SITES INCLUDED IN THE MICRO ANALYSIS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGION VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barangay Cogon, Roxas City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barangay Lupit, Batan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGION VIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barangay Palanog, Tacloban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barangay Poblacion 3, Balangkayan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Macro analysis (six sites):** Macro analysis was carried out to validate and expand hypotheses found in the micro analysis. A series of interviews were conducted in six CFS sites, some active and some inactive. At this level, the method of investigation included both semi-structured and group interviews with children and community members who had been involved with the CFS as well as those who had not, CFS staff, local child protection actors, community leaders and civil society organization staff.

\(^\text{13}\) Mobile CFS units did not appear to differ from others in content; however, activities were more irregular and infrequent other than making CFS sessions a seldom experience for these communities.
### Table 2. Macro analysis sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITES INCLUDED IN THE MACRO ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REGION VI</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barangay San Nicolas, Tapaz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barangay Bino-an, Batan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barangay Boroñgon, San Dionisio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REGION VIII</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barangay Hinapolon, Alang-alang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barangay San Roque, Mayorga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barangay Cacao, La Paz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General analysis:** At the conclusion of the macro analysis, a survey of still-operating CFS was developed, based on the emerging findings and iterations of analysis carried out by the research teams. The survey was administered in both regions but with slightly different approaches due to time and resource limitations:

- Region VI: all but one operating CFS covered (26 CFS surveyed), administered in person and through coordinators.
- Region VIII: randomized selection of CFS conducted in Leyte and Samar Provinces, where researchers administered the survey in person on site (49 CFS surveyed).

The results of the survey were analysed by region and then as a combined data set because the results were consistent across the two regions. The survey analysis generally confirmed the overall evaluation findings.

### Table 3. Data collection sources and number of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA SOURCES</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Documents reviewed</td>
<td>&gt;200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-structured interviews, regional level</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group discussions, regional level</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group interviews, regional level</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey of CFS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government officials, national level</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme staff, national level</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFS staff interviewed</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFS managers answering the survey</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children aged 7–12 (group discussion participants)</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescents aged 13–17 (group discussion participants)</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community adults (group discussion participants)</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

14 Originally, the inception report anticipated a top-line, largely illustrative quantitative survey that would reach all still-active CFS established by UNICEF. It was agreed that the method of administration would be verified based on the actual situation, specifically the opportunity to reach CFS managers electronically.
1.6 Challenges encountered

The evaluation of CFS was relatively smooth thanks to the cooperation and planning of the various teams and individuals in Manila and the study sites. However, a number of challenges and limitations were encountered during the data collection process. The evaluation team tried to mitigate the impact of these challenges, and the overall findings were not compromised in a significant way.

- Participant selection was problematic at the outset. Challenges included the mixing of beneficiary and non-beneficiary respondents, inaccurate identification of CFS facilitators to be interviewed, interference with the random selection process in an effort to purposively select participants to join the group discussions and selection of participants for logistical or convenience purposes. In some cases, CFS staff wrongly informed participants that they might receive scholarships in return for participating in the research. These issues were subsequently resolved in later sites, where additional guidance on the selection criteria was provided to selection assistants.

- Another limitation involved community members selected to participate in semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions that were not CFS beneficiaries and had little to no knowledge of the CFS purpose or activities. Barangay officials and municipal social welfare and development officers also had limited knowledge of the CFS. It was not possible to ask these respondents specific questions about the CFS. The semi-structured interview tool was thus altered to add questions about other community child protection services.

- In locations where the Barangay Council for the Protection of Children had not been established or was not functioning, the research team interviewed representatives of the barangay council instead. One selected macro analysis site had to be replaced midway when it became apparent that the site selected did not have a CFS. A new site with similar characteristics was found.

- Unanticipated language issues were problematic in locations where different dialects were spoken. In one site in Region VI, participants spoke Akeanon, which none of the research team spoke. In these locations, the research team used Tagalog, which made it possible to collect data.

- The tight time frame – four weeks – to complete the inception report, train the researchers, organize and collect data over a large geographical area and ensure that all interviews were documented stretched the research teams to capacity.

Some data were not made available to the research team during the evaluation process. In some cases, this data would have contributed useful detail and helped contextualize the analysis. In addition, the data set pertaining to the expenditure of the child protection budget within the evaluation year was not available to the evaluation team, although this missing piece did not impact the rigour of the conclusions.

15 At the village level, local areas are administered by elected barangay councils. The Barangay Council for the Protection of Children (BCPC) is organized at the barangay level to ensure the promotion and protection of child well-being and welfare under the mandate of article 87 of Presidential Decree No. 603 of the Child and Youth Welfare Code. In reality, very few BCPC have been established or are functional.
2. Evaluation findings

2.1 Introduction

The findings presented in this section derive from the analysis of all evaluation sources described in the previous chapter. The findings were largely consistent across the data sources, regardless of the data collection method used or the CFS site evaluated. This suggests that the findings presented here are a realistic representation of the entire CFS experience in response to Typhoon Haiyan.

2.2 UNICEF humanitarian response

The scale and degree of devastation of Typhoon Haiyan were unprecedented for the Philippines, prompting a high-level response from the Government, civil society and international organizations. UNICEF declared a Level 3 emergency and, for the first time, simplified standard operating procedures were fully applied, with direct implications for procurement, staff deployment and recruitment. UNICEF rapidly deployed an immediate response team (IRT) and other surge capacities; 102 persons from around the world were deployed to the Philippines by December 2013. The IRT covered all programme sectors and support staff, including the cluster coordinators and communication officers for each sector for which UNICEF carries responsibility. UNICEF co-led or participated in the WASH, education, nutrition, health and the gender-based violence and the child protection ‘area of responsibility’ under the protection cluster.

Because of the swift team deployment, the response took shape rapidly at the coordination bases of Tacloban and Guiuan municipality (Region VIII) and Roxas City (Region VI), with a partial presence in Borongan City and Cebu. The deployment took place in extreme circumstances and amid a flood of international aid. According to many respondents, the IRT deployment created de facto parallel structures within UNICEF. In 11 November 2013, 3 days after Haiyan had struck, UNICEF Philippines suspended its regular country programme and directed its human resources to the disaster. At times, issues with lines of reporting and accountability affected the overall efficiency and effectiveness of the emergency response. Establishing a definitive set of priorities and an implementation plan as well as ensuring cohesive intersector links was challenging for the protection sector, including child protection, given the scope of the Interagency Strategic Response Plan, which targeted 5 million beneficiaries.

According to the UNICEF real-time evaluation, the IRT deployment was effective and efficient overall, contributing additional and sometimes much-needed technical and management experience. However, the evaluation also found that the team did not sufficiently complement or support the Country Office. National and international staff suggested that any future IRT deployment should aim to maximize the existing experience and considerable capacity on emergency response available in the Philippines.

17 This challenge was stated by several informants but also emerged clearly in the literature review.
18 UNICEF, 2014b.
National staff of UNICEF Philippines deployed to the affected regions cited challenges in balancing competing demands, including providing support to expatriate emergency experts unfamiliar with the country context. Several rounds of expatriate specialists were deployed during this time; it was frequently mentioned during the evaluation consultations that the lack of continuity hampered effective teamwork and programme development. Interviews indicated national officers thought their critical knowledge of the Philippine context was not sufficiently valued or utilized.19

The initial child protection immediate response team deployment was tasked with assessing the situation in affected areas, setting up the clusters, designing the strategic response and initiating activities. Their work lasted until mid-January 2014. The Interagency Strategic Response Plan, as a culmination of those efforts, was launched on 27 December 2013 (see Figure 1 for the timeline of events). Between February (when the Level 3 status was lifted) and March 2014, a new group of specialists joined the emergency response. According to various accounts, although relatively senior officers were recruited and/or deployed, their collective experience and exposure to large-scale emergencies and natural disasters was limited and insufficient for the enormous challenges arising. This transition challenge appears applicable to all sectors, including child protection, and across agencies (UNICEF and Save the Children).20 The second deployment of child protection specialists focused on the challenge of implementing the UNICEF Strategic Response Plan and finalizing the outstanding partnership agreements.

19 Interviews with national staff of UNICEF and international NGOs.
20 From interviews and several literature sources; see, for example, UNICEF, 2014b; Save the Children, 2014.
Figure 1. Timeline of UNICEF child protection response, including opening and closing of child-friendly spaces

Note: PCA = programme cooperation agreement.
Sources: Secondary data from the desk review and spreadsheet database on CFS shared by UNICEF, updated to 10 March 2015.
2.3 Evolution of the child protection response

Immediately after Typhoon Haiyan struck, national and local Philippine government officials focused their response on distributing relief goods to affected populations and removing debris. The Department of Social Welfare and Development conducted a survey to assess the damage and relayed useful information to the affected populations by megaphone. Cash-for-work initiatives were launched to help clear up debris, with efforts reportedly made to prevent the involvement of children. The government priority, as expressed in the strategy document *Reconstruction Assistance for Yolanda,* focused mostly on restoring livelihoods. Apart from these efforts, there was limited focus on child protection during the early response phase, and priority was given to actions traditionally understood as life-saving and recovery.

Within the broad outline of the Interagency Strategic Response Plan, UNICEF’s early goals were that children in the worst-affected communities receive immediate life-saving and life-sustaining assistance in the areas of WASH, health, nutrition, education and child protection; humanitarian action contributed to reducing risks and strengthening resilience; and the Philippine capacity to achieve the Millennium Development Goals is strengthened through ‘building back better’. From these articulated aims, it is clear that from the outset that the Interagency Strategic Response Plan had a long-term vision.

2.3.1 Development of the child protection response strategy

The IRT child protection specialist spearheaded the development of the emergency response plan for child protection immediately following deployment. The UNICEF Strategic Response Plan was pulled together quickly due to the enormity of the disaster, using the limited information available. The limited input subsequently received was predominantly provided by a senior national officer from the Country Office Child Protection Section deployed for the emergency. UNICEF staff reported that the main foci of the response, including the emphasis on CFS, were decided by the IRT experts before arriving in Tacloban. Another agency also made the same assertion about its own child protection programmes.

---

21 Information abstracted from the triangulation of semi-structured interview responses.
22 Semi-structured interview with representative of Save the Children Estancia Field Office, Region VI.
23 NEDA, 2013.
27 Group interviews and semi-structured interviews with UNICEF staff, March 2015.
28 Semi-structured interview with implementing partner staff, March 2015.
The UNICEF child protection response plan was ambitious and sophisticated in its strategic goals. It aimed not only to respond to emergency child protection needs but recognized an opportunity to create a bridge towards the longer-term development objective of strengthening the national child protection system. Actually, the child protection intermediate result statement carried no reference to an emergency response:

“Child protection intermediate result: Mandated systems, mechanisms and processes for protection of girls, boys and women are organised/re-organised and further strengthened in priority cities, municipalities and barangays; and contribute to reducing risk and strengthening resilience.”

Despite these aspirations, the child protection Strategic Response Plan became somewhat generic and was not sufficiently calibrated for the Typhoon Haiyan situation or even for the Philippines more generally. Information from MIRA 1 and MIRA 2 was not considered particularly useful for UNICEF programmatic areas; evaluation interview respondents universally stated that a rapid but comprehensive child protection assessment should have been undertaken – despite the practical challenges – to inform the programmatic choices made for both the UNICEF child protection Strategic Response Plan and the Interagency Strategic Response Plan. Or at the least, as staff from UNICEF and implementing partners suggested, more attention should have been given to sourcing and using existing knowledge about child protection issues, community mechanisms and their context. As the child protection strategy was being finalized, consultations with children and government authorities were still being carried out (in December 2013 and January 2014), suggesting that their opinions would have no bearing on the strategy. Many respondents from UNICEF, implementing organizations and local government authorities stated that a more inclusive process, particularly involving the experience and opinions of national staff, would have greatly helped to inform, shape and tailor the immediate and longer-term strategic priorities of the child protection response.

This evaluation found that the UNICEF strategic plan format was based on the CCCs, which, being a generic framework to address any type of emergency, did not lend itself to adaptation for the context of the Typhoon Haiyan emergency response. The CCCs are organizational commitments for interventions in humanitarian emergencies and not a planning tool. Contextualization became difficult when the strategic plan mirrored the CCC interventions. Some of these interventions are specific to other types of emergencies, such as armed conflict and complex humanitarian crises (especially the monitoring and reporting and the unaccompanied and separated children focus). Given that Typhoon Haiyan was a natural disaster, there should have been greater priority placed on those aspects most relevant to the relief phase.

The UNICEF child protection Strategic Response Plan reflects the logic associated with many other child protection responses in emergencies around the world. It refers to CFS as a strategy
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29 UNICEF, 2013c.
31 While there were a small number of known pre-existing issues with recruitment of child soldiers, these were relatively minor in relation to the effects of a huge natural disaster.
to provide psychosocial support. It also includes other activities aimed at reinforcing child protection services as well as information campaigns and capacity-building efforts.

When compared, the two strategic documents reflect an evolution of the CFS approach. The interagency document sketches a road map for moving from the immediate relief phase, stretching into later recovery and development. However, while the UNICEF Strategic Response Plan is coherent and well conceptualized, the transition to long-term systems-strengthening was not articulated in the subsequent Interagency Strategic Response Plan or in the programme cooperation agreements. The limited appreciation of the functioning of the Philippines child protection system (including the cultural and social dimensions that influence people’s actions in the affected regions) along with the minimal information available about the needs of children and families proved to be a significant limitation for envisaging and articulating the transition towards recovery and rehabilitation.

Based on this evolution that the comparative analysis revealed, the UNICEF response actually refers to two models of a child-friendly space, which this report refers to as generation I and II CFS:

- **Generation I CFS**: understood as an immediate relief strategy to provide psychosocial support and bring normalcy to children’s lives at the height of the emergency, offering a structured, safe, supervised play area. NGOs set up the generation I CFS, which UNICEF contributed to with supplies.

- **Generation II CFS**: reflecting a more elaborate strategy to combine emergency response functions and long-term system-strengthening functions (mostly unspecified). The rationale and the actual means by which these aims would be achieved were not explained. They were conceptualized as long term, with their operational management and funding anticipated to be handed over to the barangay authority, a local NGO or the community.

A careful reading of the documents (reinforced by some interview discussions) suggested that the strategy evolved rapidly but that the second model of CFS was aspired to early on. The majority of the CFS reviewed in this evaluation reflect the generation II concept.

The idea of transforming these spaces into an entry point for community-level child protection systems was not fully developed at the start (or end) of the process. For example, documents reviewed do not describe the specific child protection function or contribution of generation II CFS. The protection needs of boys and girls, especially those of adolescents, were not sought out or well understood and hence left inadequately addressed. Additionally, it would have been beneficial to understand what mechanisms within communities could have been enhanced rather than starting something anew. The initial conceptualization of the generation II CFS appears to have been based on an assumption that future financial investment would be forthcoming from the barangay administration, even though they were already clearly struggling to support the mandated Barangay Council for the Protection of Children. Through the interviews conducted, it became clear that there was insufficient consideration of the staffing needs and
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32 Some UNICEF officers expressed a different perspective on this point.  
skills required to achieve the objectives of the model.

The magnitude of the disaster and the impact on the population were enormous, and UNICEF should be commended for establishing a set of important goals to match the scope and complexity of the challenges. Among other protection actors, UNICEF made a concerted effort to ensure large-scale coverage by promoting CFS in more than 40 municipalities. Nonetheless, as described later in this report, the goals stated in the plans were not fully attuned to the realities.

A note on generation I and II child-friendly spaces

The distinction between generation I and II CFS is an analytical construct developed by Child Frontiers – agencies involved in their implementation did not make this distinction. The majority of UNICEF supported CFS implemented in the post-Haiyan Philippines were established after recovery had begun. Accordingly, the findings presented refer largely to generation II CFS. For clarity, this report refers to ‘CFS’ when referring to general, time-independent experiences and findings in the emergency response to Typhoon Haiyan. Where findings are particular to the immediate three months following the typhoon or the months after recovery had commenced, the terms ‘generation I’ and ‘generation II’ are used.

2.3.2 Child protection coordination

A national Child Protection Working Group (CPWG) was activated and established in Manila from the outset, chaired by the Council for the Welfare of Children and co-chaired by the UNICEF Child Protection Section. At the regional level, a CPWG was established in Roxas City (Region VI) and Tacloban (Region VIII).34 In Region VIII, sub-CPWG hubs were established in heavily affected areas: Guiuan (Eastern Samar) and Ormoc (Western Leyte). The national CWPG and the two regional CPWGs deployed international coordinators almost immediately.

At all levels, the CPWG role was to coordinate activities for strengthening the protection of children in affected areas, with a special focus on protection issues that resulted from or had been exacerbated by the disaster. The CPWG was to analyse “the trends and principal risks faced by children in the emergency, map out child protection actors and their programmatic and geographic reach, assess the adequacy of ongoing programmes and identified strategies to meet gaps”.35

With the support from the global CPWG extended to the national and regional levels (Tacloban and Roxas City), the Philippine CPWG initially performed an important role in managing information and assuming leadership to develop the Interagency Strategic Response Plan. Although the initial discussions around the strategy were rich and included consideration of child protection issues to be prioritized, once the Strategic Response Plan was finalized, the discussions shifted to CFS implementation, their geographical coordination and logistical and supply issues. An implementing partner staff thought that, as a result, substantive child protection issues were crowded out of the dialogue.36

34 Child Protection Working Group, undated, p. 2.
36 Interview with a cluster member, March 2015.
The Region VIII CPWG established a Child-Friendly Spaces Technical Working Group (CFS-TWG) in April 2014. Its purpose was to enable stronger interagency coordination, thus bridging the gap between agencies in different sectors involved in CFS, such as social services, education, health and nutrition, and to build common understanding and dialogue among the different actors involved in running these safe spaces. The CFS-TWG, which also included non-UNICEF-funded CFS, worked on the contextualization of CFS national guidelines and coordinated implementing agencies on such issues as standard facilitators’ fees and the sharing of materials.

Although the cluster system promoted coordination among agencies, wider collaboration among the sectors did not develop. For example, the CPWG does not appear to have collaborated with the education cluster to reach common strategies or to avoid overlap between temporary learning spaces, supervised neighbourhood play and the CFS.

Within UNICEF, child protection and education officers reported little coordination and collaboration between their sections, even though each shares responsibility for implementing a coordinated, convergent child protection response, especially in relation to CFS. Although a joint assessment was carried out by the two sectors, no evidence was found of effort to ensure complementarity between their activities in the affected areas. Internationally, education and protection specialists often collaborate on CFS because it serves several mutual purposes. In the Philippines, however, the CFS strategy appears to have been implemented independently by the Child Protection Section. The Education Section adopted different strategies, such as supervised neighbourhood play, which does not require a structure or complex skills, similar to the first CFS structures set up in the immediate aftermath of the disaster.

The reviewed literature and interviews indicate that the leadership of the various CPWGs and technical working groups was not experienced enough to address in a strategic way the most common and known limitations of the CFS. In general, the working groups were unable to adequately assess the existing resources and capacities that could be mobilized from across the Philippines nor to decipher the most appropriate, viable strategies to deal with child protection issues in the affected areas. In particular, there was a lack of reflection or understanding about how the CFS could become one integral mechanism within a more multifaceted, broader child protection response strategy.

2.4 Child-friendly spaces programme management

Many CFS appear to have been used as day-care centres and vice versa; in some cases, day-care staff were responsible for facilitating CFS. Although this did not seem to be the result of a deliberate, coordinated strategy, several interviewees suggested that prepositioned supplies from the Education Section were handed over to the Child Protection Section staff to accelerate implementation of the CFS. Interviews with UNICEF staff involved in the CFS implementation

38 Group interviews with representatives of UNICEF Child Protection and Education Sections, March 2015.
40 Interview and group interviews, March 2015
confirmed that an overemphasis on the need for supplies to establish CFS was a source of significant stress and tension between the two sections.\textsuperscript{41}

CFS have been implemented through agreements with mostly large international NGOs (Plan International in January 2014; ChildFund in March 2014; Save the Children in April 2014). The contractual cooperation agreements with the LGUs in relation to the CFS were limited in scope, involving local authorities in the Tacloban area only. Additional agreements were signed with national NGOs and focused on building capacities of government agencies and communities to respond to child protection needs in emergencies as well as preparation for any future emergency. The latter were all started towards the middle of 2014, once the relief phase of the emergency was over.

Staff from the partner agencies reported that they were asked to facilitate implementation of the CFS strategy developed by UNICEF. Early in the process, UNICEF decided to have a few large-scale programme cooperation agreements with well-known and respected international agencies, based on the rationale that they had the required experience to deliver in terms of scope, scale and quality. The fact that these international organizations work through local implementing partners does not appear to have been considered. Additionally, many international agencies had already secured sufficient funding for their relief response efforts and were not in urgent need of the funds that UNICEF offered. Therefore, they were not compelled to immediately sign a programme cooperation agreement, although this eventually occurred. According to staff from some agencies, potential staffing and capacity challenges to implement the planned programme at a large scale were evident during the initial programme cooperation agreement discussions, but PCAs were signed anyway.

Relationships between the agreement signatories do not appear to have been based on a shared sense of collective responsibility. Interviews indicated that overcoming the challenges and limitations of the CFS experience was not viewed as a joint endeavour. When considering important limitations of CFS implementation during a partners’ meeting in February 2014, for example, no changes to the programme cooperation agreements or CFS approach were discussed or proposed. According to some implementing partners, the absence of shared ownership resulted in limited accountability to the affected populations.\textsuperscript{42}

The delay in finalizing the agreements with partners was a critical factor in the evolution of the child protection response to Typhoon Haiyan. From the outset, these agreements took approximately two to five months to finalize. By the time some of the last agreements were signed in March and April 2014, the agreement content was no longer relevant because it pertained to the already completed relief phase.

The Level 3 simplified standard operating procedures offer room to abridge the programme cooperation agreement process in order to create faster and leaner responses. Nonetheless, the UNICEF real-time evaluation revealed that although information on this simplification was made

\textsuperscript{41} Interviews, March 2015.
\textsuperscript{42} Validation meetings with implementing partners and authorities: Roxas City, Tacloban in March 2015; Manila in April 2015.
available to the Country Office, UNICEF officers differed in their interpretation of it.\textsuperscript{43} Miscommunication between the IRT and the Country Office posed additional challenges, which were compounded by turnover of staff dealing with contracts on both sides. According to UNICEF, the delays stemmed in part from failure of partners to present acceptable proposals, budgets or contextually appropriate strategies. Three batches of specialists deployment struggled with the agreement signing process, while on the NGO side, staff turnover meant that more than five consecutive people were responsible for the finalization of coherent proposals and their implementation.

Beyond the evident implications of having an emergency response delayed by months, the programme cooperation agreement process absorbed an important portion of many professional officers’ time. Several professionals reported that it was so frustrating, constraining and difficult that the eventuality of ‘revisiting’ or amending the contracts to better meet the protection needs of children and families and the evolving situation was no longer considered an option by UNICEF and NGO staff in the affected areas. At the same time, multiple respondents across the different organizations explained that there was tremendous pressure once an agreement was signed to implement the programmes swiftly and at scale, all the while mindful to respond to donor requirements of financial accountability and organizational visibility.\textsuperscript{44}

\textbf{2.4.1 Phases of the child-friendly spaces experience}

During the evaluation research, many staff members of UNICEF and implementing partners mentioned that in the immediate aftermath of the disaster, child protection plans emerged quickly, led by specialists with considerable experience. Yet, it seems that the rationale for the central pillars of the child protection response was not understood and/or interpreted in the same way by individuals across all of the child protection agencies involved in later stages of implementation. Instead, what emerged was a somewhat two-dimensional implementation focused primarily on:\textsuperscript{45}

- establishment of child-friendly spaces
- identification and documentation of unaccompanied and separated children for family tracing and reunification.\textsuperscript{46}

The record of opening dates of CFS and supply flows reflect two distinct implementation periods: one coinciding with the relief phase and the second spanning from June to October 2014, well into the recovery phase. During the relief operation, a series of CFS structures were set up using NGO funds and materials. UNICEF contributed supplies (tents, recreational kits and early childhood kits) without a programme cooperation agreement. Within the first three months after Typhoon Haiyan struck, UNICEF contributed to at least 49 CFS through the provision of supplies (not represented in Figure 1 and 2).\textsuperscript{47} These CFS were set up in the evacuation centres where the need was most evident and in communities most affected by the typhoon. While initiating

\textsuperscript{43} UNICEF, 2014b, p.15.
\textsuperscript{44} Group interviews and semi structured interviews, March 2015.
\textsuperscript{45} Semi-structured interview carried out with the UNICEF child protection team in Manila. February and March 2015.
\textsuperscript{46} This was evident for Region VIII but less so for Region VI.
\textsuperscript{47} This figure is not definitive and is conservative because the data relative to the supply distribution for CFS implementation was available only for Region VI. It is assumed there were similar arrangements in Region VIII.
their own CFS strategy, those NGOs entered into the UNICEF programme cooperation agreement process (this period appears as a dotted line in the timeline in Figures 1 and 2). These independently initiated CFS became part of the overall UNICEF CFS response and were eventually supported by UNICEF once the agreements were signed. Some transitioned into UNICEF-supported generation II CFS.

Generation I CFS were set up as an emergency response within the first three months of the disaster and focused on providing immediate recreational and psychosocial support to children and adolescents through supervised play. This is a simple strategy that does not rely heavily on physical structures or supplies. These CFS had a short lifespan, operating for a maximum of three months.

The second period of implementation entailed setting up new CFS between June and October 2014. These were all UNICEF-funded initiatives responding to the programme cooperation agreements. These generation II CFS attempted to combine elements of emergency response with child protection system strengthening and were set up at least six months after Typhoon Haiyan struck, some opening as late as October 2014.

Although more time was available for strategic planning, preparation and greater engagement with communities at this stage, it is not evident that these key steps were carried out. In many cases, the CFS were reliant on the existence of tents and supplies, which, as of July and August, were not always available, adding to delays in implementation.

2.4.2 Results and perception of child-friendly space effectiveness

In terms of results, it is important to recognize UNICEF’s effectiveness in activating its Level 3 emergency special procedures and the largely positive impact of these efforts. The initial response attempted to set a high standard by the child protection team and the CPWG at different levels.
This evaluation found that CFS have been overwhelmingly popular with communities, beneficiaries and caregivers. Regardless of which phase a CFS operated in, on the whole, communities and boys and girls appreciated them for the following reasons:

- children are supervised in a safe location (especially in the immediate aftermath of the disaster), thus relieving parents and allowing them to attend to other immediate needs;
- CFS provides children with opportunities to play and learn (with the provision of toys and other materials). Early childhood care and development activities were most evident in Region VIII); and
- the presence of a CFS sends a strong, positive signal to the entire community that assistance is being provided in a time of high distress.

Figure 3. Most important achievements, according to child-friendly space staff

Note: CRC = Convention on the Rights of the Child; CP = child protection; PSS = psychosocial support.
Source: Child Frontiers CFS survey, March 2015.

Among other achievements echoed by beneficiaries was the opportunity to socialize, to learn manners and to have positive activities (rather than having nothing, which potentially increased the vulnerability of boys and girls to risky behaviours). Beyond these broad common achievements, the beneficiaries and CFS staff perceptions of other areas of success and results
are less consistent, possibly reflecting much more varied and less focused patterns of implementation six or seven months after the typhoon.

Community members remarked that the CFS were most effective in the first three months after the typhoon. Safe space, supervised play and psychosocial support are the essence of any CFS, and these are the achievements that the generation I CFS delivered for children and families. The tangible benefits (beyond child protection) provided by the CFS to vulnerable children, families and communities should not be underestimated. Although the child protection function may not have been fully developed in the CFS strategy, boys and girls had a safe physical space in which to play and learn – which is an essential element in the recovery of disaster survivors, both as individuals and collectively.

2.4.3 Setting up child-friendly spaces

The implementation of generation II CFS encountered significant challenges, particularly in terms of human resources, the degree of involvement of local authorities and communities in the design and implementation, the types of beneficiaries involved and the capacity of the spaces to have a meaningful role in child protection or strengthen the child protection system.

Recruitment of staff, training and support

Everyone in the Visayas region was affected by the typhoon. It was thus a major challenge to find the required number of skilled personnel for the child protection programmes and the CFS at a large scale. This reality was even more pronounced in the second phase because teachers and day-care workers were returning to their jobs. All other humanitarian sectors were also urgently seeking staff for their own initiatives, which involved non-relief distributions, supervised neighbourhood play initiatives, temporary learning centres and women-friendly spaces.

The unmatched need for knowledgeable and skilled people affected the ability of the CFS strategy to fulfil its objective of contributing to the strengthening of the child protection system. This challenge was less common where CFS served only a recreational purpose. When CFS are intended to have a more complex, protective role, then specialist staff skills are essential. Given the scale of the disaster that Haiyan left in its wake, it is unlikely that it was ever feasible to recruit, train, support and supervise the numbers of required specialist staff in the months immediately following the typhoon.

In Region VIII, many of the CFS staff (facilitators and managers) and volunteers previously worked in day-care centres, many of which were damaged or destroyed by the typhoon. These individuals had the advantage of already knowing the community and how to work with young children; some also had organizational and management skills. Few, however, had experience in working with older children, including teenagers. The fact that initial CFS activities were geared towards young children may reflect the predominance of early childhood educators in the CFS workforce. According to interviews with CFS staff as well as with representatives of implementing partners, as the day-care centres started reopening, some staff were tempted to
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48 Group interviews with CFS staff, and semi-structured interviews with implementing partners, Region VIII, March 2015.
remain working in their higher-paying job at the CFS; in some cases, individuals maintained both jobs. Either situation potentially undermined the pre-existing basic services.

In Region VI, staff and volunteers had more varied professional backgrounds, especially in the CFS that opened after August 2014. Initially, mothers, teachers and health workers were selected as volunteers to run sessions with younger children. In the later-opened CFS, out-of-school adolescents and young adults became more involved, particularly in the facilitation of sessions (specifically on disaster risk reduction activities). Their involvement represented participation and positive contribution of teenagers, a group that had been largely underserved by the CFS.

The CFS survey findings indicate the time that implementing partners spent on improving the capacities of the CFS personnel: 68 per cent of the CFS staff who were surveyed reported receiving more than three training sessions; 7 per cent had only one training opportunity and 1 per cent said they had no training (Figure 4).

However, each implementing organization used different training packages, reflecting different agencies’ priorities. These organizations had varying learning modules as well as in-service and follow-up training. The content of these sessions was not consistent because the intended role of the CFS facilitators varied by implementing agency and at different phases of implementation.

Direct observation by the evaluation team and analysis from the discussions and survey findings suggest that the training on managing CFS was only partially effective. Some CFS facilitators appeared confident in their skills and their capacity to interpret the CFS operations. But the majority, despite their training, were not clear when interviewed about the CFS objectives or their own responsibilities and functions or could not perform them with confidence.

In Region VI, staff and volunteers had more varied professional backgrounds, especially in the CFS that opened after August 2014. Initially, mothers, teachers and health workers were selected as volunteers to run sessions with younger children. In the later-opened CFS, out-of-school adolescents and young adults became more involved, particularly in the facilitation of sessions (specifically on disaster risk reduction activities). Their involvement represented participation and positive contribution of teenagers, a group that had been largely underserved by the CFS.

The CFS survey findings indicate the time that implementing partners spent on improving the capacities of the CFS personnel: 68 per cent of the CFS staff who were surveyed reported receiving more than three training sessions; 7 per cent had only one training opportunity and 1 per cent said they had no training (Figure 4).

However, each implementing organization used different training packages, reflecting different agencies’ priorities. These organizations had varying learning modules as well as in-service and follow-up training. The content of these sessions was not consistent because the intended role of the CFS facilitators varied by implementing agency and at different phases of implementation.

Direct observation by the evaluation team and analysis from the discussions and survey findings suggest that the training on managing CFS was only partially effective. Some CFS facilitators appeared confident in their skills and their capacity to interpret the CFS operations. But the majority, despite their training, were not clear when interviewed about the CFS objectives or their own responsibilities and functions or could not perform them with confidence.

The majority of CFS staff who participated in this evaluation had a background in education or early childhood development. Nonetheless, one of the most frequently cited challenges by the
CFS staff was the day-to-day care and management of children, especially those whose behaviour was difficult to manage. This difficulty highlights the potential need for supplementary training to build specialist skills for working with children who have experienced traumatic circumstances. This evaluation also revealed a widespread perception among facilitators that the CFS were established primarily to provide education and teach children manners.

Four of the five most frequently mentioned challenges faced by CFS staff are those that could have been improved with a greater emphasis during the training on skills for working with children and preparation: understanding and supporting children’s development, managing children’s behaviour, learning ways to ensure participation and attendance, and developing relations with parents (Figure 5). The CFS staff also mentioned additional, more specific challenges, such as a need for skill development for working with and supporting children with disabilities.

**Figure 5. Staff perception of the most important challenges of the child-friendly spaces**

Source: Child Frontiers CFS survey, March 2015.

The process for setting up child-friendly spaces

This evaluation found similar processes were undertaken for preparing each CFS, regardless of which phase it was opened in. As noted previously, the CFS strategy was decided by the international agencies with, in the majority of cases, only limited engagement with communities in the process leading up to the opening of a CFS. Recognizing that all agencies were operating in highly stressful circumstances, it did not appear during the evaluation that effort was made to verify with potential beneficiaries and communities whether the CFS was needed, desirable or appropriate, or if a different approach would have worked better. Rather, in all circumstances
where the international NGOs operated, staff met with local officials to advise them of their intention to set up a CFS and to obtain permission to do so. Even in Tacloban city, where the City Social Welfare and Development Office took the lead, staff consulted with devastated barangays on setting up a CFS and coordinated with NGOs to carry out the plan. This appears frequently to have been the extent of the engagement with barangay officials, including the Barangay Council for the Protection of Children, the majority of whom had a limited to no role in the CFS design, establishment or implementation. Municipal officials were less involved, if at all. This finding is consistent across the majority of sites evaluated in both regions.

Once permission was obtained and the location decided, only in one community visited by the evaluation team did the implementing partner conduct a community meeting requesting support for the CFS or go house to house to explain the initiative and enrol children. Affected communities appeared to have been rarely consulted to discuss and assess the relevance of the planned interventions.

In the first phase of CFS implementation, tarpaulins (rather than tents) and school supplies were provided to communities to set up a space. People in the barangay and local officials helped build the space by donating bamboo and doing needed carpentry work.49 Generation II CFS, on the other hand, were heavily reliant on having a tent, without which it was often assumed that activities could not be conducted. Findings from the evaluation interviews and the survey with implementing international organizations suggest that there was disproportionate attention and tension related to the procurement and delivery of tents and recreational or early childhood kits. From the perspectives of the agency representatives who were interviewed, these items were essential for the functioning of the generation II CFS activities, even though the generation I CFS functioned effectively without them and other external supplies.

The aim, objectives and functions of generation II CFS were not clear among communities, local authorities and CFS staff consulted during the evaluation. Generally, the CFS were understood to have a valuable role in supporting the psychosocial well-being of children. They were also viewed as a place where younger children were taught good behaviour and how to prepare for disasters (Table 4).

Several community respondents mentioned that the purpose of the CFS was to help children overcome or forget the trauma experienced during and after the typhoon. This understood aim was also confirmed by their perception of the achievements and results of CFS. The wider protection role of the CFS was rarely mentioned. When it was cited, further probing did not elicit any practical actions taken to ensure that child protection issues were identified and addressed by the CFS. What emerges strongly from communities’ perceptions is that in addition to the emergency value of supporting psychosocial recovery, the CFS role was primarily associated with learning.
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49 Interview with CFS staff member (animator/facilitator).
Table 4. Ranking of perceived purpose of the child-friendly space, from most to least frequently mentioned, according to community members\(^5\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank of perceived importance</th>
<th>BY ALL GROUPS COMBINED</th>
<th>BY CHILDREN &amp; ADOLESCENTS</th>
<th>BY ADULTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To overcome or forget trauma</td>
<td>To teach good behaviour</td>
<td>To overcome or forget trauma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To teach good behaviour</td>
<td>To discuss disaster preparedness</td>
<td>To provide supplies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To discuss disaster preparedness</td>
<td>To help children study/attend school and increase knowledge and literacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To make friends</td>
<td>To overcome or forget trauma</td>
<td>To make friends</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To help children study or to attend school</td>
<td>To make friends</td>
<td>To provide an alternative class for children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To team build</td>
<td>To share problems and look for solutions</td>
<td>To support child protection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To recover from the typhoon</td>
<td>To team build</td>
<td>To train older children so they could teach younger ones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To increase knowledge</td>
<td>To recover from the typhoon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide alternative classes for children</td>
<td>To help children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support child protection</td>
<td>To help parents find good jobs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To help children</td>
<td>To share food with each other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To help parents find good jobs</td>
<td>To feel good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To share problems and look for solutions</td>
<td>To know children's rights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To share food with each other</td>
<td>To be trained to become facilitators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To feel good</td>
<td>To clean the surrounding areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To know children's rights</td>
<td>To teach about climate change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be trained to become facilitators</td>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To clean the surrounding areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To have sessions every Saturday and Sunday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child sponsorship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To teach about climate change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The understanding of the CFS objectives from the perspective of the staff presents a fragmented picture. The CFS staff survey findings on the question asking for three CFS objectives corroborate the community findings that the primary perceived objective was to offer play and recreational activities. Figure 6 depicts the cited CFS objectives, with play and recreational activities for children ranked highest, followed by psychosocial activities for children and a safe place for children (these three aspects are closely related). The three interrelated aspects of supervised play, safe area and normalization of life are building blocks of any psychosocial support and are crucial in a relief phase. Due to problems with funding flows and significant

\(^5\) Group discussions, March 2015.
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delays in implementation, agencies had to retroactively develop strategies and a rationale to support and justify the role of generation II CFS in a non-emergency context.

Figure 6. Staff perception of the most important child-friendly space objectives

As pointed out previously, the majority of the CFS began operating seven months after the typhoon struck. By that time, a degree of normalcy to daily life for families and children had returned, with schools reopening and community safe places established. It is not clear to what extent the play and recreation function of the CFS was still a priority at this stage. The majority of generation II CFS in both regions were established after schools had reopened. More than half of the generation II CFS evaluated were open only one or two days a week; only 1 per cent were open for activities seven days a week. This indicates that the CFS were not providing specific services required by children on a daily basis and that they largely overlapped in functions with schools and that the CFS competed with schools for the beneficiaries’ time.

Only 6 per cent of CFS staff respondents considered the CFS to be a way to identify and address specific child protection problems, indicating a gap between the perception of the intended CFS role and its actual function. Stimulating the Barangay Council for the Protection of Children into action was also described as an objective, although few CFS appeared to have successfully achieved this aim. Another stated objective was to educate parents and to sensitize communities on the needs of children. However, the majority of CFS staff involved in this
evaluation reported that they did not engage with the parents of beneficiaries or the wider community; thus, it is difficult to see how this goal could have been reached.

Figure 7. Number of operating days among child-friendly spaces still open in February 2015
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By the time the CFS were taken to scale across the affected areas, their actual operations had reduced in nearly all cases to a few days a week or part-time activities. This reduction was in contrast to the expanded and much more complex functions they were expected to encompass. This reality brings into question the contribution or added value of the generation II CFS and the extent to which they were an integral and essential element of the disaster recovery after the first three months.

The role of child-friendly spaces in identifying and addressing child protection issues

The child protection response implemented through the CFS strategy appears to have been underpinned by assumptions and standardized responses that are commonly employed in other emergency contexts. The evaluation team encountered a range of perspectives among partners in the interpretation of child protection and what a child protection function for the CFS might actually translate to in practice. Beyond a common recognition that psychosocial support is integral to child protection, some organizations also include education about hygiene and hand washing. The promotion of children’s rights is prominent and often considered interchangeable with child protection; in the Philippines, the discourse on child protection is closely aligned to a children’s rights agenda – these two programmatic strands are considered mutually reinforcing. The general promotion of children’s rights is, however, only one aspect of child protection and possible CFS function. If CFS are used as the central child protection strategy in an emergency, they must expand their function to include promoting well-being, care and protection outcomes for children through direct interventions to prevent and respond to violence, abuse, neglect and exploitation. This is even more critical if other interventions to ensure these types of child protection services are not yet in place or in a position to operate.
This evaluation found an inherent tension in the conceptual and implementation strategies among partners, swinging between notions of child protection as the exclusive terrain of those concerned with safeguarding against serious abuses and the provision of specialized services as well as the general promotion of children’s rights, including education, health care, hygiene and child participation.

The majority of community members interviewed, including parents, boys and girls, stated that the CFS did not adequately address the child protection risks that they perceived as a priority at the time.\(^{51}\) Identified risks included violence, abuse and what community members referred to as ‘vices’ (Figure 9). Both male and female adolescents participating in the evaluation (in both regions) cited concerns related to risky and illegal behaviours, such as working in clubs, early marriage, premarital sex, drug use and trafficking.\(^{52}\)

Figure 8 shows that the perceptions of caregivers and children regarding the child protection risks to girls and boys prior to and after the typhoon tended to converge in relation to vices or challenging behaviours, environmental dangers, loss of home, malnourishment and trauma. The UNICEF-supported CFS strategy in the typhoon-affected areas was organized to deal with environmental dangers in areas where children might play and provide limited psychosocial support but did not address broader issues, such as abuse, violence, housing and malnutrition. While these latter problems are not traditionally considered to be child protection issues, the beneficiaries of the CFS expressed the incongruence of the provision of opportunities for children to play while their families were still struggling without shelter and enough to eat. Many caregivers remarked that the CFS did not function as a referral platform for essential services for families in need.

None of the reviewed documents or any evaluation participant described any CFS component designed to respond to what communities perceived as child protection risks before or after Typhoon Haiyan struck the Visayas region (Figure 8). They were not designed, for example, to address risky adolescent behaviours, peer violence, abuse, rape, family problems and teenage pregnancy. These problems existed and were identified before Haiyan, and experience from numerous other settings as well as the community research findings suggest that they were likely exacerbated by this type of profound shock, especially in the medium term. In fact, the joint needs assessment conducted by the UNICEF Education and Child Protection Sections in February–March 2014 (three months after the typhoon) highlighted this same point (see the following box).\(^{53}\)

---

\(^{51}\) Group discussions, March 2015.

\(^{52}\) Group discussions, March 2015.

Findings from the joint needs assessment of perceptions among barangays by UNICEF Education and Child Protection Sections

Psychosocial

- Between 80% and 93% of assessed barangays reported that children showed signs of psychosocial distress.
- More than 83% of assessed barangays reported that children experienced stress due to the lack of food and shelter.

Child labour

- Around 54% of assessed barangays reported that children were involved in harsh or dangerous labour (including the worst forms of child labour).
- Around 74% of assessed barangays reported that children who were working did not go to school.

Physical danger

- Around 42% of assessed barangays reported that children had died or had been seriously injured by the typhoon and 80–93% reported that children were at risk outside their homes.*

Other child protection issues

- Between 51% and 82% of assessed barangays reported that teenage pregnancy was a risk.
- Around 36% of assessed barangays reported that children were involved in crime (looting or belonging to a gang).
- Around 46% of assessed barangays reported that children were most at risk of sexual violence at home, while 35% thought that the risk was greater on their way to school.
- Around 12% of assessed barangays reported that the incidence of sexual violence had increased since Typhoon Haiyan. According to the report, this was primarily the result of having lost caregivers in the typhoon (Region VIII) or because their caregiver had to travel to find work after the typhoon due to loss of livelihood (Region VI).
- Around 35% of assessed barangays reported that some children were unaccompanied or separated.
- Around 55% of assessed barangays reported that groups of children had less access to basic services, of those, 56% said that these children were from impoverished families and 19% said they were children with disabilities.

Note: These needs assessments were conducted in February to March 2013.

* The term ‘risks outside their homes’ was not defined.
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Figure 8. Child protection risks before and after Typhoon Haiyan struck, according to communities, by the frequency of mention in group discussions

Note: Multiple factors have been clustered, specifically ‘vices’ and challenging behaviours, which include (staying outside the house at night, working in clubs, or member of fraternity or informal peer groups; exposure to pornography, premarital sex, transactional sex, computer addictions; smoking, illicit drug use); illegal activities include stealing and drug trafficking.
Source: Child Frontiers CFS survey, March 2015.

In the relief phase, the CFS interventions were understood as relevant to the immediate needs and priorities of communities for a safe place for children and addressing psychological distress but this ‘fit’ was not needed in the next stage of the disaster response because communities’ priorities had shifted.

As pointed out earlier, the CFS were not designed or tailored in a way that enabled or encouraged the staff to identify and address child protection issues or more complex family challenges. The large majority of informants interviewed (local authorities, CFS staff and CFS beneficiaries) did not recognize the child protection role of the CFS. In the interviews, the staff rarely appeared confident to assess or identify child protection issues among the CFS attendees, let alone take necessary action to prevent or respond to abuse, neglect or exploitation. Acting on child protection concerns was not perceived – by themselves or others – to be their role.54 CFS

54 Group interviews with staff, March 2015.
staff seemed unaware of child protection risks faced by children in their community (only abandonment was mentioned).

Interaction with staff, managers and coordinators as well as observation of CFS by the research teams did not reveal any mechanism to identify vulnerable children or conduct outreach to those most in need of protection other than efforts in some locations to involve out-of-school youth as facilitators in the CFS.

Interestingly, interview respondents in Region VI did not recall any CFS detecting or dealing with a child protection case, while there were references to the handling of cases in Region VIII. According to the survey findings (Figure 9), 29 per cent of CFS in both regions dealt with at least one child protection case. It is unclear how and with what results these cases were handled, however.

Figure 9. Child protection cases handled since establishment of the child-friendly spaces

CFS staff across sites were often unable to describe the referral pathway to child welfare and protection services, which was one of the more visible initiatives of the UNICEF child protection emergency response programme. This liaison function was not seen as their role, and the CFS were generally not considered to have a child protection function. From the evaluation interviews there appeared to be an assumption that there were other services in place to handle these issues.

A referral mechanism has become a ubiquitous element of the system-strengthening discourse, and the development of such a mechanism in the typhoon-affected regions of the Philippines was mentioned by most of the international organizations’ staff interviewed. Referral pathway posters were visible in most CFS, but community members and CFS staff did not appear to be familiar with the referral process, and no evidence suggests their use. Thus, although the referral

55 Observation and group discussions in evaluation sites, March 2015.
56 Group interviews with UNICEF staff, March 2015.
mechanisms or pathways that were finalized existed on paper, they did not seem to function in practice. The evaluation team found that the child protection referral system in the CFS was not designed in conjunction with other sectors and not linked to government agencies that were developing similar mechanisms. This resulted in a series of unlinked, often duplicating referral pathways for different groups of people categorized by agency mandates rather than actual need.

Any referral system by definition must ultimately lead to support services and help, either formal or informal. UNICEF supported training sessions for multidisciplinary teams associated with child protection with the aim of increasing the functionality of services. Yet, many CFS staff did not know of any other services available within the community to address child protection issues. In retrospect, a mapping of community resources would have been valuable and helpful in maximizing support and options for ensuring the welfare and protection of the most vulnerable children. In some locations, respondents stated that child protection cases should be reported to the Department of Social Welfare and Development and the Philippine National Police. But it was unclear to the evaluation team what services would have been provided beyond medical care and the possible arrest or reprimand of a perpetrator.

The CFS visits revealed a rather fragile relationship with child protection services. Interestingly, the survey findings indicate that the CFS were connected with a series of agencies at the local and provincial levels that were able to deal with child protection cases. This mismatch between what was observed and discussed with respondents and what was revealed in the survey can perhaps be explained by the minimal effectiveness and efficiency of those linkages during the time of emergency response, when the already-limited services available at the municipal level were extremely stretched and focused initially on the distribution of relief packages.

CFS staff reported being in regular touch with a range of services, but the reason and purpose for this cooperation was not articulated. As mentioned earlier, CFS (in line with the generation II concept) had been envisioned as an entry point to revitalize and support the Barangay Council for the Protection of Children, although now that the CFS are operating activities only part-time, the extent of this support is not clear.

The functionality of services appears to have changed once UNICEF began to support the temporary deployment of a surge capacity for social workers at the municipal level. According to some respondents, this additional capacity dramatically improved the work on child protection. A specific review of this experience might prove whether this strategy was actually effective and could inform decisions of whether to prioritize such an intervention from the start in future emergency situations.

2.4.4 Functioning of the child-friendly spaces

The CFS were implemented as an emergency response strategy (even seven months after the natural disaster). The emergency response functions (safe space, structured play and psychosocial support) were maintained alongside development activities involving rights promotion, education and some information and skills provision around disaster risk reduction.
The core activities across all evaluated sites (the majority of which only operated part time), however, was recreation and play.

Activities carried out in CFS in the Philippines included standard session modules used by international NGOs in other emergency response settings. These sessions do not appear to have been significantly adapted to the context or to the specific needs of children in the communities affected by Typhoon Haiyan. Community members frequently stated that the CFS activities and services were not tailored to the priorities and needs of the targeted beneficiaries. Some session plans reviewed by the evaluation team did not deliver what was implied by their titles. For instance, sessions titled ‘Appreciating my sexuality’ and ‘Me and my body’ did not provide information on reproductive health or sex education, which would have been beneficial, as communities identified teenage pregnancy as a risk factor for young people before and after Typhoon Haiyan.

In some locations, the evaluation team observed CFS volunteers lecturing children on various topics (such as children’s rights, violence against children, climate change and disasters), with limited open dialogue, information exchange or discussion around those themes. As a result, boys and girls did not have opportunities to discuss the issues they were experiencing with the facilitators, nor did such engagement appear to be encouraged. In other sites, sessions were more interactive, with children encouraged to draw, reflect and participate in different activities. On balance, however, sessions do not appear to have involved children in an active and engaging way.

The majority of respondents highlighted the psychosocial role of the CFS, although this was largely understood as ‘helping children forget their trauma’ through recreational activities. Even though provision of psychosocial support was an aim of CFS, it continued to be interpreted primarily as structured games and recreational activities in the spaces opened months after the disaster struck. The provision of psychosocial support through play and peer interaction was common to all UNICEF-supported CFS visited for this evaluation. This important component of the CFS appears to have been one of the most successful and consistent features of the strategy. Children largely spoke positively and with enthusiasm about their opportunities to play games, draw and interact with their friends at the CFS.

In some locations, however, inappropriate psychosocial activities using debriefing techniques with children to revisit a traumatic event were reportedly used. These techniques are not recommended by the World Health Organization because of the possible negative effects on children, particularly several months after an emergency. The psychosocial modules designed for the immediate aftermath of the emergency were used, in some cases, more than a year after the typhoon. Children reported feeling distressed by being asked to draw and recount traumatic experiences. Children also expressed that these feelings were difficult to manage, probably because CFS facilitators were often adolescents themselves or volunteers with limited experience, skills and training.

The implementing partners made an effort to respond to the needs of some teenagers in the CFS that opened in September and October 2014. Adolescents were directly involved either as facilitators or as beneficiaries in several sites in Region VI. Further investigation would be needed to determine whether these approaches were effective and useful within the CFS framework.

The accessibility of the CFS to children with disability was cited as a challenge in the January 2014 UNICEF review. It appears that the decision to have a programme cooperation agreement (finalized in July 2014) specifically aimed to improve the capacity of implementing partners to include children with disabilities had some success. The evaluation team found that most children with physical disabilities could in principle attend the CFS sessions because issues of accessibility were largely resolved. However, little proactive effort was made to reach out to children in the affected communities who had special needs and encourage their participation. When boys and girls with disabilities did attend a CFS, there were few activities adapted or designed to cater for their specific needs. The evaluation team encountered a positive case in which the CFS provided tailored opportunity for play to a child with a developmental delay. (The child did not want to return to school because other children made fun of him. He reportedly enjoyed his time at the CFS and was eager to participate in the weekly sessions.)

Community respondents were not clear on whether the CFS were aimed exclusively at children or were meant to also support parents. In one site, mothers were recruited as CFS facilitators, and there was a stronger sense than elsewhere of its openness to the community. Several parents whose children participated in a CFS stated that they thought it was unfortunate that the CFS only focused on children and did not consider the family as a whole. CFS child beneficiaries reiterated this observation.

2.4.5 Closure or handover of child-friendly spaces

The link with local authorities, and especially the Barangay Council for the Protection of Children, was an important component of the generation II CFS concept. Although there were slight variations by site, the actual link and coordination between the CFS and local authorities was found to be either weak or non-existent. On the whole, local authorities (such as barangay captains) did not seem to understand the aims of the CFS. They were not involved in the decision on whether a CFS was the best strategy to use or in the process to decide what functions it would take on. Local authorities described feeling like the recipient of a programme decided by others elsewhere. They thus perceived themselves as detached from the CFS operations, which were understood to belong to the implementing NGO and to be dependent on its funding stream.

One recently opened (at the time of the evaluation) CFS reportedly re-activated or facilitated the formation of the Barangay Council for the Protection of Children. The council members received support and training sessions on topics related to child protection from the implementing NGO.

58 It is interesting that this experience, which represents an exception compared with other sites visited, belonged to a generation I CFS, which demonstrates how articulate and coherent strategies can be adopted even at the height of the relief phase. This was also the same site where a simple assessment and more comprehensive community involvement process was carried out.
Council members expressed interest in continuing the CFS activities after the implementing agency withdraws. In another instance, the council reportedly managed the CFS from the beginning.\(^{59}\)

In most cases, local authorities appear to have initially agreed to allow an NGO to enter their community to set up a CFS – even if they did not understand its role – in the hope that it would be helpful and contribute to enabling the affected community members get back on their feet. Many of the local authorities interviewed stated that they were busy immediately after the disaster with clean-up and recovery demands and thus did not seek to be more involved in the process.

Based on comments from local authorities, there seems to have been a fragile foundation for expecting communities to take over the longer-term responsibility and the costs of maintaining a CFS. Meaningful consultations with communities and local authorities would have been beneficial for ensuring that the intervention was needed, appropriate and, if implemented, that community representatives would drive the CFS experience from the outset, albeit with the support of external agencies.

In principle, community members expressed an interest in keeping the CFS running. However, in most cases, there were not enough resources available to make this possible. Nonetheless, several respondents mentioned that 1 per cent of the internal revenue allotment of the barangay funds\(^{60}\) is technically allocated for the Barangay Council for the Protection of Children and that, in theory, these funds could be used to maintain the CFS if the barangay officials decided to support it. This is a sustainability strategy that was commonly cited by implementing partners.

The evaluation findings demonstrate that it is not realistic to expect particularly impoverished communities impacted by a typhoon of historical proportions, with small administrative budgets, to provide volunteer participation and invest financially in sustaining mechanisms that they do not fully understand. Additionally, the 1 per cent of the budget available to the Barangay Council for the Protection of Children is theoretically meant for child protection activities. If it is used to support a CFS, which to date have contributed little in terms of child protection, there would be no resources for wider child protection services.

Only one of the ten sites visited had specific plans to transition the running and programming of the CFS to local authorities. Otherwise, no clear plan had been developed or discussed on this matter. As a result, the handover process was confused and contradictory, with community expectations poorly managed. Many parents, children and local officials expected the CFS to continue for an indeterminate period of time. The evaluation team encountered instances of generation I CFS that were handed over by NGOs to local authorities but months later, communities were still waiting for them to reopen. One CFS had a plan to transition to a youth centre; doing so may address an identified gap in the provision of services for teenagers.

\(^{59}\)Bantayan CFS, information provided by UNICEF at the report writing stage.  
\(^{60}\)In one barangay, the 1 per cent was estimated at approximately 40,000 pesos per year.
The debate on handover and closure of the CFS was pertinent and active at the time of the evaluation, and agencies were wondering what would be the best strategies to ensure that communities continue the operations. Yet, that timing seemed too late to be looking for exit strategies; the original CFS strategy should have considered or communicated its functions, long-term implications or envisioned evolution.

2.4.6 Monitoring, evaluation and quality improvement of child-friendly spaces

The effort to protect children in response to Typhoon Haiyan resulted in a large programme involving considerable investment of financial and human resources. The creation of generation II CFS demanded close follow-up and monitoring. According to UNICEF staff, the CFS Monitoring Guide was used to guide the UNICEF Child Protection Section in monitoring. However, the evaluation team did not find a clear set of monitoring indicators producing monitoring data within UNICEF and among the implementing agencies. The evaluation team only found one instance of a generation I CFS (of the ten CFS visited) that suggested that a systematic follow-up and monitoring process had been put in place by the implementing organization.61

Although the evaluation team did not look systematically into the monitoring and evaluation approaches by UNICEF and implementing partners (because it was not one of the primary focus areas agreed), there are some elements that deserve commentary. Each implementing partner used its own monitoring and evaluation frameworks and programme quality improvement approaches. Those frameworks do not appear to have been particularly elaborate. Possibly this is one of the aspects that hampered the capacity of the CPWG and/or the collective group of implementing partners to identify strategic and programmatic changes to address shortcomings that were detected early on.

In the desk review of UNICEF monitoring reports of the CFS implementation by partners, the lack of structure or framework for consistent monitoring was immediately apparent. Staff in each CFS reported on different aspects or indicators, which makes assessing programme quality and level of implementation problematic. Of the 15 trip reports that were accessible to the evaluation team, the information collected emerged as patchy, inconsistent and often contradictory. For example, the reports conveyed different understandings of psychosocial support and the activities associated with it as well as different ways of calculating CFS beneficiaries.62

Considering that the final signature of the programme cooperation agreements was completed nearly five months after the disaster began – when the pressure of the emergency phase had passed – it is unclear why basic and coherent monitoring parameters were not established and implemented. For this evaluation, UNICEF made substantial effort to compile fragmented data sets on the child protection response in the two regions to assemble a detailed picture of the CFS experience. The data shared for this evaluation presented some contradictory information and some gaps, although this was still being developed during the evaluation data collection.

---

61 CFS Barangay Boroñgon, San Dionisosio, Region VI.
62 Trip reports from UNICEF and implementing partners.
As previously mentioned, in January 2014, the CFS experience was reviewed by UNICEF and a workshop was conducted to consider the findings and agree on future action. How the findings of that review and workshop were used to improve programmes, however, is not clear. As noted previously, different parties to the agreement did not appear to be in a position to propose adapted or alternative strategies, either as individual agencies or as a collective group. Consequently, one year later, this evaluation revealed many of the same challenges that were discussed in January 2014.

For example, the CFS component of the UNICEF child protection response in the Typhoon Haiyan disaster had challenges in satisfying basic quality standards, including the involvement of adolescents, marginalized children from different ethnic groups and children with disabilities. No evidence was found of attempts to ensure that the CFS integrated the principles of gender-sensitivity and equity in their operations (in relation to both the recruitment of volunteers and child participants).

Nevertheless, UNICEF did take measures to address some of the programme shortcomings. UNICEF contracted Handicap International to bolster partners’ capacities to include and support children with disabilities in CFS. Additionally, specific activities targeting adolescents were promoted in late 2014 among a series of initiatives in child protection outside of the CFS programmes.

**Compliance with international guidelines**

Focused attention, at least at the managerial level of the programme, both in Manila and in the affected regions, was given to compliance with international standards. The adherence to international standards was also highlighted in the terms of reference for this evaluation. The emphasis placed on the importance of guidelines resulted in the CPWG promoting a Filipino version of the international guidelines on CFS implementation, which were signed and approved in 2015. Yet, neither these national or international guidelines nor other implementing standards were made available to CFS staff, particularly at the local level. During the evaluation interviews, respondents did not mention any CFS standards or implementation guidelines, apart from a reference by a national CPWG member to the process for their development. The way that CFS were set up and operated was found to be distinct from what was proposed in the main standards and guidelines. Little evidence was found that internationally accepted guidelines were used or adhered to, from the design of the response strategy to the implementation of the CFS.

For example, the Minimum Standards for Child Protection in Humanitarian Settings developed by the global CPWG has a dedicated section on CFS. The guidelines for field-testing CFS reflect and detail these standards, including:

---

“Carry out an assessment together with the community to decide whether CFSs are needed, safe and accessible to all children nearby and contextually appropriate.”

Minimum Standards for Child Protection in Humanitarian Setting

The evaluation team recognizes that it would have been difficult to carry out such a needs assessment immediately after a natural disaster of the scale of Typhoon Haiyan. It is unfortunate, however, that in the ensuing weeks and months that the protection needs of affected children and communities were not confirmed and responses adapted accordingly. In cases where assessments were conducted, it is not clear how or if the findings were used to adapt the CFS activities or services to meet the identified child protection priorities.

“Map the existing facilities and infrastructure, including schools and community centres. Before deciding to set up CFS structures, decide whether a structure is needed at all.”

Minimum Standards for Child Protection in Humanitarian Setting

Typhoon Haiyan destroyed a large number of facilities, and there was limited infrastructure that could be used for CFS. There was an overwhelming sense of dependence on tents because they were perceived as a necessary and sufficient element of the CFS success, even though in the second phase those tents took several weeks or months to arrive. In the initial phase, some CFS sessions were conducted in barangay day-care centres or makeshift tents made from local materials. That this approach was effective demonstrated how it is possible to promote CFS with minimal supplies.

“Fully involve boys, girls, women, men and vulnerable groups from the community in developing and supporting CFS.”

Minimum Standards for Child Protection in Humanitarian Setting

This evaluation did not find community involvement and vulnerable group inclusion to be a systematic approach in the implementation of the CFS strategy. Of the ten sites where primary data were collected, only one site reported a deliberate attempt to include children with special needs.

“Recruit volunteers from the community and link with other community-based initiatives.”

Minimum Standards for Child Protection in Humanitarian Setting

This standard was generally complied with, considering that many CFS facilitators were from the community, including day-care centre staff, teachers, parents and adolescent youth.
“Set up a programme of activities that looks at the needs of children and communities overall, and coordinate with other agencies and sectors to provide support such as health and hygiene education, breastfeeding groups and spaces, supplemental feeding, information on humanitarian help, etc.”

Minimum Standards for Child Protection in Humanitarian Setting

As already noted, this standard was met: The CFS provided children with the opportunity to play in a safe place, which was deeply appreciated by the communities and was thought to have contributed towards helping children feel better. Other than this, however, the activities were not linked to known child protection concerns in the community. The CFS did not appear equipped to identify and address child protection issues in a proactive way, and links with other sectors or agencies to enhance a child protection function were not apparent. Some CFS exhibited successful integration of hygiene, health and other programme issues, such as supplemental feeding.

“Provide on-going monitoring with feedback mechanisms that involve children and families.”

Minimum Standards for Child Protection in Humanitarian Setting

It was not evident to the evaluation team whether feedback mechanisms at individual CFS existed and were functioning. Implementing partners did have some feedback from beneficiaries that they might have used. There was, overall, no coherent monitoring framework among agencies that involved communities and children.

“Early on, develop in consultation with the community a phase-out or transition plan that links with broader recovery planning. Make sure that community is aware from the beginning that a phase-out period or handover will take place. Provide information as soon as possible about when phase-out or transition will take place.”

Minimum Standards for Child Protection in Humanitarian Setting

The phase-out period or handover was not fully reflected upon and planned from the beginning in either of the two implementation phases. Communities reported the end of the generation I CFS (now all closed) to be abrupt. The life cycle of the generation II CFS was not clearly articulated during the planning phase, which limited the potential for success. The evidence indicates that little consultation took place to discuss both the set-up and the possible phase-out or transition of the CFS.

Overall, the international standards seem to have had little bearing on the experience of the CFS in the disaster-affected areas. Further reflection is needed to explore possible reasons why, with so many resources and capacities mobilized and with such availability of standards and guidelines, the child-friendly spaces in the aftermath of Typhoon Haiyan did not perform as they should.
3. Conclusions and lessons learned

3.1 Overall conclusions

Typhoon Haiyan struck the Visayas region of the Philippines on 8 November 2013, leaving a massive trail of devastation. The disaster destroyed communities in the area and created a major challenge for national government and international humanitarian organizations mandated to provide emergency relief. The overwhelming size and scope of the disaster necessitated a response that stretched the capacity and performance of the stakeholders involved, including UNICEF and implementing partners.

In the aftermath, UNICEF and other international agencies began implementing an extraordinary response effort. The speed and volume of the UNICEF emergency team deployment was remarkable and made it possible to achieve important results. These results were not the same across sectors, however, and despite the significant individual professionalism and dedication demonstrated by those involved, the child protection response effort suffered from a series of compounding factors. As a result, the CFS experience as a child protection response to Typhoon Haiyan was only partially successful.

Generation I CFS were clearly effective in providing a safe space for recreation, supervised play and psychosocial support, which communities and government officials recognized as extremely important during the relief phase. However, when this period ended, community priorities shifted, and related services were no longer appropriate. Generation II CFS did not adapt effectively to the new circumstances and did not address broader child protection concerns as envisioned. The strategy of linking the CFS emergency response with child protection system strengthening was commendable but not fulfilled. It was almost certainly too early and the evidence base too weak to think through the operational implications of this commitment. A number of strategic decisions and contextual factors further limited the success of generation II CFS.

First, the modalities and characteristics of the IRT deployment had a significant impact. Although it was effective in rapidly mobilizing world-class international expertise and set in motion an exceptional humanitarian response for child protection, it did so at the expense of a full appreciation of the Filipino context and ultimately overlooked the potentially valuable input of national officers and national and local government counterparts. The in-country skills, capacities and experience could have been better maximized and supported within the long-term strategic aspiration of strengthening systems.

Second, the child protection response was not grounded in an assessment of local child protection needs and concerns or in consultation with communities. It was instead guided by a standardized, predesigned approach from elsewhere. This evaluation found that CFS might be relevant and appropriate as an initial response to a natural disaster but might not in every case be relevant and appropriate for subsequent phases. In fact, the strategic assumption that CFS are capable of combining an immediate emergency response role with system strengthening during the longer-term recovery phase without major re-adaptations proved to be unrealistic in the Typhoon Haiyan context. The lack of contextual relevance was exacerbated by limited
shared understanding of the pre-existing systems upon which to base system-strengthening work.

Third, the CFS implementation was hampered by insufficient strategic leadership by the national and regional CPWG, compounded by a situation in which the government co-lead was not in a position to effectively drive the response. These governance difficulties translated into limited capacity to improve in the face of well-known CFS challenges (encountered and documented elsewhere), such as involving communities, catering for children older than 12 years and being accessible to children with special needs and socially excluded children.

Fourth – and linked with the issues already mentioned – the delay of up to five months to finalize programme cooperation agreements with implementing partners resulted in the disruption of the CFS initiative overall and, in part, with the child protection response. Having almost missed the relief phase, the pressure on organizations to rapidly implement the programme cooperation agreements was so significant that there was no room for revision, even though the passage of time meant their programme relevance become obsolete.

Fifth, the pressure to be visible and to spend committed budgets, along with divergent monitoring mechanisms and limited strategic leadership of the collective group of agencies, resulted in a constrained capacity to overcome challenges after it became evident that the CFS response was on a problematic course.

Finally, the presence of CFS in the relief phase of the typhoon provided an important positive reassurance to communities at the height of this dramatic and distressing experience. However, the accumulation of difficulties as described here created programme reliance on CFS, which, ultimately, became formulaic and less relevant and appropriate for the Philippine context, particularly several months after the relief phase had concluded.

The evaluation specifically considered the relevance, appropriateness, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the CFS strategy in the Typhoon Haiyan context, as summarized in the following sections.

3.1.1 Relevance

The relevance of the strategy to implement CFS as the primary child protection response to Typhoon Haiyan does not seem to have been considered in depth in the immediate aftermath of the disaster. This approach appears to have been developed based on an assumption that CFS are unquestionably the most appropriate child protection response to an emergency. Thus, imperative conversations related to the overall objectives of the strategy, why CFS were being implemented, what child protection results or outcomes CFS were meant to achieve and whether the specific approach adopted (focus on younger children and the strong emphasis on supplies and tents) was the most effective in the local and Philippine context were skipped.

No assessment was carried out to inform the child protection strategic response, nor did specific community-level assessments appear to have been conducted prior to setting up CFS. The strategy therefore ended up being only partially relevant: Generation I CFS had a short-lived and
essential relevance because they addressed some basic needs of children specific to the immediate aftermath of a disaster. This focus included providing psychosocial support to children (and in a limited way to their caregivers) and engaging them in safe play while simultaneously providing respite care for parents who were busy rebuilding their lives and communities. From this perspective, CFS, even as a predetermined strategy, were relevant for the relief phase in the Philippines.

In protracted conflict settings, CFS might be a useful long-term strategy, because these facilities can satisfy the need for a safe and supervised play and learning area in the absence of other services. In a natural disaster, these needs tend to be most prominent in the relief phase (as this evaluation demonstrates) but become progressively less relevant as families return to normalcy and communities return to being generally safe places for boys and girls to play and socialize. An exception may be the need for specific children’s spaces located in evacuation centres, if families remain in these centres for an extended period of time, although their function should adapt to the evolving context around and within the centres (schooling, recreational and support opportunities being offered by other agencies, for example).

In the context of Typhoon Haiyan, most CFS were set up too late to serve as an emergency response. Although envisioned in the design of generation II CFS, this did not prove to be a viable strategy to strengthen the child protection system in the Philippines. Strategically and programmatically, CFS were not sufficiently contextualized to credibly contribute to the latter goal. Aside from the need for psychosocial support, the specific child protection concerns among the children and families in the Visayas region were not sufficiently taken into account and hence not appropriately addressed. Additionally, it is problematic that CFS were in competition with schools and early childhood care services and were active only part time, when other recreational or educational institutions were not operating. Their relevance is therefore less substantial than the generation I spaces.

Generally (outside the Philippines), CFS have been considered the routine child protection response in a humanitarian emergency and, in many cases, their establishment has become an end in itself. It has become integral to the increasingly standardized approach to emergency response programming, which is typically compounded by pressure to implement rapidly and utilize funding. In this standardizing, lack of contextualization can quickly result in decreased relevance because the response is no longer appropriate or linked to the achievement of specific child protection outcomes.

3.1.2 Appropriateness

CFS have been an appropriate means of providing basic care and support to children through the promotion of structured supervised recreational activities, the reintroduction of everyday routines and the re-creation of a sense of normalcy among community members of all ages. Generation I CFS implemented in the first phase, which were not bound by a programme cooperation agreement, were most appropriate, because they showed indications of collaboration with communities and capacity to use local materials, guidance and expertise. Generation I CFS provided essential services and were generally inclusive to different ages of children, although less appropriate or tailored to the needs of adolescents and children with
disabilities and ethnic backgrounds. The simplicity and timing of these first generation CFS allowed this intervention to successfully address limited but much needed challenges during the immediate relief phase of the emergency response and was identified by the evaluation as a good practice.

During the initial relief phase, the emphasis placed on the establishment of the physical CFS structure and materials was appropriate for settings such as the evacuation centres in Tacloban and Estancia, where crowded spaces left few opportunities for children to play and rest and increased their vulnerability. As noted, CFS are likely to remain relevant in these centres as long as they are populated, particularly for children who do not go to school or who have special needs. However, in villages or rural settlements, where physical and social space and opportunities for children to play and interact are more readily available immediately after the relief phase, setting up CFS may be less relevant.

Generation II CFS established after the relief phase were not appropriate. The attempt to integrate emergency response with psychosocial and child protection systems strengthening, while an innovative idea in theory, lacked conceptual clarity. The delayed implementation of generation II CFS, with many set up several months to almost a year after the disaster began, was problematic. Lack of information and clarity on the existing system that the CFS were expected to strengthen and where effort should be targeted made the CFS system strengthening objective even less viable. The concept of a ‘child protection system’ was left in general terms, and a comprehensive vision of how the CFS would contribute to its strengthening was not articulated. As a result, the long-term child protection strategic response based on the generation II CFS model remained aspirational.

A fundamental challenge was that the child protection strategy for the response to Typhoon Haiyan assumed that generic child protection measures, like CFS, implemented during emergencies, would, by virtue of their existence, contribute to system strengthening. In reality, research has shown that child protection systems are social configurations rooted in specific visions for children, families, community and society. The ability of CFS to strengthen community protection systems or enhance mechanisms to receive and respond to reports of violence, abuse, neglect or exploitation of children was found to be limited and difficult to document in other studies of CFS in different locations globally. Systems are therefore unique, and system strengthening requires a significant level of knowledge of the existing child protection context, services and policies as well an ability to make strategic decisions that are unlikely to be possible in the early intense stages of an emergency response. Although it may be possible to invest time and effort in developing contextually appropriate system-strengthening strategies during later phases of an emergency response, the CFS component in the Philippines did not appear to evolve sufficiently to achieve this objective in the year following Typhoon Haiyan. It would have been beneficial to explore whether knowledge and experience of child protection issues already existed within communities and/or whether it would be feasible to build that capacity in a short but realistic time frame.

---
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In the same vein, the child protection response and the CFS component specifically were designed on the basis of ‘substitution’ of national and local authorities by implementing agencies. Even though a few LGUs were involved as CFS implementing partners, engagement with the local government authority came later as part of the broader child protection response. CFS appear to have been appropriate for evacuation centres, but alternative strategies should have been considered for other communities. On the whole, although conceptualized as a way to strengthen the child protection system, CFS did not appear to build upon or leverage existing community structures, mechanisms and strengths. It might have been more meaningful and effective to recruit surge personnel to bolster the presence of municipal-level social workers, producing longer-term positive benefits for capacity building and strengthening existing services and structures early in the emergency response instead of several months later.

Opportunities to address the child protection needs of children in a sustainable manner appear to have been missed, both during the immediate response and in the early recovery phase. This was true in terms of accessibility and equity for children older than 12 years, children with disabilities and marginalized children from ethnic minorities or other disadvantaged backgrounds. These problems were identified early in the CFS experience (in the UNICEF January 2014 review, when the CFS were not found to be fully appropriate for all children).69

The predominant focus on younger children by CFS set up in the immediate aftermath resulted in the exclusion of adolescents who, as noted, were identified as particularly vulnerable to protection issues. Interventions aimed at particular protection needs of this group would have also been appropriate and could have engendered longer-term impact, considering the significant gap in child protection services at the community level. CFS were not able to take on these challenges. Hence, in late 2014, UNICEF launched separate programmes specifically designed for adolescents.

The experience regarding the accessibility of CFS for children with disabilities was slightly different. This issue was identified as a challenge in the January 2014 UNICEF review and, as a result, additional technical support was provided to implementing partners in an effort to ensure that children with disabilities participated in CFS activities. This intervention seems to have been beneficial in terms of improving the physical accessibility of the CFS but not the appropriateness of its activities or outreach to children who could benefit.

Opportunities to involve parents and strengthen an appropriate protective environment around children were not maximized by CFS, because they were established without sufficient consultation with families and communities. Caregivers could have been more systematically involved in the response to raise their awareness of child protection more generally, including issues related to violence, school attendance and birth registration. Minimal engagement with families and communities also resulted in confusion and lack of understanding of the purpose of the CFS among them and local leaders, who could potentially have provided critical support to CFS initiatives and supported their continuation if they felt a genuine sense of ownership and responsibility for the CFS after NGO funding ceased.
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Beyond recreational aspects, the services and focus of CFS sessions did not appear to match either the child protection priorities of communities or the stated overall response objectives. Even though in theory CFS were assumed to take on a role in the protection of children at the community level, in reality they provided few specific functions apart from a safe place for children to play and be occupied; these provisions are widely recognized as the main achievement of the CFS strategy in the disaster-affected areas. Staff did not appear to have the capacity or training to handle child protection issues, and doing so was not understood by the community or CFS managers to be their role. In some cases, activities and session modules designed for use in the immediate aftermath of a disaster were inappropriately being used in CFS that were opened seven months after Typhoon Haiyan struck.

CFS activities were not designed to deal with identified child protection issues (beyond psychosocial support) in the Visayas region and did not seem to connect with other child protection emergency response strategies in a coherent way, beyond identifying potential sources of support in referral pathway posters developed by implementing agencies. Although some additional support was developed to strengthen services later in 2014, referral mechanism diagrams do not address the inherent limitations of the few services available at the local level or assess actual capacity to respond to a child protection problem.

### 3.1.3 Effectiveness

Overall, communities consistently valued the CFS interventions and wanted them to continue, even though the actual purpose of the CFS, particularly with regard to child protection, was not well understood. The CFS represented a positive, constructive signal to communities and children in the immediate aftermath of the typhoon that their plight was understood. CFS were valued primarily for providing opportunities for children to play and interact with their peers. Respondents thought that children were generally happier after participating in CFS and that this intervention helped them overcome emotional distress. Some also thought that children became more involved in the community after participating in the CFS. These views reflect the experience of all participants to CFS of any kind; beneficiaries generally thought that they were positive and beneficial for children. However, according to the same respondents, CFS had little or no child protection function.

The limited engagement with and involvement of the wider community thus limited the effectiveness from a child protection perspective. CFS staff conducted minimal outreach work to involve families and those children most in need; parents and caregivers were not routinely involved as beneficiaries. Additionally, the needs of adolescents, marginalized ethnic children and those with disabilities were not effectively included by either the generation I or II CFS.

### 3.1.4 Efficiency

The overall child protection programme response was relatively efficient in mobilizing supplies and making them available to implementing partners for immediate use in the first wave of CFS. From a human resources perspective, the entire UNICEF humanitarian response was efficient, contributing to the effectiveness of programmes. The delays experienced in the process of finalizing programme cooperation agreements, however, were universally considered to be
unacceptable in an emergency, even less so in one of this size and where special operating procedures were in use.

From the programme side, the overemphasis and perceived dependence on supplies, particularly tents and recreational and early childhood development kits, is an important aspect to reflect on: Although materials and supplies undoubtedly allow for better and more effective CFS functioning, these things are not essential for carrying out many of the most important recreational and supervised play activities offered by CFS. Provision of services should not be delayed due to the lack of kits or tents.

CFS were perceived to be effective in offering a child care role for younger children in the absence of functioning day-care centres and schools. Once those facilities began to reopen, CFS operating hours were reduced to only a few days a week to avoid competing or conflicting with them. The efficiency and purpose of the CFS strategy became questionable at this stage, and evidence indicates that the CFS duplicated existing services.

3.1.5 Sustainability

In principle, community groups and barangay officials generally seemed willing to take over the management of the CFS after the implementing international NGO ceased operation. Nonetheless, they had little to no direct involvement in the CFS, had an extremely limited understanding of their purpose and operational procedures and consistently stated that they did not have the resources or capacity to single-handedly support the activities. The reality is that at the time of the evaluation there was a limited sense of ownership of the CFS by the community or local authorities.

A key question is whether CFS are actually meant to be sustainable in the long term or whether their primary and most effective function is during the immediate aftermath of an emergency (approximately three months)? Due to funding flows and significant delays in implementation, CFS were being set up many months after Typhoon Haiyan, with agencies retroactively developing strategies and rationale to support and justify the CFS role in a non-emergency context.

The rationale for the longer-term operation of the CFS and the transition to community management by evolving into a new type of community structure does not appear to have been fully thought through in the child protection response strategy. Similarly, the exit strategy or handover processes were not clarified when the CFS strategy was adopted. The concept of building community ownership was not realistic due to the way the CFS were implemented.

Where CFS were set up seven or more months after the typhoon struck, it is not clear whether doing so was based on a requirement to spend funds or on actual identified need. Considering the apparent success of the generation I CFS in the Philippines, greater appreciation of the potential brevity of the strategy is recommended. Organizations should be open to the idea that CFS might well be a short-term rather than long-term or sustainable endeavour, based on an understanding and evidence that CFS are most likely appropriate and effective at a particular point in time during an emergency.
3.2 Lessons learned

Overall, this evaluation found that the CFS response to Typhoon Haiyan followed largely predetermined strategies on the basis of a standardized approach assumed to be applicable to all large-scale emergencies globally. The result was that it was only partially relevant and appropriate: Generation I CFS within the first three months of the disaster worked best. CFS that were implemented subsequently were automatically set up rather than identifying and responding to actual child protection needs in the Philippines, even several months after the disaster began and when context-specific information was available. These questions of appropriateness, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability are cause for greater reflection.

The following lessons learned that emerged through the evaluation process could be useful for a broader reflection on the role of child-friendly spaces in emergency situations globally.

- International expertise cannot replace local knowledge, experience and understanding of a context. Predetermined standardized child protection and CFS programme responses are problematic. Developing a solid understanding of the needs and what might strengthen or undermine existing systems is as essential as prepositioning supplies.

- The common acceptance of CFS as an automatic child protection response in an emergency situation is problematic. When the establishment of CFS is objectified as an end goal, the potential capacity of this strategy to achieve child protection outcomes is often lost. Emphasis on the physical establishment of a physical space at the expense of their actual function overshadows consideration of other potentially more appropriate strategies.

- International commitments, standards and guidance should guide – but not dictate – locally adapted and emergency-specific child protection response plans.

- The almost exclusive focus on establishing CFS limits opportunities for maximizing the potential of this strategy through linkages to broader child protection and other sectors. Lack of analysis of how the CFS can contribute, interact and complement broader child protection initiatives and other sectors (education, health, WASH and shelter) decreases opportunities for positive outcomes for children and families.

- Needs evolve according to situations. Evacuation centres and camps might need child-friendly spaces in the long term, while communities generally re-establish safe areas, play spaces and routines relatively quickly after a natural disaster.

- A strategy to use CFS as the response in all situations, from the emergency relief to recovery to rehabilitation periods, is misplaced. As a strategy that responds to relief, recovery and long-term reconstruction situations, CFS have evident limitations because one size does not fit all. Strategic responses need to be developed based on a phased approach, in which different strategies are utilized and adapted to evolving needs and context.

- Child-friendly spaces can contribute to positive changes for children and families when kept simple and focused on serving specific needs related to the relief emergency phase. Basic CFS can be implemented in large numbers because they require few resources, staff capacity and supplies. Extending the duration of CFS in subsequent emergency phases loses relevance unless this is based upon a strong rationale, strategy and solid theory of change grounded in the local context. However,
longer-running CFS are likely to increase in complexity and require more skills, resources and supplies to operate, posing challenges for setting up and/or operating the concept at large scale.

- CFS might not need to be sustainable if their functions are only necessary in specific circumstances. For example, if CFS are understood to be most effective in providing immediate psychosocial support to children and communities, they might be time bound to the relief phase.

- Organizations should hold each other accountable within the CPWG through a rigorous monitoring and evaluation framework. Above all, organizations should be accountable for the achievement of specified child protection results, not only the content of a stipulated programme cooperation agreement. They should feel a common sense of responsibility to ensure that strategies and programmes are constantly assessed and adapted to do this.

- The CFS challenges documented in this evaluation were consistent with lessons learned from other emergency situations and echo the large body of guidance on CFS implementation. A key common finding is that implementing CFS effectively and appropriately is difficult and therefore might not be the most appropriate strategy for many situations. This also suggests that previous lessons were either not reviewed when planning for a new situation or, worse, ignored.
4. Recommendations

The recommendations offered here reflect the conclusions and lessons learned, which are informed by the analysis of responses through the interviews, group discussions and surveys and from the reviewed literature, both in relation to CFS as an emergency response in the Philippines as well as the use of CFS as a child protection strategy in the domain of international humanitarian policy and practice. Specific recommendations are provided for UNICEF, implementing partners, government agencies (the Council for the Welfare of Children and the Department of Social Welfare and Development), the CPWG and other child protection stakeholders.

Many of these recommendations are interlinked and have wide-ranging implications. Many of the ideas presented here, including the importance of identifying the needs of children and gaps in service provision, involving children and community members in CFS design, utilizing existing resources and designing specialized programming for different groups of children, are also highlighted in the interagency CFS guidelines. They are reiterated here because they emerged as critical gaps in the CFS experience as a response to the Typhoon Haiyan disaster.

Specific recommendations for CFS as a response to Typhoon Haiyan

This evaluation was intended to serve a formative function. But the timing of this report coincides with the termination of the CFS experience in response to Typhoon Haiyan. Given this reality, it is recommended that UNICEF Philippines and implementing partners:

- Phase out the current CFS activities without any specific pressure on communities to sustain them.
- Where interest has been expressed and NGOs have the capacity and resources to do so, support communities to transition CFS to appropriate centres for youth and recreation that are designed to address identified community needs.
- Support communities and LGUs (in terms of capacity or identifying alternative ways to cover the same functions) who want to sustain CFS.

Recommendations for CFS as a child protection strategy in emergency situations in the Philippines

CFS can be a useful strategy. But it also can distract from the comprehensive child protection response in a time of emergency. In light of the endorsement of CFS as a strategy for child protection in emergencies by the Government of the Philippines and with the promotion of national guidelines on CFS, it is recommended that respective government agencies and UNICEF Philippines:

- Carry out a study to shed light on the child protection system, its components, appropriateness and its functioning. The study should involve comprehensive analysis of the present child protection system’s appropriateness to the context as well as an in-depth understanding of what communities and families typically do to prevent and respond to threats to children’s well-being. The study should be an opportunity to build a common understanding among government and non-government stakeholders on the analysis of the system. This is an essential first step in any effort to strengthen the child protection system and should be prioritized.

Ensure that the CFS concept is understood to be one of a range of strategic options available to respond to child protection needs in emergencies.

The Council for the Welfare of Children and the Department of Social Welfare and Development should adapt the national CFS guidelines, making them less prescriptive and more as operating principles. Additionally, the guidelines can be strengthened by including the following specific considerations:

- Clarify whether CFS is a strategy that can achieve the articulated child protection outcomes. Specify those outcomes in the first deliberation on whether to use the CFS strategy, and never lose sight of them.
- Explain in detail how the CFS will bring about the needed child protection outcomes.
- Explain, in detail, what the CFS strategy offers that existing services or agents cannot provide (even if they are supported or built up during the emergency situation).
- Consider whether CFS could be used as a central platform for the delivery of a range of critical services for children, linked to other child protection responses (for example, unaccompanied and separated children, children who have been maltreated, families with multiple problems).
- Clarify the lifespan and explain how CFS will be closed down or transition to other management.
- Promote, within the national guidelines and in practice, increased clarity and specific guidance on the process involved in setting up a CFS (if CFS is determined to be the most appropriate strategy), particularly in terms of engagement and involvement with communities and beneficiaries. This evaluation found that this clarity is a critical factor for successful CFS implementation, if only by the correlation between the absence of it and the difficulties the CFS implementation encountered.

Ensure that the Government is adequately supported to lead the child protection strategic response. The CPWG and UNICEF should adhere to the next series of suggestions.

Recommendations for national and international agencies involved in child protection in emergency programmes in the Philippines and globally

When joining a humanitarian emergency response in designing child protection strategies, government agencies, UNICEF and other international organizations (together in the CPWG) are recommended to:

- Develop locally adapted and emergency-specific child protection response plans that are guided – but not dictated by – international guidelines, standards and commitments.
- Design the child protection response that is relevant and appropriate for the specific context and type of emergency. This is standard knowledge, but rarely is it deeply considered. To truly respond to need and circumstance, agencies should:
  - Carry out a child protection needs assessment.
  - Reflect on local data and contextual understanding in the plans under development.
  - Use both primary and secondary data (pre-emergency data) in designing and monitoring CFS.
  - Consider the expected results in relation to the needs, the available capacities and the opportunities to implement programmes.
  - Maintain focus on the child protection outcomes. Avoid the establishment of CFS as the objective of the child protection response programme. It's not the tent but what goes on inside that only matters.
  - If CFS are selected as part of the child protection response strategy, clearly state how it will contribute to the overall intended child protection results and how it will integrate with the other programmes (including broader child protection, education, health and shelter).
- Adopt a phased development of the strategic child protection response to humanitarian emergencies. The plan should be incrementally detailed but adapted as additional information becomes available and as the evolving situation changes.
Recommendations for UNICEF management of the humanitarian response

- Design and inform the mobilizing and deployment of the immediate response team in ways that maximize partnerships and existing capacities, avoiding substitution. This requires careful planning and a gradual disengagement following the relief phase.
- Streamline processes with adequate space for flexibility and options for operations in an emergency:
  - Improve the socialization of the simplified standard operating procedures and ensure an increased understanding of the available options, especially to ensure reasonable timing for signing programme cooperation agreements.
  - Ensure that management is in a position to override procedural obstacles in the interest of the relief response.

Recommendations for international agencies involved in child protection in emergency responses globally

UNICEF and international NGOs are recommended to:

- Work towards the realization of a collective sense of responsibility built on programmatic and strategic coordination. Specifically:
  - Ensure experienced and qualified child-protection-in-emergency staff are assigned to cluster coordination.
  - Work with other sectors, especially education, on sharing strategies and jointly establishing CFS. Avoid competition between sectors or working in silos.
  - Be transparent about individual organizations’ needs for visibility, scale and programme implementation. Ensure a collective sense of responsibility to achieve outcomes for children and communities, focusing on the outcomes and measuring change in the lives of children and families.
- Strengthen partnerships through strategic and regular dialogue that focuses on how to continuously improve programmes to achieve the articulated child protection outcomes.
- Conduct regular reviews of the overall child protection response plan, in which the contributions of all programme components towards the articulated child protection outcomes are assessed and continuously verified.

Finally, the evaluation recommends that UNICEF and partners, possibly through the CPWG, organize a forum to discuss the following points and agree on a way forward in the use of CFS as a child protection emergency response globally:

- What factors determine whether a standardized emergency response strategy should be used and is appropriate in different contexts?
- Is it truly possible or opportune to carry out assessments during emergencies? If so, at what stage can this be done, and what type of assessment should be conducted?
- What are the advantages of using international guidelines and standards, and how could they be strengthened or further improved for flexible application?
- Why is CFS the primary global child protection response in emergencies?
  - What are possible alternative strategies to CFS, and why have they not been considered or deployed?
  - Why does CFS often appear to become an objective in and of itself in the child protection emergency response, even in different settings? How can this be avoided?
- What is required to ensure that CFS are integrated into and appropriate for the contexts in which they operate, the communities in which they are placed, the families with whom they are supposed to interact with and the children they are designed to serve?
Recommendations specific to design and implement child friendly spaces

If in an emergency situation CFS is selected as the response strategy, government agencies, UNICEF and international organizations (together in the CPWG) are recommended to:

- Clearly spell out the CFS rationale, expected results and functions. To do this:
  - Identify needed outcomes and assess whether CFS is the best strategy to achieve these outcomes in the given context.
  - Spell out the relevance and added value of CFS in a specific context: What does the CFS contribute that is not already there?
  - Give a realistic lifespan of strategies, such as CFS, that respond to the specified functions. Organizations should be open to the idea that CFS might be a short-term rather than long-term endeavour.
  - Consider whether CFS is the most useful option in the relief phase, and consider limiting implementation to this time frame (approximately three months).
  - Develop a clear and realistic exit or handover strategy that is discussed and agreed with beneficiaries, local partners and communities at the outset.

- Define and distinguish the CFS types or models, while being explicit on their expected outcomes, if child protection system strengthening remains a function:
  - For the relief phase, keep the CFS model simple, requiring minimal capacity building for immediate implementation and limited dependency on supplies (generation I CFS).
  - Adapt the function of the CFS implemented after the relief phase – phase out emergency-related activities and increase specific child protection functions in a complementary relationship with the existing child protection system (generation II CFS).
    - Clarify what the CFS is realistically able to do in terms of child protection system strengthening and how this will be achieved.
    - Clarify the role of CFS in the child protection system and how CFS will integrate and relate to other components of the system.
    - Determine whether other parts of the child protection system can perform what the CFS are envisioned to do (with support).

- Maintain CFS beyond a relief phase only if the circumstances require it. For example, if its functions cannot be carried out in other ways; such circumstances would be evacuation centres, situations of protracted social instability, natural hazards affecting the safety of spaces for play and socialization, among others.

- If the CFS strategy is mandated to serve a long-term function, develop a solid theory of change before entering the recovery phase to explain how the CFS is able and intended to contribute to the articulated long-term outcomes.

- If the CFS strategy is considered to be the most appropriate strategy for the relief phase, ensure that it does not replace, overlap or undermine any existing function of the child protection system in the context. This requires functional knowledge of the child protection system at the local level.
  - If such functions of the child protection system are severely weakened or non-operational, ensure that the CFS, along with the child protection response programme, address these gaps from the beginning.

CFS implementation and management

- In all circumstances, conduct a community-level assessment to ensure that the strategies adopted are adapted to the specific characteristics and needs of children and families. The assessment of the situation could be staged and carried out incrementally.

- Establish dialogue with potential beneficiaries and communities from the outset to verify whether the CFS is genuinely needed, desirable and appropriate or if a different approach would be more effective.
  - Consider that in rural communities there might be more options, compared with evacuation centres or camps for displaced persons.
If CFS is determined to be the most appropriate strategy for the emergency context, then during the relief phase, focus on establishing its core functions from the beginning (providing recreation, safe space, psychosocial support) and for all children.

- CFS activities should be age- and sex-specific, with specialized services designed and implemented for children with disabilities.
- Do not overburden CFS in the immediate relief phase with other goals and functions.
- Reconsider CFS functions and role at the end of the relief phase (after three months).

Establish CFS in coordination with communities (not only local authorities) and be proactive in the community:

- Involve and reach out to parents and caregivers to provide services and psychosocial as well as to raise awareness on and potentially address child protection issues at the community level.
- Ensure CFS are proactive in reaching out marginalized or hard-to-reach children and families.
- Address child protection challenges through the family unit rather than targeting individual children in isolation.

CFS staffing should be realistically considered during the planning phase. Weigh the numbers and capabilities of staff to be recruited against the envisioned objectives of the CFS; the more complex the model, the more specialized and skilled its staff needs to be. Agencies should consider the following points:

- Determine whether caregivers with minimal training can staff generation I CFS implemented during the relief phase.
- Encourage diversity in the recruitment of CFS staff.
- Link selection and recruitment of staff to specific CFS objectives. Promote proactive and ongoing monitoring of the effectiveness of training provided to CFS personnel.
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## Annex I. Evaluation framework

(SSI = semi-structured interview; GD = group discussion; GI = group interview; OBV = observation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus area</th>
<th>Sub-foci</th>
<th>Macro questions</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Data collection method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| CFS and the CP/CPiE programme                  | General characteristics of the child protection (CP) and child protection in emergencies (CPiE) programme | ▪ What were the goals, targets and outcomes of UNICEF CP/CPiE response during the immediate relief phase and early recovery following Haiyan?  
▪ How did the different elements of the CP/CPiE response complement each other?  
▪ How well have needs assessments informed the development of the CP/CPiE strategy and adjustments required during the course of the response?  
▪ Did a theory of change underpin the CP programme, and if so, how? Was this reviewed or amended during the evaluation period (Nov 2013–Nov 2014)? | Literature (programme documents, situation analyses, needs assessments, etc.)  
UNICEF staff (chief of section, CPiE specialist, field CP coordinator) | Desk review  
SSI                                                                 |
| UNICEF Core Commitments for Children           | Was the CP programme built upon or aligned to the CCCs?  
Did the CFS help fulfil the CCCs?                | ▪ How relevant were CFS to the CP and CPiE programmes?  
▪ How well did they address children’s protection needs?  
▪ How well adapted were they to the local context?  
▪ How well were those interventions coordinated with local authorities?  
▪ How well were links made between the CFS and other CP service providers?  
▪ Were the CFS relevant and appropriate to UNICEF’s CP theory of change? | Literature (programmes documents, etc.)  
UNICEF staff (chief of section, CPiE specialist, field CP coordinator)  
Implementing partners (CP programme managers)  
Government representatives (national level, LGU)  
CFS staff | Desk review  
SSI  
GD  
GI  
OBV  
Case stories |
| CFS response to Haiyan                          |                                                                           | ▪ What, if any, plans existed for transitioning ownership or management of the CFS to local or government partners during or after the recovery?  
▪ Were these implemented? |                                                                 |                                                                      |
<p>| CFS and the national/local counterparts         |                                                                           |                                                                 |                                                                      |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ What is the learning on the role of CFS in CP: a) in general, b) in relation to the Philippines’ emergency context and c) in relation specifically to Haiyan?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNICEF-supported CFS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ To what extent have the UNICEF CFS been meaningful, given:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ the protection needs of children and families (in terms of gender, age, exclusion, equity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ existing caring and protecting mechanisms and systems (building on/complementing any known local community or group-led initiatives of this kind, such as church groups)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ national and Local Government Unit priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ the UNICEF CP overall programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ the evolving context, from relief to early recovery.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ How appropriate were CFS to the needs of children affected by the emergency (in terms of gender, age, exclusion, equity)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Did this remain the same throughout the evaluation period?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriateness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ What guidelines or standards were used as reference?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ To what extent have the CFS complied with or adhered to international guidelines/standards (including relating to the inclusion of children and communities in the design, delivery and monitoring activities as well as quality standards)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ To what extent did the CFS approach and organization fit the socio-cultural context and the existing and emerging service paradigm (including day care centres, women friendly spaces and temporary learning spaces)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ How compatible are CFS with central and local government policies and practices (national guidelines, local ordinances, service provision)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ How did CFS fit with the dynamic national child protection system or local systems? (Was there duplication or replacement of existing services or protection mechanisms?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Was the identification, recruitment and training of staff required for</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Literature (including statistical information) |
| Communities (leaders, surrounding and participating community) |
| Programme staff (UNICEF/partners) |
| Officials (national/local) |
| CFS staff |
| Children and adults in the community |
| Community leaders |
| Observations (data collection team) |

<p>| Desk review |
| GD |
| SSI |
| GI |
| OBV |
| Case stories |
| Officials (national/local) |
| Programme staff (UNICEF/partners) |
| Observations (data collection team) |
| SSI |
| OBV |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNICEF-supported CFS</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the implementation and running of CFS effective and appropriate?</td>
<td>To what extent were CFS considered an essential part of community or local authorities’ strategies to ensure children’s care and protection?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What were the explicit or implicit theory of change and planned results for the UNICEF-supported CFS between November 2013 and November 2014?</td>
<td>Do local authorities and/or civil society organizations have the resources and capacities to sustain CFS, if considered appropriate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- To what extent were the planned results (outputs, outcomes, impacts) of UNICEF’s supported CFS met?</td>
<td>- To what extent did CFS contribute to capacity strengthening of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Were the planned results reviewed and, if appropriate, amended as the CFS became operational over the evaluation period?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Were there any unanticipated results (positive or negative) for UNICEF, the Government and others?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- What results did the CFS achieve in the immediate relief phase?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- What results did the CFS achieve in the recovery phase?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- What results did the CFS achieve in the transitional phase?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How effective was the UNICEF (and partners’) engagement with national and local authorities in protection-preparedness activities (prepositioning CFS supplies, identifying, recruiting and training staff, etc.), before and during the early response, during the recovery and during the transitional phase?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent have CFS contributed to strengthening systems for protecting children?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent did the CFS meet quality standards?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- What factors contributed to meeting, or otherwise, quality standards?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Literature
- Programme staff (UNICEF/partners)
- Communities (leaders, surrounding and participating community, adults and children)
- Officials (national/local)
- CFS staff
- Literature (including statistical information)
- Programme staff (UNICEF/partners)
- Officials (national/local)
- CFS staff
- Programme staff (UNICEF/partners)
- Officials (national/local)
- Case stories
- Literature
- Communities (leaders, surrounding and participating community, adults and children)
- Officials (local)
- Programme staff (UNICEF/partners)
- Programme staff (UNICEF/partners)
- Officials (national/local)
- Case stories

### Sources
- Desk review
- SSI
- Case stories
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNICEF-supported CFS</th>
<th>partners, for example through training?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have the CFS brought about sustainable changes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is the CFS legacy (what was learned from the CFS that made a difference to children)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How systematically and effectively have partnerships been mobilized to expand the CFS approach, if considered appropriate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent have systems been put in place with the national Government and LGUs to ensure sustainability?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent were disaggregated and regular data collected, monitored and used?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How was information managed and how did information flow systemically?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What actions were taken (if any) to address issues that became apparent from regular data monitoring (inclusion of adolescents, children with disabilities, indigenous children, etc.)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What actions were taken (if any) to rectify issues arising during the CFS implementation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How well were the funds used across various strategies and interventions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What was the cost of CFS compared with other CPiE interventions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Based on a simple analysis of cost data, what conclusions can be drawn regarding 'value for money' and cost-related expenditure in implementing CFS?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Was the procurement and delivery of supplies required for the implementation and running of CFS efficient?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Was the identification, recruitment and training of staff required for the implementation and running of CFS efficient?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is there any evidence of use of innovation, device or otherwise, that contributed, positively or negatively, to the functioning of the CFS?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What conclusions can be drawn in terms of cost effectiveness for the use of these models and possible future replication?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CFS staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officials (national/local)</th>
<th>Programme staff (UNICEF/partners)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literature (including statistical information)</th>
<th>Programme staff (UNICEF/partners)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme staff (UNICEF/partners)</th>
<th>Officials (national/local)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme staff (UNICEF/partners, procurement staff)</th>
<th>Officials (national/local)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme staff (UNICEF/partners)</th>
<th>SSI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SSI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desk review</th>
<th>SSI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBV</th>
<th>SSI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GI</th>
<th>SSI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### Future direction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lessons learned</th>
<th>Officials (national/local)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ What are the lessons learned of UNICEF-supported CFS in the aftermath of the Haiyan disaster over the period November 2013–November 2014?</td>
<td>Literature Officials (national/local)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ What factors contributed to or hindered the relevancy, appropriateness, effectiveness and sustainability of the CFS in the aftermath of the Haiyan disaster?</td>
<td>Programme staff (UNICEF/partners)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Under what circumstances should UNICEF support CFS in relief and recovery phases after emergencies in the Philippines?</td>
<td>CFS staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Future UNICEF support

| Literature Officials (national/local) |
| Programme staff (UNICEF/partners) |
| CFS staff |
| Children and adults in the community |
| Community leaders |

Desk review matrix

| GD |
| GI |
| SSI |
| OBV |
| Case stories |
## Annex II. Results and targets for UNICEF clusters and response

Source: Final Haiyan Strategic Response Plan, update September 2014, UNICEF.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Initial UNICEF target</th>
<th>Revised UNICEF target</th>
<th>UNICEF cumulative result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WATER, SANITATION &amp; HYGIENE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with access to safe water</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>1,542,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with access to appropriately designed toilet</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>650,000</td>
<td>268,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children provided school hygiene kits</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>442,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People reached with hygiene promotion activities</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>Not in HAC or SitRep</td>
<td>Not in HAC or SitRep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HEALTH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children aged 6–59 months vaccinated for measles</td>
<td>90% in affected areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children younger than 12 months receiving routine Expanded Programme on Immunization</td>
<td>90% in affected areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government units restored/improved cold chain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnant women provided with iron-folic acid supplementation</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NUTRITION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children with SAM admitted to therapeutic feeding programme</td>
<td>50% of need</td>
<td>Not in HAC or SitRep</td>
<td>Not in HAC or SitRep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregivers of children 0–23 months with access to IYCF counselling for appropriate feeding</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>64,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDUCATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-school and school age children (3–17 years) provided with learning materials and supplies</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>550,000</td>
<td>519,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children accessing temporary learning spaces</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>426,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education service providers trained on at least one emergency-related topic</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>3,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHILD PROTECTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children with safe access to child-friendly spaces</td>
<td>115,500</td>
<td>115,500</td>
<td>97,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregivers accessing psychosocial support activities</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>5,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated and unaccompanied children identified, registered and receiving FTR and family-based care or an appropriate alternative care service</td>
<td>100% of cases</td>
<td>100% of cases</td>
<td>100% of cases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: SAM = severe acute malnutrition; IYCF = infant and young child feeding; FTR = family tracing and reunification; HAC = humanitarian action for children; SitRep = situation report.

72 Emergency-related topics, such as psychosocial support, handling of large classes, education in emergencies, disaster risk reduction.
Annex III. Evaluation terms of reference

An evaluation of child-friendly spaces in the aftermath of Typhoon Haiyan (Yolanda) in the Philippines

Background

Broadly, the purpose of child-friendly spaces (CFS) is to support the resilience and well-being of children and young people through community organized, structured activities conducted in a safe and stimulating child friendly environment. CFS are used in emergencies as a first response to meet the protection needs of children, and as an entry point for working with affected communities. While CFS are typically used as temporary supports that contribute to the care and protection of children in emergencies, they can also function as transitional structures that bridge to early recovery and long-term supports for vulnerable children.73

To date, UNICEF has supported 40,060 children in 144 CFS across the Typhoon Haiyan affected regions with an additional 7,215 caregivers also reached. However, Region VI and VIII are the worst affected region, as they were in the path of Typhoon Haiyan.

A documentation of 30 CFS in Region VI and VIII was conducted in February-March 2014. The full report and recommendations have been used to help inform ongoing programming as well as the government’s new guidelines on CFS implementation for the Philippines.

In Region VI, partners have already identified several key lessons from CFS implementation. First, that CFS interventions need to more appropriately address the needs of all children (including adolescents), access and serve the most vulnerable populations, link more directly with women friendly spaces (WFS) and health & nutrition initiatives, and leverage local resources to solve the bottleneck of limited human resource personnel.

In Region VIII, various trainings and workshops have been conducted with members of the government to build capacity in CFS implementation. These have included orientations with municipal social workers, police officers, school teachers, and other government staff on psychosocial support, minimum standards, practical management, and sustainability of CFS. A capacity building workshop was also held in January for Eastern and Western Samar with NGOs and government on training and action planning for CFS.

This initial review of the 30 CFS revealed key issues and recommendations for ongoing implementation particularly with regard to activities related to outreach, attendance tracking, engagement of adolescents, promotion of child protection awareness, and feedback mechanisms, etc. While CFS were viewed positively by community members and children; their role in supporting early recovery and system-strengthening, and as a harmonised approach to support all children’s protection and well-being, is not yet well established. However, important questions remain regarding the role of CFS in emergency responses in the Philippines and more specifically the role that they have played to protect children in Typhoon Haiyan affected areas.

It has been recognized that a range of approaches to the establishment and management of CFS have been used by different partners with differing results and challenges reported. The recent assessment noted concerns about CFS access to supply items, access to CFS for the most vulnerable and marginalized communities, and to what extent CFS have strengthened existing child protection and child care mechanisms or the more worrying trend of duplicating existing services or replacing them.

To investigate these issues more closely in order to consequently make more informed recommendations for future UNICEF emergency responses, evaluation of CFS implementation in the Typhoon Haiyan affected areas is required.

Purpose and objectives
The evaluation is formative; and will assist in strengthening the child protection programme response in the
Philippines in emergencies. In addition, the evaluation will also determine the relevance, protective and
restorative effectiveness, efficiency, coverage, and sustainability of UNICEF supported CFS, drawing on lessons
learned in Typhoon Haiyan affected areas, with the following specific objectives:

- Examine how CFS contributed to child protection programming in the context of relief and recovery in
  the emergency context, using the CCCs as a reference;
- Based on the Global Minimum Standards for Child Friendly Spaces, informed by UNICEF’s CCCs for
  child protection, and taking account of the specific context of Typhoon Haiyan affected areas, assess
  UNICEF supported CFS immediately after the emergency and through the transition to recovery as a
  response and protection mechanism in the aftermath of Typhoon Haiyan;
- Assess how key principles and approaches such as equity, gender, community participation, and human
  rights have been integrated in the implementation of CFS; and
- Identify key successes and gaps, in terms of what works and does not work and why, good practices,
  and lessons learned in the establishment and implementation of CFS.

Based on evidence gathered, provide recommendations and technical guidance for policy and management
decisions in the Philippines and for UNICEF in operationalizing, and monitoring CFS within a child protection
framework in the context of emergencies in the country.

Scope of the evaluation
The main focus of the evaluation will be on UNICEF’s Child Protection programme progress in achieving results
for CFS in the initial phase of the response to the Typhoon and in the transition to early recovery. The period
under review will cover UNICEF’s response from November 2013 to July 2014, assessing the initial phase of the
response and the transition to early recovery.

This evaluation exercise will cover the 40 UNICEF selected Typhoon Haiyan-affected municipalities for which
CFS initiatives were implemented, and it will be conducted from the period 15 August until 30 September 2014.

Use of the evaluation
The evidence and recommendations developed by the evaluation will provide a source of evidence to improve
future decisions in the use of CFS as an emergency response mechanism and serve as a knowledge base for
investment programming by the Philippine national government, UNICEF, and other partners who have
supported the establishment of CFS in the aftermath of Typhoon Haiyan.

The recommendations arising from this evaluation will be relevant for UNICEF, and the Local Social Welfare and
Development Office of local governments which supervises the operations and maintenance of local CFS
facilities.

Evaluation questions
Relevance / appropriateness
- How relevant are the CFS to national and local government priorities, and to UNICEF’s overall response
to emergencies and the Child Protection programme?
- How relevant and responsive were / are CFS to the needs of children affected by the emergency?
- To what extent did the CFS build on/ complement existing systems and mechanisms (including day care
  centres / BCPC activities / temporary learning spaces?) and adapt to changing needs and the changing
  context.

Effectiveness
- What are the key results achieved by UNICEF supported child-friendly spaces in the Typhoon Haiyan
  affected areas in immediate relief and recovery phases?
- How effectively has UNICEF and its partners engaged national and local governments in protection
  related preparedness activities (prepositioning of CFS supplies) before the emergency and during the
  early response and recovery phases?
To what extent has UNICEF through partners delivered on its commitments and targets for the establishment of CFS.

To what extent have UNICEF and its partners contributed in developing national capacities on CFS at central and decentralized levels (including international NGOs and NGOs)?

To what extent have CFS provided an opportunity to strengthen systems for protecting children (national guidelines, local ordinances and service provision).

To what extent have CFS contributed to the effectiveness of UNICEF’s Child Protection programme?

**Efficiency**

- How well were the funds utilised across various strategies and interventions?
- Based on a basic analysis of cost data, what conclusions can be drawn regarding “value for money” and cost related expenditure, including supplies, human resources (efficiencies and inefficiencies) in implementing CFS?
- Is there any evidence of use of any innovation, device or otherwise, which contributed to the CFS success? What conclusions can be drawn regarding the utility of these models for future replication and cost effectiveness?

**Sustainability**

- How systematically and effectively have partnerships been mobilized to expand the CFS approach?
- To what extent have systems been put in place with the national government and Local Government Units to ensure sustainability?

**Cross-cutting**

- To what extent do CFS meet expected quality standards? What factors have contributed to meeting quality standards?
- Where quality standards are not met, what were the key bottlenecks / constraints that need to be addressed to meet quality standards?
- How effectively have CFS addressed the distinct needs, vulnerabilities and capacities of girls, boys (including adolescents) been identified and addressed?
- To what extent are sex and age disaggregated data collected and monitored?
- To what degree have the CFS responded to the inclusion of girls and boys to participate in the design, delivery and monitoring of activities?

**Evaluation approach and methodology**

Use the following to inform the evaluation: secondary data desk reviews, measurement tools to conduct the above assessment, observation, photos, interviews, and focus group discussions with CFS facilitators, community members, children and government and site visits to CFS.

The approach followed from the onset of the evaluation will be as participative as possible. Stakeholders will participate in the evaluation through discussions, consultations, providing comments on draft documents. In gathering data and views from stakeholders, the evaluation team will ensure that it considers a cross-section of stakeholders as much as possible.

The evaluation will employ internationally agreed evaluation criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability. The methodology should demonstrate impartiality and lack of bias by relying on a cross-section of information sources (e.g. stakeholder groups, including beneficiaries, etc.) and using a mixed methodology (e.g. quantitative, qualitative, participatory) to ensure triangulation of information through a variety of means.

An inception report will be prepared describing any challenges faced and how to address them, the suitability of the methodology and the effectiveness of the data collection methods and instruments.

The evaluation will proceed based on the following major stages:

1. Inception, including preparation of an evaluation framework. An inception report will be submitted and presented to the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD) and UNICEF and the reference group that will be established to support the evaluation. The report will contain the overall plan and evaluation framework for the conduct of the evaluation, including the suggested methodology, data gathering processes, assessment instruments, methods of analysis, proposed adjustments in this TOR and other issues relevant to the
successful completion of the assessment. The evaluation framework will be based on the above evaluation scope, objectives and list of questions.

2. Secondary data collection and analysis. As described above, the evaluation team will undertake collection and analysis of secondary data through literature review, which should be considered and made part of the inception report.

3. Primary data collection through survey, field visits and key informant interviews and focus group discussion. The evaluation team will undertake primary data collection and analysis through field visits and informant interviews and focus group discussion as described above. Prior to conducting the field visits, the evaluation instruments or tools will be pre-tested and a report will be prepared that describes the pre-test outcomes.

4. Presentation of preliminary findings and initial recommendations. Workshops will be convened by the consultant to present and validate preliminary findings and initial recommendations to DSWD and relevant government agencies and institutions such as the departments of justice, interior and local governments, social welfare and development; the national police agency; prosecutor's office; barangay officials; local government officials; different leagues of local governments; residential care facilities' administrators; NGOs and other relevant stakeholders.

Main output and deliverables

The consultant shall deliver the following:

- Inception Report The report will contain the overall plan and evaluation framework for the conduct of the evaluation, including the suggested methodology, data gathering processes, assessment instruments, methods of analysis, proposed adjustments in this TOR and other issues relevant to the successful completion of the assessment. The evaluation framework will be based on the above evaluation scope, objectives and list of questions;
- Draft Evaluation report; and
- Final Evaluation report.

The main output of this undertaking is the Evaluation Report containing an exhaustive, structured, logical, clear and concise discussion of the findings and recommendations consistent with the objectives of the evaluation. The report will be prepared based on the UNICEF-Adapted UNEG Evaluation Reports Standards. Copy will be furnished upon awarding of the contract.

Duration of the consultancy

This evaluation shall be undertaken within an estimated period of 3 months. In the event of an extension in the implementation period, the Consulting Group shall not receive additional budget from UNICEF.

Management arrangements

This undertaking will be managed and overseen by the Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation unit of UNICEF, Philippines along with the Regional Evaluation Advisor, based in the UNICEF EAPRO Regional Office. Child Protection technical support and field coordination will be provided by the Child Protection Programme, Philippines. Additional technical support will be sought from the Child Protection Unit, New York and the Regional Advisor for Child Protection, EAPRO.

A reference group will be constituted by UNICEF led by PME to strengthen the relevance, accuracy and hence credibility and utility of the evaluation. The Reference Group will serve in an advisory capacity, their main responsibility being to review, comment and recommend the quality of the main evaluation outputs (the Inception Report, reports on emerging findings and the Draft and Final Reports). The members of the Reference Group will be composed of representatives from the following: UNICEF Philippines (PME, Child Protection, Senior Management), the UNICEF EAPRO regional office; DSWD; the Council on the Welfare of Children (CWC), Selected Administrators of DSWD, LGU and INGO and NGOs; and other such institutions as may be later identified. A TOR outlining the roles and responsibilities of the Reference Groups will be developed separately.

Tasks of the consulting group and timelines
The consulting group will have the following specific tasks and timelines:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Preparation of the Work Plan. The Consulting Group will provide a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>detailed work plan along with the budgetary requirements for the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conduct of the evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Review of secondary documents and materials relevant to the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conduct of the evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The review will help provide the basis for the evaluation design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and the crafting of the instruments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Preparation of an inception report. The report will cover the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conduct of the evaluation highlighting the evaluation design and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>framework, detailed methodology, data analyses of secondary data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(desk review), evaluation instruments and proposed changes to ensure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the successful completion of the evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Data Collection. The Consulting Group will ensure the timely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conduct of data collection activities on the agreed timelines.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Validation of draft evaluation results. A validation session will</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be conducted to allow stakeholders including selected participating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGUs and community-based services to confirm or clarify issues in the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>draft evaluation results.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Presentation of evaluation report in a forum. The Consulting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group will prepare and present the final evaluation report in a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forum to be attended by the DSWD, UNICEF and other relevant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Finalization and submission of the Evaluation Report. The report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will be finalized on the basis of the recommendations and additional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inputs during the presentation forum with, UNICEF and key</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualifications:
UNICEF will hire a team of external consultants to conduct the evaluation, comprising:
- A consultant team with global experience in Child Protection in Emergencies and familiarity with CFS.
- Proven experience in conducting similar evaluations.
- Proven experience in conducting evaluations of emergency programmes in post-emergency settings.
- Proven experience in designing and implementing evaluation tools.
- Understanding of child rights.
- Commitment to equity and gender sensitive analysis.
- Ability to design and conduct interviews and focus group discussions.
- Strong analytical skills.
- Cultural sensitivity.
- Excellent writing skills.

Key competencies:
- Excellent communication skills (written and oral).
- Ability to work in multi-cultural environments.
- Excellent listening skills and empathy with his / her audience.