



# Evaluation of the UNICEF Pacific Child Protection Programme

## Inception Report

*Prepared by:*

**Ingrid van Aalst & Dr Iain Matheson**

*PS... Services*

**19 February 2024**



# Contents

- List of Acronyms.....3**
- 1. Introduction.....4**
- 2. Background.....4**
  - UNICEF’s Child Protection Programme in the Pacific .....4
- 3. Evaluation Purpose and Objectives .....5**
  - Evaluation purpose.....5
  - Evaluation objectives.....6
  - Evaluation approach.....6
  - Theory of change.....7
- 4. Evaluation Methodology .....8**
  - Evaluation framework .....8
  - Toli: Data collection .....12
  - Tui: Data analysis and interpretation .....18
  - Ethics.....19
  - Risks and mitigation .....20
- 5. Work Plan .....20**
- Annexes to Inception Report.....23**
  - Annex A: Information sheet, consent forms.....23
  - Annex B: Semi structured interview guides .....27
  - Annex C: Agencies for Key Informant Interviews .....53
  - Annex D: Roles and responsibilities .....56
  - Annex E: Risks and mitigation .....58
  - Annex F: List of documents reviewed for the Inception Report .....59

## List of Acronyms

CP	Child Protection
CPP	UNICEF Pacific Child Protection Programme
CPS	Child Protection Section (UNICEF Pacific)
DAC	OECD Development Assistance Committee
DFAT	Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (Australia)
EMT	Evaluation Management Team
ILO	International Labour Organization
IOM	International Organization for Migration
KEQ	Key Evaluation Question
KII	Key Informant Interview
MERL	Monitoring, Evaluation, Research and Learning practices and processes
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
PICT	Pacific Island Countries and Territories
STC	Save The Children
SW	Social worker
ToC	Theory of Change
ToR	Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund (formerly the United Nations Fund for Population Activities)
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
WHO	World Health Organization

# 1. Introduction

PS... Services has been appointed by the UNICEF Pacific Multi-Country Office to conduct an evaluation of the UNICEF Pacific Child Protection Programme (CPP or the Programme).

The main purpose of this evaluation is to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, gender equality and human rights-based approach, and impact of the Programme. This evaluation is intended to contribute to improved programme implementation, learning, and to enhance accountability to donors.

The primary audience for this evaluation is the UNICEF Pacific Multi-Country Office particularly the Child Protection Section (CPS) team, and the Australia Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT). Secondary audiences are UNICEF's Pacific development partners in child protection, including UN Women, UNFPA, WHO, IOM, ILO and UNDP, line ministries in countries where the evaluation takes place, and other UNICEF offices and UNICEF Pacific teams.

The scope of the evaluation reflects the operation of Programme from 2018 to until data collection starts in 2024. As such the evaluation crosses two UNICEF programme cycles i.e. 2018-2022 and 2023-2027.<sup>1</sup> It is focused on the implementation of the Programme in Kiribati, Samoa, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu.

This inception report integrates the key findings from the desk review done to date. It begins with a brief background (Section 2), which is followed by an overview of the evaluation purpose and objectives (Section 3), the proposed methodology (Section 4) and our work plan (Section 5).

The Annexes include: an information sheet and an informed consent form; draft interview/topic guides for KIIs and discussion groups; agencies for KIIs; respective roles and responsibilities for making in-country arrangements; a discussion of key risks and their mitigation; and a list of documents reviewed for this Inception Report.

## 2. Background

### UNICEF's Child Protection Programme in the Pacific

The **UNICEF Pacific's Child Protection Programme** (which is the evaluand for this evaluation) supports 14 Pacific Island Countries and Territories (PICTs). Its overall purpose is to "enhance the protection of children against all forms of violence, abuse, neglect, and exploitation", with the outcome that "Children in the Pacific are better protected from abuse, neglect, exploitation, harmful practises, and psychological distress, including in emergencies".

---

<sup>1</sup> Hereafter referred to simply as the "UNICEF Pacific Child Protection Programme", "CP Programme" or the "Programme".

The Programme has the following three stated outputs<sup>2</sup>:

1. Governments have strengthened child protection institutional frameworks, particularly in target countries
2. Government and other service providers (non-governmental agencies) have enhanced capacities to provide child protection services that prevent and respond to violence and abuse, particularly in target countries.
3. Parents, caregivers and teachers have increased knowledge and skills to eliminate harmful practices and better protect children from violence and abuse, particularly in target countries.

The types of activities and/or interventions that have been undertaken in pursuit of these outcomes have varied across the two programme cycles covered, and across respective country work plans.

### 3. Evaluation Purpose and Objectives

#### Evaluation purpose

This is a formative and summative evaluation of UNICEF Pacific Child Protection Programme to both assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, gender equality and human rights-based approach, and impact of the Programme; and to contribute to improved Programme implementation, learning, and enhanced accountability to development partners.

The evaluation aims to understand what is working well, in what contexts, and how, to inform decision making on activities delivered to achieve the Programme’s overall stated purpose to “enhance the protection of children against all forms of violence, abuse, neglect, and exploitation” across its three Programme outputs identified above.

The primary audience of the evaluation is UNICEF’s Pacific Child Protection Section and its funding partner, the Australia Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT). Secondary audiences are UNICEF’s Pacific development partners in child protection, including UN Women, UNFPA, WHO, IOM, ILO and UNDP, ministries in countries where the evaluation takes place, and other UNICEF offices and Pacific teams.

The scope of the evaluation reflects the operation of the Programme from 2018 to 2024, focussing on its implementation in Kiribati, Samoa, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu. However, we will also be seeking the perspectives of from government officials across PICTs on the effectiveness of the CPP interventions they are familiar with, to provide additional context.

---

<sup>2</sup> These vary slightly, from the 2018-2022 to the 2023-2027 Programme cycles. The stated outputs listed have been supplied and confirmed for use by Ali Safarnejad, Multi-country Evaluation Specialist, UNICEF, by email dated 15 February 2024. They correspond to the outputs indicated in the 2018-2022 Pacific MCPD.

## Evaluation objectives

The specific objectives of this evaluation, as outlined in the Terms of Reference (ToR), are to:

- assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, gender equality and human rights-based approach, impact and sustainability of the UNICEF Pacific CP Programme.
- draw lessons and recommendations that improve and enhance UNICEF Pacific CP Section's support to Governments in the PICTs under the current country programme (2023-2027) in addressing critical child protection issues, including reducing intergenerational violence cycles.

## Evaluation approach

In terms of an overall approach, the evaluation will take a combined summative and formative view, drawing lessons to inform the next phase of the Programme's implementation across the Pacific Region (noting that this has already commenced), while also assessing the merit and worth of the interventions and their contribution to the child protection outcome (direct and indirect; intended and unintended).

The evaluation will be utilisation-focused, providing continuous and rapid feedback to the primary audience(s) during the evaluation process. This will include presentations of data collection results, as well as a strategic sense-making workshop following the development of our preliminary report and findings.

The evaluation will primarily rely on qualitative data collection and analysis utilising a range of primary and secondary data sources. This is due to existing data on measures of effectiveness and impact not being readily available, consistent, reliable or current. We will endeavour to identify and draw on quantitative data where it is available and appropriate (eg, data on community social workers and related roles' engagement), as described in Section 4. During the Inception Phase, the evaluation context, approach and methodology have been further discussed with UNICEF, reflecting the co-design approach that has been adopted.

The ToR highlights the following principles that will guide the evaluation, which we have further elaborated below:

- **Formative and summative:** As indicated above, we will both look back to assess the implementation of the Programme and the progress made to date, and look forward, with a view to identifying good, innovative practices that can be adopted as lessons learned to enhance the implementation of the Programme. We note that the CPP will continue through 2023-2027, and that the two-year rolling schedule of activities for 2023-24 has already been developed, with some variations in focus and approach. We aim to either confirm recent changes as being desirable and/or to make additional recommendations arising from this work for consideration and application in future planning phases.
- **Utilisation focussed:** With the implementation of the Programme continuing, we aim to provide briefings to the Evaluation Management Team (EMT) on emerging findings at regular intervals during the data collection phase as may be useful, in addition to the sense-making workshop that is proposed to consider the initial full draft report. Appropriate caveats relating to data interpretation will apply, depending on the corroboration of data at the time.

- **Human rights and equity focussed:** This evaluation recognises the cross-cutting themes of Gender Equality, Disability and Social Inclusion (GEDSI) as both processes and outcomes of the Programme to encourage and enable impact/reach from the Programme amongst both direct (targeted) and indirect beneficiaries, including a range of groups which could be considered vulnerable or marginalised within specific contexts. We have experience in applying a GEDSI perspective within our team to ensure effective consideration of these themes and will draw upon this and key gender equality and disability inclusive development programmes and research throughout the evaluation, to shape the research questions and the data collection tools.

The evaluation will **not** be premised on any specific Theory of Change (ToC), as this has been revised several times throughout the course of the CPP (refer Theory of Change section below). However, the ToCs will help guide our overall approach and assessment of the CPP, and we expect to be in a position to comment on the most recent iteration of the ToC on completion of the evaluation for UNICEF's consideration.

## Theory of change

Four different ToC diagrams have been identified as having been in use or developed for the Child Protection Programme over the period 2018-2023, dated 2017, 2020, 2022 and 2023 (proposed<sup>3</sup>). A fifth ToC has recently been developed, following a workshop and interviews to refine the UNICEF Pacific CPP's ToC in December 2023.

The 2017 and 2020 versions are similar, although with minor changes in wording, and the 2020 version dropped the assumption and reference to "customary care practices are promoted as an asset and strengthened". However, the 2022 ToC is markedly different both in format and content; it is more comprehensive and while it better captures the activities that are being undertaken, the varying components are not categorised, connections between components are not clear, and the diagram does not fully align with the Programme outputs. In terms of content, the proposed 2023 format was more like the 2017 ToC than the 2020 one, albeit presented differently, and the latest refined ToC, to support the 2023-2027 CPP, is different again.

All five models are high level to varying degrees and take a different format to the conventional structure of inputs, activities, outputs, short-term outcomes, intermediate outcomes and long-term outcomes. As such, much of the information that one might expect to see addressed in a ToC is somewhat absent. This includes such information as the rationale for UNICEF Pacific selecting the activities to pursue that it has, how they will be carried out, more discussion of causal mechanisms, and how "success" or performance will be assessed and by what standards or indicators.

---

<sup>3</sup> Proposed new presentation for child protection theory of change, in Programme Evaluability Assessment Report by Manitou, 2023 (p. 34).

## 4. Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation methodology has been designed based on the purpose, objectives, approach and principles set out in Section 3, and taking into account the data that is available and has been supplied as part of the desk review and discussions with UNICEF Pacific CP Programme managers. As noted previously, the evaluation will be both formative and summative in nature, utilisation-focused and adopts a predominantly qualitative approach.

The methodology will adhere to UNICEF Evaluation Policy; to UNICEF procedure for ethical standards in research, evaluation, data collection and analysis; to the UNEG Ethical Guidelines; to the UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation; and to UNICEF's Evaluation Report Standards.

### Evaluation framework

The ToR specifies ten key evaluation questions (KEQs) that will guide the evaluation, and on which the evaluation findings will be reported. These KEQs are aligned with five out of the six evaluation criteria based on standards from the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development's (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency impact and sustainability, plus an area of questioning around gender equality and human rights-based approach.

The following framework (Table 1) presents our overall approach to the evaluation based on the UNICEF's KEQs. We have indicated the key target stakeholder groups that will be asked for their perspective on respective questions, and the method(s) by which that data will be collected. These questions will be framed differently according to the nature and role of the key informant/group. For example, UNICEF staff would be asked how they ensured the Programme activities were relevant to local Government child protection strategies and priorities; implementing government agencies would be asked the extent to which the Programme activities were relevant; social worker practitioners and community leaders will be asked to comment on relevance according to their observed needs.

Indicative interview guides based on this framework are provided at **Annex B**. These will be further contextualised to the key informants, their roles and exposure to the CP Programme, and their respective countries, as not all activities were delivered to all target beneficiaries.

**Table 1: Key evaluation themes, target groups and data sources**

Evaluation Themes & KEQs	Target Stakeholder Groups & Sources/Methods of Data Collection						
	UNICEF CPS	Development Partners	Implementing Partners Government Agencies	NGO Service Providers	Front-line Practitioners	Community Leaders	Community Members
<b>Relevance: (Is the CPP doing the right things?)</b>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How relevant and consistent are the Programme interventions to Government child protection strategies and priorities?</li> </ul>	Doc Review, KIIs	KIIs	Doc Review, KIIs	KIIs			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How do the Programme interventions and strategies link to the beneficiary needs?</li> </ul>	Doc Review, KIIs	KIIs	Doc Review, KIIs	KIIs	FDGs	FDGs	FDGs <sup>1</sup>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How relevant are approaches for the Pacific programming context, including civil society partnership and links to customary practices?</li> </ul>	Doc Review, KIIs	KIIs	KIIs	KIIs	FDGs	FDGs	
<b>Effectiveness: (Is the CPP achieving its objectives and outcomes?)</b>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What have been the results relating to the three Programme outputs:                             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>strengthened targeted government child protection institutional frameworks</li> <li>government and other service providers' increased capacities to provide child protection services that prevent child abuse and neglect</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	Note: Data analysis where existing relevant and reliable data exists against the three outputs.						
	Doc Review, KIIs		Doc Review, KIIs	KIIs	FDGs		
	Doc Review, KIIs		KIIs	KIIs	FDGs	FDGs	

Evaluation Themes & KEQs	Target Stakeholder Groups & Sources/Methods of Data Collection						
	UNICEF CPS	Development Partners	Implementing Partners Government Agencies	NGO Service Providers	Front-line Practitioners	Community Leaders	Community Members
3. caregivers, families and communities' increased knowledge and skills to eliminate harmful practices and better protect children from violence and abuse.	Doc Review, KIIs		KIIs	KIIs	FDGs	FDGs	FDGs <sup>1</sup>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To what degree has UNICEF Pacific's CPP contributed to the creation of positive conditions and changes for children in the Pacific to be increasingly protected from violence and abuse?</li> </ul>	Doc Review, KIIs	KIIs	KIIs	KIIs	FDGs	FDGs	FDGs <sup>1</sup>
<b>Impact: (What difference is the CPP making?)</b>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What were the main impacts (positive/negative, expected/unexpected) as perceived by the children, their families and communities; i.e., What has happened as a result of improving CP in the Pacific?</li> </ul>	Doc Review, KIIs	KIIs	Doc Review, KIIs	KIIs	FDGs	FDGs	
<b>Efficiency: (How well are resources being used?)</b>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are the utilised partnership modalities the best ones for implementing the CP Programme?</li> </ul>	Doc Review, KIIs	DFAT KII	KIIs	KIIs			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To what extent and how has UNICEF improved coordination to achieve the planned results for child protection?</li> </ul>	Doc Review, KIIs	KIIs	KIIs	KIIs	FDGs		

Evaluation Themes & KEQs	Target Stakeholder Groups & Sources/Methods of Data Collection						
	UNICEF CPS	Development Partners	Implementing Partners Government Agencies	NGO Service Providers	Front-line Practitioners	Community Leaders	Community Members
<b>Gender equality and human rights-based approach</b>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How successfully has the CP Programme integrated UNICEF's commitment to gender equality and human-rights and disability inclusion throughout the Programme cycle?</li> </ul>	Doc Review, KIIs	KIIs	KIIs	KIIs	FDGs		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To what extent did children from marginalized communities, children with disabilities, girls and other disadvantaged groups benefit from the child protection programme?</li> </ul>	Doc Review, KIIs		KIIs	KIIs	FDGs	FDGs	
<b>Sustainability: (Will the benefits last?)</b>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To what extent do sustainability and scalability have the potential to be achieved? To what extent are formal systems linking with community based and customary practices?</li> </ul>	KIIs	KIIs	KIIs	KIIs	FDGs	FDGs	
<b>Definitions and Abbreviations used:</b> "Beneficiaries" refer to the individuals, groups, or organisations, whether targeted or not, that benefit directly or indirectly, from the UNICEF Pacific CP Programme.				<sup>1</sup> To be explored with the UNICEF Vanuatu Country Team to gain a better understanding of the nature of the intervention and whether this will be a valid and useful question area to explore.  FDGs = Focussed Discussion Groups KIIs = Key Informant Interviews			

## Toli: Data collection

Proposed data sources are summarised in Table 2 and elaborated upon below. In considering the potential data sources, we have reflected on a review of the four country work plans from 2018 to 2023 and other key documentation, initial engagements with country teams to better understand the work plans, and our past experience in conducting evaluation and other research activities remotely.

**Table 2: Summary of data collection methods and targets**

Stakeholder Group	Kiribati	Solomon Islands	Vanuatu	Samoa	Regional
<b>1. Research methods not requiring ethics</b>					
• Documentation review	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
• Programme documentation	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
• Administrative data/Country doc's <sup>a</sup>	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
• Review of M&E data <sup>a</sup>	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
<b>2. Primary data collection methods requiring ethics approval</b>					
Key informant (individual or small group) interviews (KIIs) with:					
• UNICEF	1	1	1	1	3
• Development Partners/CP Stakeholders					8
• Government Agencies	6	6	5	8	
• NGO Service Providers	2	2	2	1	
• National Committees/Independent monitoring agencies	1	2	2	2	
<b>Sub-total KIIs</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>11</b>
Focused discussion groups with:					
• Frontline practitioners	2	2	1+1 <sup>b</sup>	2	
• Community leaders, counsellors, Youth leaders, etc.		1	1 <sup>b</sup>	1	
• Judicial officers/Police	1				
• Community members			1 <sup>b</sup>		
<b>Sub-total Focused discussion groups</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	

<sup>a</sup> To the extent that this data and information is both available and is reliable.

<sup>b</sup> To be conducted in Tafea Province (outer island) – see **Sub-national consultation in Vanuatu** below. These could be KII or FGD, based on numbers of available Child Protection Officers.

This phase covers a range of sources of documentation and administrative data, the latter to the extent available. They include:

### **Desk review of Programme documentation**

A review of UNICEF CPP documents, including those relating to the design, implementation and monitoring, was commenced in the inception phase (see range of documents listed in **Annex F**). The purpose of this review is to better understand the Programme design, and the nature and extent of implementation; draw initial reflections from routine and ad hoc monitoring; and to investigate the GEDSI considerations throughout the Programme cycle (planning, design, implementation, and dissemination).

### **Desk review of Programme documentation for context section of report**

A desk review to complete the context of key social, political, economic, demographic, and institutional factors that have a direct bearing on the Child Protection in the Pacific.

- Relevance to **partner government's strategies and priorities**, international, regional or country development goals, strategies and frameworks
- Relevance to **UNICEF's corporate goals and priorities**, as appropriate (e.g. in terms of size, influence, or positioning)
- Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the **status and needs of the target groups** for the intervention
- An **equity analysis** of structural marginalisation, and social and cultural patterns, affecting groups targeted by the evaluation object; and a discussion of gender, power and human rights considerations in the design of the object
- Explanation of **how the context relates** to the implementation of the Child Protection Programme.

### **Desk review of administrative data and country documentation**

A review of available administrative data will help inform our context analysis which is directly relevant to assessment of achievements against outcomes and influencing factors, as well as the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence, sustainability and impact of the Programme. Country documentation may include national policy documents, as well as any broader child protection evaluations, reports and project documentation from international and national implementing partners and associates.

We note that a key assumption in some versions of the ToC was that there would be media dissemination of information about child development and protection issues. While we considered adding a media scan to determine the extent to which this has occurred, we have at this stage decided not to include this element, in the interests of containing budget. This is a potential area for ongoing monitoring of the impact of the CPP, as an indicator of public awareness of the issues at stake.

## **Review of current monitoring and evaluation data**

We note that an evaluability assessment<sup>4</sup> of the UNICEF Pacific CPP conducted in 2023 found that there are limited, reliable information sources from which to draw for monitoring and evaluation for Outputs 2 and 3, and proposed tools for the CP Section to use to gather evidence about the Programme's outcomes. The UNICEF Pacific CP team refined the proposed tools, and piloted and administered two surveys in 2023 with social workers, child protection working group members and policy makers.

We also note that there were proposals to undertake pre- and post-training surveys of participants of various capacity-building programmes, but it is not clear whether this has been done. We may be able to source and review some of this data, if it's available, along with other UNICEF monitoring data that exists, when we conduct interviews with relevant key informants.

We have reviewed the tools that have been piloted, refined and applied, and the response data captured. As a result of our review, we have concluded that little can be used as a "base-line" or for any comparisons.

Following discussions with UNICEF Pacific on proposals to re-survey groups of social workers and key government officials to capture some quantitative information using revised tool(s), it was determined that the proposed surveys would not be undertaken. Hence, the data collection in this evaluation will rely on qualitative information from key informant interviews and focused discussion groups, and the review of documentation that is available.

### **Key informant semi-structured interviews (KIIs)**

Interviews will be conducted either remotely or in-person, by either our lead evaluators or by our local in-country evaluation team members. Both lead evaluators and our local in-country evaluation team members may jointly participate in some key interviews.

One of our lead evaluators (Ingrid van Aalst or Iain Matheson) will visit Vanuatu and the Solomon Islands to conduct face-to-face KIIs with targeted key stakeholders. They will be assisted by our in-country local evaluation team members, who will also be responsible for conducting some interviews and running focus/discussion groups with key target groups.

Our lead evaluators will also conduct KIIs remotely with key stakeholders in countries they do not visit, and with regional Programme stakeholders and UNICEF CP Programme staff. Remote interviews may also be conducted with stakeholders who were not available to meet with the lead evaluators when in-country. Local in-country evaluators will conduct the balance of interviews in countries not visited by lead evaluators.

Key informants will be selected for interviews using purposive sampling based on participants' responsibilities related to the Programme and based on information supplied about key stakeholders by UNICEF Pacific staff. They will include the following target groups:

---

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.unicef.org/evaluation/reports#/detail/19206/evaluability-assessment-of-unicef-pacific-child-protection-programme>

- UNICEF Programme staff in Fiji (Pacific Multi-country office), Kiribati, Samoa, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu, and may include former staff who played a leading role in the design and initial implementation
- Senior managers/officials responsible for CP in the lead Government ministries within the target countries (Kiribati, Samoa, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu)
- Chairpersons/key members of any national coordinating committees or similar, with a focus on national CP systems and processes
- any independent body (such as an Ombudsman) that monitors a government's performance in protecting the rights of children
- Senior members of associated Ministries/government agencies with CP-related mandates (eg, Justice, Health, Police, Education)
- CP Programme implementation partners in the target countries
- Community agencies benefiting from CP interventions
- UNICEF Programme development partners and CP stakeholders including the Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT), UNFPA, UN Women, Save the Children Fund, ChildFund Alliance members,<sup>5</sup> and Pacific Council of Churches.

The aim of the interviews will be to capture a breadth of stakeholder perceptions of the Programme across the KEQs represented in the Evaluation Framework. Participant information sheet and consent forms are attached in **Annex A** and draft semi-structured topic guides are attached in **Annex B**.

Not all KII target groups are present in all countries; the specific organisations/targets to be interviewed will depend on the activities of the CPP in respective countries. This will involve/require further conversations with key UNICEF Pacific staff. We will aim to interview approximately 10-12 respondents in each target country plus undertake around nine KIIs with regional Programme development partners/roles. Some interviews may also include two-three informants, for example if there are two-three different roles in a ministry/agency with a perspective on the UNICEF CPP. **Annex C** lists the key informant agencies we have provisionally identified for interviews.

Key roles and responsibilities of UNICEF Pacific and PS Services for the recruitment of the key informants for the KIIs along with the focus group discussions can be found in **Annex D**.

At the start of the interview, the interviewer will explain the purpose and value of the evaluation and ask the participant if they have any questions or concerns regarding it. The interviewer will then ask the participant if they (a) consent to participate in the interview, and (b) consent for the interview to be recorded. The purpose of the recording will be to assist the interviewer with any notes taken and will not be made available to anyone outside the evaluation team. For in-person interviews, the interviewer will ask the participant to sign a form; for remote (on-line) interviews, the interviewer will record consent being provided verbally. Once consent is given, the interview will commence.

The consent form is based on a previous UNICEF consent form that was provided, which had been pre-tested and ethical approval granted. However, like the semi-structured topic guides for the KIIs and the focus group discussions, these are being reviewed by our Pacific Evaluation Team members to ensure that

---

<sup>5</sup> ChildFund Australia operates in Vanuatu; ChildFund New Zealand operates in Kiribati and Solomon Islands.

they will work in the context they are applied. Our Evaluation Team has also been fully briefed on both the data collection tools and the consent forms to enable them to use these in a way that is both culturally and contextually appropriate and elicit the information we need to the key evaluation questions.

Given that the KIIs are semi-structured interviews across four countries with several different key informants, as is good practice, we are building in touch points during the data collection phase to collectively come together to review the data collection tools to ensure we are collecting the information we need to address the key evaluation questions and to identify any opportunities for strengthening.

### **Focussed discussion groups**

Three to four focussed discussion groups will be conducted in each target country by local in-country evaluators, who can converse in the local language and use culturally appropriate frameworks, such as Tok Story in the Solomon Islands. Where scheduling allows, lead evaluators will observe these when undertaking in-country visits.

The focussed discussion groups will be held with the following target groups who have received UNICEF-sponsored training or Programme interventions in relation to CP within the past 12-18 months:

- front-line practitioners (typically social workers or child protection officers, but may include other practitioners such as community counsellors, police, school principals/teachers, health workers, and judiciary)
- community leaders (churches, community elders, youth, facilitators) in geographical areas close to main centres (but see proposed **sub-national consultation in Vanuatu** below)
- community members who have been involved in an activity or intervention in the Tafea Province, Vanuatu.

The 12–18-month time limitation is to ensure that participants are more likely to have a useful recall of the Programme interventions and had time to consider what impacts the interventions have had on their knowledge and behaviours in relation to CP issues. However, some flexibility will be allowed if this is necessary to achieve the desired numbers and coverage of participants.

Not all target groups could be captured in every target country. The information provided to us indicates that different targeted activities occurred in each country, within the target timeframe. Where specific voices are not heard directly, we will seek indirect feedback via KIIs and other stakeholder groups.

The aim of the focussed discussion groups will be to capture a broad view of participant perceptions of the respective Programme interventions, and the extent to which they were relevant and meaningful, and have had an impact on participants' awareness, knowledge and/or behaviours when it comes to tackling CP issues and the situations in which these may arise. Views will also be sought on whether the respective interventions can be made more effective. Participant information sheet and consent forms are attached in **Annex A** and semi-structured discussion group topic guides are included in **Annex B**.

Participants will be selected using a convenience sample at sites selected in conjunction with UNICEF Pacific and/or its implementing partners, based on records of attendance of respective activities. We will aim to achieve six-eight participants per group, of mixed genders, and different levels of experience (among practitioners).

Qualitative information will be captured in the focus group discussions.

The locations of the discussion groups are suggested in Table 2 and will be discussed further with the UNICEF Pacific EMT.

Recruitment of participant front-line practitioners, community leaders and community members, and the proposed respective roles and responsibilities for these processes and making arrangements for the focussed discussion groups are detailed in **Annex D**. Essentially, we will be reliant on local UNICEF in-country programme managers to identify the participants, seek approval for their attendance and make arrangements for the focussed discussion groups, in liaison with the local evaluators who will facilitate the discussion groups. We shall budget for any venue and catering costs, and the provision of gifts to non-professional participants (eg, community members and leaders). Examples of such gifts may include an appropriate cash reimbursement to contribute to any transport costs, an appropriate gift voucher to thank them for their time, or a donation to the community group.

We note that for Kiribati, interviews with remote participants will be conducted by telephone, instead of a discussion group, after emailing a set of high-level question areas due to issues around connectivity and access.

At the discussion group, the local evaluator will:

- re-state the purpose of the discussion groups, covering the information that had been provided in the participant information sheet (**Annex A**)
- ask participants if they have any questions regarding the group discussion and address these
- ask if each participant (a) consents to participate in the group discussion, and (b) consents to the discussion to be recorded (if the facilitator wishes to adopt this approach). The consent form will then be completed by the participants.

Once consents have been achieved and recorded, the discussion group will start.

### **Sub-national consultation in Vanuatu**

UNICEF Vanuatu strongly supported the need for KIIs and/or discussion groups to include sub-national consultations. There is comparatively far more access to child protection and wider police and justice services in and around Port Vila. However, beyond the main centre, the complexity of issues is magnified by geography, accessibility and the limited availability of CP services. This will probably also be true of the other three countries, and all four countries (to a greater or lesser extent) also probably share the constant challenges around connectivity, service delivery and coordination.

We propose that in Vanuatu, we collect data from stakeholder groups based both in and around the main centre (Port Vila) and also a more remote, outer province – UNICEF Vanuatu identified Sanma, Tafea or Torba Provinces as being more remote areas in which there has good levels of CPP activities.

Other reasons to support data collection directly in a more remote Vanuatu province are consideration of the impact of frequent natural disasters on a fragile/weak CP system, which potentially could draw some valuable insights around the development-humanitarian nexus that could be applied to other Pacific

countries. It would also be an opportunity to directly engage with community members and receive their input, and use this as a case study for UNICEF to extrapolate to activities in other remote Pacific areas.<sup>6</sup>

Therefore, our Vanuatu Evaluation Team member (Elizabeth Faerua) will travel to Tanna, in the Tafea Province, for two days. (Tafea appears to have daily flight schedules, so time in the area is not excessive due to less regular flight schedules.) This would allow her to connect with all those groups of stakeholders that have been involved in UNICEF's CP interventions including child protection officers, community leaders, local police, and community members, either in KIIs or in discussion groups.

We acknowledge that travel to outer islands in target countries was not costed in our revised budget submitted to UNICEF at the end of 2023 (it was removed from our original proposal). As such this would require an additional level of investment, which has now been factored into our revised budget estimate (provided separately).

## Tui: Data analysis and interpretation

Our analysis, synthesis and integration of data from multiple sources is a collective process that will identify themes, patterns, similarities and variations in the data, and focussing on responding to the overall KEQs, identifying and verifying how well the CP Programme is meeting its key goals and outcomes, and where improvements can be made for the future.

The qualitative data will be provided as detailed notes (not full transcripts) from interviews and focussed discussion groups by our interviewers. These notes will be augmented from recordings (where consent to record is given) to assure accuracy and that key illuminating comments are captured. Interview notes will be stored by the evaluation team in a secured folder. At the completion of the evaluation, the local evaluators will be required to delete all data from their storage devices and computers.

Qualitative interview data will be thematically analysed using Microsoft Excel.

Data will be disaggregated as appropriate, but not to a level where it is possible for individual respondents to be identified. Data, including any quotations, will be presented in the final report in an anonymous manner, referring only to the category of respondent (eg, government official, community leader, social worker, caregiver, etc). The Evaluation Team will retain copies of the interview notes in a secure folder for five years, in accordance with ethics standards.

Once data collection is complete, we will focus on data analysis and synthesis. Our evaluation team will analyse the interview and secondary qualitative data using a framework analysis drawing on the KEQs, to identify key themes arising.

We will corroborate data across all sources to generate findings and recommendations.

As our data collection proceeds, we will present initial thoughts and preliminary findings to the EMT, to keep UNICEF informed of progress.

---

<sup>6</sup> Based on our engagement with country teams, the only other useful opportunity that exists to reach out to community members existed in Guadalcanal. This was excluded because of difficult logistical challenges (confirmed by UNICEF's Solomon Islands CP Team), the upcoming Solomon Island election, as well as timeframe and budget reasons.

The findings and recommendations will be initially developed by the evaluation team, with collaborative workshops used to validate the team's (1) preliminary findings; and (2) revised findings and draft recommendations.

A sense-making workshop will be held with the local evaluators and UNICEF EMT. This will serve as a means of testing and challenging our preliminary and revised findings, to be fed back into the analysis. This workshop will be held with the UNICEF EMT in its Fiji office, but local evaluators will attend online.

At this stage, UNICEF will assume responsibility for disseminating any country-specific reports and findings to the interested key stakeholders in each country, couched in a context of the broader evaluation findings.

## Ethics

The evaluation will be consistent with the UNEG norms and standards, the [UNEG Ethical Guidelines](#), the [UNEG Code of Conduct](#), the [Global Evaluation Reports Oversight System \(GEROS\)](#), the [UNICEF UNEG Quality Checklist for ToR and inception reports](#), the [Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations](#), the [UNICEF Report Standards Checklist for evaluation reports](#), the [UNICEF procedures for ethical research involving children](#), the [UNICEF Procedure on Ethical Standards in Research, Evaluation and Data Collection and Analysis](#), and will ensure:

- *Respect for rights of individuals and institutions:* The evaluator will accord informants the opportunity to participate voluntarily while maintaining their anonymity, and to make an independent decision to participate without pressure or fear of penalty (informed consent/assent). Also, interviewers will assure respondents that information would be confidential and that reports would be written such that responses/contributions would not be traced back to them. Interview notes and any recordings will be accessible to the evaluation team members only.
- *Respect for cultural identities and sensitivities:* Variances in ethnicities, culture, religious beliefs, gender, disability, and age will be respected.
- *Professional responsibilities and obligations of evaluators:* The evaluator will exercise independent judgement and operate in an impartial and unbiased manner. During data collection, any sensitive issues and concerns will be addressed through the appropriate mechanisms and referral pathways. We intend to have a briefing with the local UNICEF Country Team (or the appropriate person/people in country) who will be able to guide us on what the mechanisms and referral pathways are in each country prior to the start of the data collection with community leaders and/or the community.

Children, vulnerable groups or marginalised groups will not be part of the data-gathering efforts.

The Evaluator will undertake the Evaluation according to the following values:

- *Independence:* The evaluator is completely independent, and has had no prior engagement in the design, implementation or supervision of the CP Programme.
- *Impartiality:* The evaluator is committed to providing a comprehensive and balanced assessment of the Programme's strengths and weaknesses. The evaluation process will be unbiased at all stages, and take into account and fairly consider all views and opinions received from stakeholders – such stakeholder views are considered primary evidence in the process of forming the external assessment of the Programme.

- *Transparency*: The evaluator will communicate as openly as possible the purpose of the evaluation, the criteria that will be applied and the expected use of the results. This evaluation report will provide transparent information on its sources, methods and approaches.
- *Disclosure*: The evaluation report will serve as a mechanism by which the findings and lessons identified will be disseminated to management and Programme staff in the regional and Pacific UNICEF office, as well as to external stakeholders such as the DFAT donor, etc.
- *Credibility*: The evaluation will be based on data and observations that will be demonstrably reliable and trustworthy with respect to the quality of the instruments, procedures and analyses used to collect and interpret the information gathered.
- *Usefulness*: The evaluator will strive to be as well informed as possible, and ensure the evaluation report is as relevant, timely and as concise as possible. The evaluation will draw on the principles and values of Utilization Focused Evaluation (UFE) approaches that put client needs at the centre of the evaluation and understands the evaluation process as a whole as a learning exercise for the client, where the utility of the final product determines all steps taken through the evaluation process.
- *Conflicts of interest*: The evaluator has no conflict of interests, as reflected in comments with regards to Independence above with our role as evaluator of the UNICEF Child Protection Programme.

The evaluation will always maintain strict confidentiality among participants, and all data will be anonymised, password-protected and encoded. While the evaluation findings will be owned by UNICEF Pacific and they will have authority over any public dissemination/publication following the conclusion of the evaluation, UNICEF Pacific will not have access to notes or recordings of interviews.

## Risks and mitigation

Key risks associated with this evaluation, and proposed mitigations, are outlined in **Annex E**.

## 5. Work Plan

The major outputs for this evaluation include:

- Inception report
- PowerPoint presentation of qualitative data collection results
- Draft evaluation report
- Comments matrix of issues addressed
- Final evaluation report (maximum 45 pages/30,000 words, excluding executive summary and annexes), prepared according to the UNICEF-Adapted UNEG Evaluation Reports Standards, and UNICEF standards for evaluation reports as per Geros guidelines.

Our adjusted Price and Technical Alignment Proposal set out a work plan with key milestone dates. We note that this has already been compromised, with the late finalisation of the contract and delays in

getting the required information regarding the design and implementation of the Programme in order to complete the desk review and Inception Report. Our revised work plan and milestone dates is as follows:

Activity/Phase	Deliverables	Complete by
<p><b>Contract signed</b></p> <p><b>Phase One: Teu</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk review of relevant documents &amp; administrative data.</li> <li>• Draft inception report, covering desk review findings, methods, evaluation matrix, workplan, data collection instruments.</li> <li>• Finalise inception report with all comments from the ERG cleared, and ethical clearance received.</li> <li>• Submit for ethical approval.</li> </ul>	<p>Final Inception Report</p> <p>Ethical approval letter for the evaluation from an accredited ethics review board</p>	<p>Early Dec 2023</p> <p>Mid-Late Jan 2024</p> <p>Early Feb 2024</p> <p>End Feb 2024</p>
<p><b>Phase Two: Toli</b></p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Logistical arrangements for qualitative field work, with support of UNICEF.</li> <li>• Conduct qualitative field work.</li> <li>• Present high level qualitative data collection results.</li> </ul>	<p>PowerPoint presentation of data collection results</p>	<p>Mid Mar 2024</p> <p>End Apr 2024</p> <p>Early May 2024</p>
<p><b>Phase Three: Tui</b></p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Processing and analysis of the collected data, drafting of interim report.</li> <li>• Sense-making workshop with local researchers (on-line), UNICEF EMT (in person)</li> <li>• Review and respond to comments by local researchers, EMT on the first draft report, and produce second draft.</li> </ul>	<p>First draft evaluation report</p> <p>Second draft evaluation report</p>	<p>End May 2024</p> <p>Early Jun 2024</p> <p>Mid Jun 2024</p>
<p><b>Phase Four: Luva and Malie</b></p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document all comments raised and how they have been addressed in a comments matrix.</li> <li>• Review and respond to comments by ERG and UNICEF Rep until clearance of all pending comments.</li> </ul>	<p>Comments matrix of issues addressed</p>	<p>End Jun 2024</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review and respond to comments by the</li> </ul>	<p>Third draft evaluation report</p>	<p>End Jun 2024</p>

Activity/Phase	Deliverables	Complete by
<p>ERG on the second draft report, and produce a third draft report.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submit final report conforming to UNICEF Evaluation Reports Standards and the GEROS Quality Assessment System.</li> </ul>	Final evaluation report	End Jul 2024

Our preliminary discussions with UNICEF indicated its preference/requirement for an initial draft report by the end of May 2024. As noted above, we are still aiming to achieve this, although it may not be as “polished” or “complete” as we might otherwise have preferred and will require that each party does its part in a timely fashion from this point on.

# Annexes to Inception Report

## Annex A: Information sheet, consent forms

### Information Sheet

Date: [date month] 2024

### Evaluation of the UNICEF Pacific Child Protection Programme

<b>Principal Evaluators:</b>	Ingrid van Aalst and Dr. Iain Matheson	PS... Services
<b>Local Evaluators:</b>	Margaret Sapolu Lamositele-Sio	Samoa
	Ruth Mataela	Solomon Islands
[Update relevant to country]	Tokintekai Bakineti	Kiribati
	Lisa Faerua	Vanuatu

#### [Insert appropriate Pacific Greeting]

You are invited to take part in this evaluation that explores how effective the UNICEF Pacific Child Protection Programme has been, and to how to strengthen the Programme to enhance child protection in the Pacific.

#### What is the background of the evaluation?

Rates of violence against children in the Pacific are very high. UNICEF Pacific set up a program in 2018 to protect children in 14 Pacific Island Countries and Territories from violence, abuse, neglect, and exploitation by 2027.

#### What is the objective of this evaluation?

The evaluation of the UNICEF Child Protection Programme aims to see what's working and how, to make decisions that improve activities and achieve goals, helping UNICEF learn and be accountable to partners.

#### How was I identified and why am I being invited to participate in this evaluation?

You were selected to participate in this evaluation because you have either a key role in your organisation working with UNICEF, you are a child protection front-line worker, or you have a key role in your community or as a caregiver.

#### What will happen in this evaluation?

Participation in this evaluation will involve participating in either a one-on-one interview or a group discussion, where you will be asked to talk about your experience of working with UNICEF's Child Protection Programme interventions, what is working well and what could be improved, and how the Programme can better meet the challenges to strengthening child protection in the Pacific.

Individual interviews will take around 45-60 minutes. Group discussions may take a little longer, say around 90 minutes. We will ask for and confirm your consent to participate in the interview or discussion. These may also be recorded, if you consent to that. These recordings will only be used by members of our evaluation team to confirm that they have accurately captured your views. They will not be listened to by anyone outside the evaluation team.

Anything you say will be anonymous in any reporting we do.

### **Are there any risks to me?**

There are no risks involved in your participation in this evaluation. Your name will not be associated with what you have to say in the interview/discussion, and the data will only be available to the Evaluation Team.

### **How will my privacy be protected?**

The data collected for this evaluation will be kept secure. In any report we publish, we will not include information that would make it possible to identify you in any way. Records will be held only by the evaluators and will not be available to anyone else in your organisation or community, or to UNICEF.

### **Can I decline to participate, or withdraw?**

Yes. You are free to withdraw from the interview at any time without obligation or penalty – we respect your right to do so. You can ask us to withdraw any information you give us up until the time that the final report is written. The information gathered will be destroyed after five years. Information on individuals who decline to be interviewed, or withdraw from the process, will not be shared or provided to anyone.

### **What are the benefits of participating in the evaluation?**

You may benefit from participating in this evaluation through having an increased awareness of the drivers of child protection issues and the challenges in addressing these. Your views will contribute to a better understanding of how UNICEF can better support governments and communities to protect and prevent harm to children.

### **What opportunity do I have to consider this invitation?**

If you are willing to participate in this evaluation, please indicate this to me within a week of receiving the invitation. We will also follow-up with a gentle reminder. Declining to participate will not affect your relationship with UNICEF or your employer. There is no compensation or other monetary inducement for your participation.

### **Can I receive a copy of the final evaluation report?**

Yes, you can. The consent form will ask you to provide your contact details if you wish to receive a copy of final evaluation report. UNICEF has also indicated that a copy of the final evaluation report will be sent to the head of each agency that participates in the evaluation as well. UNICEF will also upload the report on the UNICEF's Evidence Platform and publish it on their website:

<https://www.unicef.org/evaluation/reports#/>

### What do I do if I have any concerns or questions about this evaluation?

If you have any questions about the evaluation, and/or any concerns regarding any aspect of it, please contact one of the Principal Evaluators (Ingrid or Iain). You can also reach out to one of the UNICEF contacts (Michael or Ali) who have commissioned the evaluation and are closely working with Ingrid and Iain on it:

Who	Email	Mobile
Ingrid van Aalst	<a href="mailto:ps.services@xtra.co.nz">ps.services@xtra.co.nz</a>	+64 21 169 5043
Dr. Iain Matheson	<a href="mailto:iain@betteroutcomes.org.nz">iain@betteroutcomes.org.nz</a>	+64 27 407 0722
Michael Copland Chief Child Protection UNICEF Pacific Multi-Country Office	<a href="mailto:mcopland@unicef.org">mcopland@unicef.org</a>	+ 679 9925438
Ali Safarnejad Multi-country Evaluation Specialist, UNICEF	<a href="mailto:asafarnejad@unicef.org">asafarnejad@unicef.org</a>	+ 1 202 439 6921 (WhatsApp)

Consent Form

Date: [Month] 2024

**Evaluation of the UNICEF Pacific Child Protection Programme**

Declaration by the participant

- I understand I am being asked to provide consent to participate in this evaluation.
- I have read the Participant Information Sheet, or someone has explained it to me in a language that I understand.
- I understand the purposes, key tasks, and risks of the evaluation.
- **[Strike out if not applicable or if not agreed]** I understand that the Evaluation Team Interviewer may record the interview/discussion in order to confirm that they have accurately captured my views, and I agree to be recorded for this purpose.
- I provide my consent for the information collected to be used for the purpose of this evaluation only.
- I have had an opportunity to ask questions and I am satisfied with the answers I have received.
- I freely agree to participate in this evaluation as described and understand that I am free to withdraw at any time during the evaluation and withdrawal will not affect my relationship with any of the named organisations and/or evaluation team members.
- **[Strike out if not applicable]** I would like to receive a copy of the evaluation results via email, I have provided my details below and ask that they be used for this purpose only.

Participant’s Name (printed):

Organisation:

Signature:

Date:

Contact email:

(if they would like to receive a copy of the evaluation results)

## Annex B: Semi structured interview guides

### Informed consent briefing

**Interviewee Name(s), Position and Organisation:**

**Interviewer:**

**Date:**

We have been engaged to conduct an evaluation of the CPP. The evaluation will focus on assessing progress against the CPP's objectives and outcomes to date, and identifying learnings on what has and hasn't worked well. The findings will be used by UNICEF's Pacific Child Protection Team to strengthen the Programme's approach and interventions. Findings and recommendations will be published in a public report by UNICEF.

This interview will take around 45 minutes to an hour. The information you gift us will be kept confidential and will not be directly attributable to you.

Your participation in this interview and the evaluation is entirely voluntary. You may refuse to answer any question you do not wish to answer, and you may withdraw from the interview at any time. If you withdraw, you can also choose to withdraw any information you have provided to us at any stage of the evaluation prior to publication of the final report.

**Do you consent to proceed with the interview?**

We would also like to be able to record the interview to ensure we capture what you say accurately. Only the Evaluation Team will have access to these recordings and the interview notes. The recordings will be deleted once we have completed the evaluation.

**Do you consent to this interview being recorded?**

[Complete Consent form (see **Annex A**) if in-person interview; record consent for remote interview]

## Questions for UNICEF Programme Staff

Including Chief Child Protection Officer; Country Programme Managers/Team (past and present that have been/are responsible for design, implementation, and management of PCCP) for target countries: Kiribati, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu and Samoa.

<b>Introduction</b>
How long have you been in the Country Programme Managers role/involved in the UNICEF CP Programme?  Which aspects of the UNICEF Child Protection Programme are you primarily responsible for?  <i>Note: Tailor references to the UNICEF CP Programme to those the subject is familiar with.</i>
<b>Relevance</b>
Over the past 5 or so years [ <i>or period that subject is familiar with</i> ], how have you ensured that the UNICEF CP Programme interventions and support have been relevant to, and consistent with [the target country's] Government child protection strategies and priorities?  How have you ensured they addressed or supported the issues and needs the [ <i>country's</i> ] Government has identified as priorities for attention?  <b>Probes:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• What approaches have worked well? Not so well? Why is that? Provide examples</li><li>• Have your government's child protection priorities changed over the last five years? If yes, what has led to that change? Has the CP adapted to these changes?</li></ul>
Do you believe the UNICEF CP Programme interventions and support are currently relevant to, and consistent with the [ <i>country's</i> ] Government's current child protection strategies and priorities now, and moving forward?  <b>Probes:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• If not, or there are gaps, where and how can the UNICEF CP Programme interventions and support be improved, in terms of relevance to and consistency with Government priorities? What needs to change?</li></ul>
Who have been the key beneficiaries of the Programme interventions and strategies in your (country)?  <i>[Note: "Beneficiaries" refer to the individuals, groups, or organisations, whether targeted or not, that benefit directly or indirectly, from the UNICEF Pacific CP Programme.]</i>  How well do the Programme interventions and strategies link to those beneficiaries' needs?  How do you ensure this happens?

**Probes:**

- If not well, or there are gaps, why is this?
- What could the UNICEF Programme do better to link to those beneficiaries' needs?

To what extent are the **ways** that the UNICEF Pacific CP Programme works, are relevant to and are appropriate for the country context?

If yes, how has UNICEF ensured this? What has worked well to achieve this?

If not, why not, what are the gaps, what could be improved?

**For example:**

- How well aligned is it to the country's political, social and cultural context?
- Does it recognise the country's child protection strengths and well as your challenges?
- How well are the cultural practices in the country understood, and those relating to children in particular?
- Does the UNICEF Pacific CP Programme value Pacific or country-specific knowledge and ways of working? Does it work in ways that are culturally appropriate?
- Does it account for the availability an engagement with non-government and community organisations as partners?
- To what extent does it understand the capacity of government's organisation to engage on child protection activities?

What other agencies are delivering programmes that tackle child protection issues in [*country*]? Eg, other UN agencies, development partners, other UNICEF programmes.

To what extent is there any overlap, duplication, or competition for resources (including funding, capacity, attention) among these? Or do they operate effectively in complementary fashion?

***Effectiveness***

Over the past 5 years or so, to what extent do you believe that children have been increasingly protected in [*the country*] from violence and abuse?

Why do you say this? What has changed for the better?

**Probes:**

- *Ask for each output area the subject is familiar with* (1) strengthened institutional frameworks; (2) increased capacities of government and other service providers; (3) increased awareness, knowledge and skills among caregivers, families and communities
- Do you have specific evidence or data to support this? If yes, can you share it with us?
- Has progress been better or less than expected? Why is that?

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where progress has not been as good as expected, what do you think the reasons for this are? (probe for both internal/external factors that have impacted on progress)</li> </ul> <p>Would this have been achieved without UNICEF’s CP Programme support?</p> <p>What else/more/different could the UNICEF CP Programme offer to help bring about desired change?</p>
<p><b>Efficiency</b></p>
<p>How has UNICEF Pacific supported or delivered interventions and support under each of the CP Programme areas?</p> <p><i>For example, through use of UNICEF programme managers/staff, UNICEF funded international or local consultants/contractors, UNICEF funding for positions within your organisation, engagement of locally based non-government/community providers to design/deliver activities, etc.</i></p> <p>Are these relationships/engagements/partnerships with other partners working effectively and efficiently? Why or why not?</p>
<p>Has the work of UNICEF Pacific <b>improved coordination throughout the child protection system</b> in [the country], across the various stakeholder and interest groups and agencies?</p> <p><i>If yes, how has this improved? Has this contributed to positive results for child protection? How did UNICEF go about improving coordination?</i></p> <p><i>If no/not much, is this a role for the UNICEF CP Programme? If so, what more/different could UNICEF do in this regard to support this?</i></p>
<p><b>Gender equality and human rights-based approach</b></p>
<p>How successfully does the UNICEF CP Programme integrate and address the principles of gender equality, human rights and disability inclusion throughout its programme of interventions and support activities?</p> <p><b>Probes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are these principles actively and explicitly considered, discussed, and referred to in technical advice or support provided, and interventions that are designed and delivered? Is there a specific focus on them?</li> <li>• To what extent have marginalised groups been involved in the process for identifying needs, developing interventions, and participating in activities?</li> <li>• How would you say children from marginalised communities, children with disabilities, girls and other disadvantaged groups have benefited from the UNICEF CP Programme?</li> <li>• Do you have evidence or data to support this? If so, can you share it with us?</li> <li>• How could UNICEF do better?</li> </ul>
<p><b>Impact</b></p>

What in your view have been the main impacts of the UNICEF CP Programme on children, their families and communities in [country]? What difference has the UNICEF CP Programme made, in protecting children from violence and abuse?

**Probes:**

- Has there been an improvement in the protection of children? In what ways?
- Have there been any negative impacts? What were these?
- Have there been any unexpected impacts – either positive or negative?

**Sustainability**

Overall, do you think the UNICEF CP Programme and its activities, and the ways in which it works is sustainable? Why/why not?

What would make them more sustainable?

**Probes:**

- formal systems linking with community based and customary practices
- CP more fully integrated into government policies or plans
- government funds allocated to CP issues
- local providers taking up the implementation of activities
- UNICEF embedded into a key ministry that focuses on CP issues
- key government and other staff being retained
- CP capability and capacity growing

Are these activities, strategies, and ways of working that can be scaled up and extended in your country? Why/why not? What would it take for that to happen?

**In summary – Key Strengths & Areas for Improvement**

In summary, what would you say is the one thing that UNICEF Pacific and its CP Programme does really well in improving protection for children in [country]?

To what extent do you believe this is occurring in other Pacific countries the UNICEF Pacific CP Programme is working in? Is it transferrable to other countries?

And what would you say is the one key improvement that UNICEF Pacific could make in terms of the design and delivery of the CP Programme, and the support provided in this area?

**Thanks & Close**

Provide contact details if any data/evidence is able to be shared with us, or if participant has any further information they wish to share in relation to the matters talked about.

Remind participants of assurances of confidentiality and protection of data/privacy.

Expectation that UNICEF Pacific will share findings from the evaluation once the report is completed.

## Questions for Senior government officials responsible for CP

*Includes senior government officials of associated government agencies within target countries: Vanuatu, Samoa, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu. Note:*

- 1. For some interviewees, CP will be their primary responsibility, while for others it will be much more marginal*
- 2. Similarly, while some interviewees may have an overview of the entire UNICEF Pacific CP Programme, others will not and potentially some may just be involved in a narrower range of activities. While not all interviewees will be familiar with how UNICEF Pacific groups their activities, they will all fall under one of the following three UNICEF Pacific outputs:*

**Output 1:** *Governments have strengthened child protection institutional frameworks, particularly in target countries*

**Output 2:** *Government and other service providers (non-governmental agencies) have enhanced capacities to provide child protection services that prevent and respond to violence and abuse, particularly in target countries.*

**Output 3:** *Parents, caregivers and teachers have increased knowledge and skills to eliminate harmful practices and better protect children from violence and abuse, particularly in target countries.*

*As such you may need to tailor references to the UNICEF CP Programme to those aspects that the interviewee is familiar with.*

- 3. As well as generally asking interviewees to sometimes expand on aspects of their responses, a lot of specific probes have been included for use if not addressed in the response and any discussion around the main questions. However, not all probes should be used.*
- 4. Where appropriate do ask for some specific examples.*

<b>Introduction</b>
What is your role with the [Name of Government Agency]? How long have you been in the role and agency?
Could you please describe for me what you understand the UNICEF CP Programme to be?
What contact or involvement have you had with the UNICEF Child Protection Programme?
Which of their activities are you most familiar with?
<b>Relevance</b>
Over the past 5 or so years, in your view, how well do the activities align with your government's child protection policies and strategies?
Have they addressed or supported the issues and needs your Government has identified as priorities for attention?

**Probes:**

- If yes, what has UNICEF done to achieve this? What has worked well and why? Can you give me a couple of examples.
- If not, or not always, can you explain why not/give an example(s)?
- Have your government's child protection priorities changed over the last five years? If yes, what has led to that change? Has the CP adapted to these changes?

Are the UNICEF CP Programme interventions and support currently relevant to, and consistent with your Government's current child protection strategies and priorities, and moving forward?

**Probes:**

- *If not*, or there are gaps, where and how can the UNICEF CP Programme and its activities become more relevant?
- What needs to change?

In your country who benefits most from the UNICEF Pacific CP Programme and its activities, and how?

How well do the Programme activities link to those beneficiaries' needs?

What could the UNICEF Programme do better to link to those beneficiaries' needs?

**Probes:**

- Are those who you would have expected to see benefit?
- Are there beneficiaries missing?
- Are there any other individuals, groups, or organisations, whether targeted or not, that benefit directly or indirectly, from the UNICEF Pacific CP Programme?

To what degree are the **ways** that the UNICEF Pacific CP Programme works, relevant to and are appropriate for your country context?

What are the key things that UNICEF done to achieve this?

If not relevant and/or appropriate, what are the gaps? How can these be strengthened?

**Probes:**

- How well aligned is it to your country's political, social and cultural context?
- Does it recognise your country's child protection strengths and well as your challenges?
- How well are the cultural practices in your country understood, and those relating to children in particular?
- Does the UNICEF Pacific CP Programme value Pacific or country-specific knowledge and ways of working? Does it work in ways that are culturally appropriate?

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does it account for the availability an engagement with non-government and community organisations as partners?</li> <li>• To what extent does it understand the capacity of your organisation to engage on child protection activities?</li> </ul>
<p><b>Effectiveness</b></p> <p>Over the past 5 years or so, to what extent do you believe that children have been increasingly protected in [your country] from violence and abuse?</p> <p>In your view how has the UNICEF Pacific CP Programme contributed to this?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Probe for each output the interviewee is familiar with</b></li> </ul> <p>Is this better or worse than you might have expected?</p> <p>Would this have been achieved without UNICEF’s CP Programme support?</p> <p>What else/more/different could UNICEF do to make its activities more effective?</p> <p>As well as your professional judgement, is there any supporting evidence that you can share with us or point us to?</p>
<p><b>Efficiency</b></p> <p><i>UNICEF Pacific delivers its CP Programme using a variety of different partnership modalities e.g. modalities in terms of partnership models, meaning INGOs, NGOs, Government, regional bodies.</i></p> <p>Which of these modalities are you familiar with and to what extent do you think that this/these are the best partnership modalities for the UNICEF Pacific CP Programme in your country? Why is that?</p> <p>What other methods could be used, or done differently? Are the relationships/engagements with the UNICEF Pacific (country) Teams or engagement with non-government/community providers that deliver UNICEF’s CP activities working effectively?</p> <p>Why or why not? How can these be strengthened?</p>
<p>To what extent has UNICEF Pacific contributed to <b>improving child protection coordination</b> in your country across the various stakeholder and interest groups and agencies?</p> <p>How has it improved?</p> <p>How have they done this?</p> <p>If it has not improved, why not, and what can could UNICEF do more of/less of/do differently?</p>

### ***Gender equality and human rights-based approach***

*UNICEF is committed to the principles of gender equality, human rights and disability inclusion throughout its programme of interventions and support activities.*

How would you say children from marginalised communities, children with disabilities, girls and other disadvantaged groups have benefited from the UNICEF CP Programme in your country?

Do you have evidence or data to support this? If so, can you share it with us?

How can they do better?

#### **Probes:**

- Do you know to what extent marginalised groups have been involved in the process for identifying needs, developing interventions, and participating in activities?
- Are these principles actively and explicitly considered, discussed and referred to in technical advice or support provided, and interventions that are designed and delivered? Is there a specific focus on them?

### ***Impact***

What in your view have been the main impacts of the UNICEF CP Programme on children, their families and communities in your country? What difference has the UNICEF CP Programme made, in protecting children from violence and abuse?

#### **Probes:**

- Has there been an improvement in the protection of children? In what ways?
- Have there been any negative impacts? What were these?
- Have there been any unexpected impacts – either positive or negative?

### ***Sustainability***

Overall, do you think the UNICEF CP Programme and its activities, and the ways in which it works is sustainable? Why/why not?

What would make them more sustainable?

#### **Probes:**

- formal systems linking with community based and customary practices
- CP more fully integrated into government policies or plans
- government funds allocated to CP issues
- local providers taking up the implementation of activities
- UNICEF embedded into a key ministry that focuses on CP issues
- key government and other staff being retained
- CP capability and capacity growing

Are these activities, strategies, and ways of working that can be scaled up and extended in your country? Why/why not? What would it take for that to happen?

**In summary - Key Strengths & Areas for Improvement**

In summary, what would you say is the one thing that UNICEF Pacific and its CP Programme does really well in supporting your country in improving protection for children?

And what would you say is the one key improvement that UNICEF Pacific could make in terms of the design and delivery of the CP Programme, and the support provided in this area?

***Thanks & Close***

Provide contact details if any evidence is able to be shared with us, or if participant has any further information they wish to share in relation to the matters talked about.

Remind participants of assurances of confidentiality and protection of data/privacy.

Expectation that UNICEF Pacific will share findings from the evaluation once the report is completed.

## Questions for National Coordinating Committees - Chairs or Members

Within target countries: Vanuatu, Samoa, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu.

<b>Introduction</b>
<p>What is your role with the [Name of National Coordinating Committee]? How long have you been a member?</p> <p>Which aspects of the UNICEF Child Protection Programme are you familiar with?</p> <p><i>Note: Tailor references to the UNICEF CP Programme to those the subject is familiar with.</i></p>
<b>Relevance</b>
<p>Over the past 5 or so years, have the UNICEF CP Programme interventions and support been relevant to, and consistent with your Government's child protection strategies and priorities?</p> <p>Have they addressed or supported the issues and needs your Government has identified as priorities for attention?</p> <p><b>Probes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• If yes, what has UNICEF done to achieve this? What has worked well and why? Can you give me a couple of examples.</li><li>• If not, or not always, can you explain why not/give an example(s)?</li><li>• If relevance has changed, how so? What lead to that change? Has the CP adapted to these changes?</li></ul>
<p>Are the UNICEF CP Programme interventions and support currently relevant to, and consistent with your Government's current child protection strategies and priorities now, and moving forward?</p> <p><b>Probes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• If not, or there are gaps, where and how can the UNICEF CP Programme interventions and support be improved, in terms of relevance to and consistency with Government priorities? What needs to change?</li></ul>
<p>To what degree are the <b>ways</b> that the UNICEF Pacific CP Programme works (its interventions and strategies), relevant to and are appropriate for your country context?</p> <p>What are the key things that UNICEF has done to achieve this?</p> <p>If not relevant and/or appropriate, what are the gaps?</p> <p>How can these be strengthened?</p>

**Probes:**

- How well aligned is it to your country's political, social and cultural context?
- Does it recognise your country's child protection strengths and well as your challenges?
- How well are the cultural practices in your country understood, and those relating to children in particular?
- Does the UNICEF Pacific CP Programme value Pacific or country-specific knowledge and ways of working? Does it work in ways that are culturally appropriate?
- Does it account for the availability an engagement with non-government and community organisations as partners?
- To what extent does it understand the capacity of your organisation to engage on child protection activities?

***Effectiveness***

Over the past 5 years or so, to what extent do you believe that children have been increasingly protected in [your country] from violence and abuse?

*This might be because Government child protection institutional frameworks have been strengthened; Government and other service providers have increased capacities to provide services that prevent child abuse and neglect; and/or that caregivers, families and communities have increased awareness, knowledge and skills to eliminate harmful practices and better protect children from violence and abuse.*

Why do you say this? What has changed for the better?

**Probes:**

- *Ask for each output area the subject is familiar with:* 1) strengthened institutional frameworks; 2) increased capacities of government agencies and service providers; 3) increased awareness, knowledge and skills among caregivers, families and communities
- Do you have specific evidence or data? If yes, can you share it with us?
- Has progress been better or less than expected? Why is that?

*If positive progress made,* to what degree has the UNICEF CP Programme helped to create these positive conditions and changes for the protection of children? Would they have been achieved without UNICEF's CP Programme of support? Why or why not?

*If no/limited change,* what do you think the reasons for this are? (probe for both internal/external factors)

What else/more/different could the UNICEF CP Programme offer to help bring about desired change?

Has the work of UNICEF Pacific **improved coordination throughout the child protection system** in your country, across the various stakeholder and interest groups and agencies?

If yes, how has coordination been improved? Has this contributed to positive results for child protection? How did UNICEF do this?

If no/not much, what more/different could UNICEF do in this regard to support this?

### ***Gender equality and human rights-based approach***

*UNICEF is committed to the principles of gender equality, human rights and disability inclusion throughout its programme of interventions and support activities.*

How would you say children from marginalised communities, children with disabilities, girls and other disadvantaged groups have benefited from the UNICEF CP Programme in your country?

Do you have evidence or data to support this? If so, can you share it with us?

#### **Probes:**

- Do you know to what extent marginalised groups have been involved in the process for identifying needs, developing interventions, and participating in activities?
- Are these principles actively and explicitly considered, discussed and referred to in technical advice or support provided, and interventions that are designed and delivered? Is there a specific focus on them?
- [If applicable] How can they do better?

### **Impact**

What in your view have been the main impacts of the UNICEF CP Programme on children, their families and communities in your country? What difference has the UNICEF CP Programme made, in protecting children from violence and abuse?

#### **Probes:**

- Has there been an improvement in the protection of children? In what ways?
- Have there been any negative impacts? What were these?
- Have there been any unexpected impacts – either positive or negative?

### ***Sustainability***

Overall, do you think the UNICEF CP Programme and its activities, and the ways in which it works is sustainable? Why/why not?

What would make them more sustainable?

#### **Probes:**

- formal systems linking with community based and customary practices
- CP more fully integrated into government policies or plans
- government funds allocated to CP issues
- local providers taking up the implementation of activities

- UNICEF embedded into a key ministry that focuses on CP issues
- key government and other staff being retained
- CP capability and capacity growing

Are these activities, strategies, and ways of working that can be scaled up and extended in your country? Why/why not? What would it take for that to happen?

**In summary – Key Strengths & Areas for Improvement**

Overall, how satisfied are you with the support and technical assistance provided to your country through the UNICEF Pacific CP Programme? Why do you say that?

**Probes:**

- Reasons for being less than satisfied

What would you say is the one thing that UNICEF Pacific and its CP Programme does really well in supporting your country in improving protection for children?

And what would you say is the one key improvement that UNICEF Pacific could make in terms of the design and delivery of the CP Programme, and the support provided in this area?

***Thanks & Close***

Provide contact details if any data/evidence is able to be shared with us, or if participant has any further information they wish to share in relation to the matters talked about.

Remind participants of assurances of confidentiality and protection of data/privacy.

Expectation that UNICEF Pacific will share findings from the evaluation once the report is completed.

## Implementing partners - NGOs and CSOs

Those NGOs and CSOs that have worked with UNICEF to deliver/implement interventions and support services under the CP Programme within target countries: Samoa, Kiribati, Vanuatu, and Solomon Islands.

<b>Introduction</b>
What is your role with the [ <i>Name of NGO/CSO</i> ]? How long have you been in the role and agency?  Which aspects of the UNICEF Child Protection Programme are you familiar with?  What is your role or relationship with UNICEF in regard to its Child Protection Programme?  <i>Note: Tailor references to the UNICEF CP Programme to those the subject is familiar with.</i>
<b>Relevance</b>
Over the past 5 or so years, have the UNICEF CP Programme interventions and support in [ <i>area of familiarity</i> ] been relevant to, and consistent with the priorities and needs for child protection within [ <i>country</i> ]?  <b>Probes:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• If yes, what has UNICEF done to achieve this? What has worked well? Why?</li><li>• If not, or not always, can you explain why not/give an example(s)?</li></ul>
Are the UNICEF CP Programme interventions and support currently relevant to, and consistent with addressing [ <i>country's</i> ] current child protection needs and priorities now, and moving forward?  <b>Probes:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• If not, or there are gaps, where and how can the UNICEF CP Programme interventions and support be improved, in terms of relevance to priorities?</li><li>• What needs to change?</li></ul>
Who have been the key beneficiaries of the UNICEF CP Programme's interventions and strategies?  <i>[Note: "Beneficiaries" refer to the individuals, groups, or organisations, whether targeted or not, that benefit directly or indirectly, from the UNICEF Pacific CP Programme.]</i>  Are those the ones who you would have expected to see benefit?  How well do the Programme interventions and strategies link to those beneficiaries' needs?  <b>Probes:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• If not well, or there are gaps, why is this? What could the UNICEF Programme do better to link to those beneficiaries' needs?</li></ul>

- Are there any beneficiaries missing?
- Are there any other individuals, groups, or organisations, whether targeted or not, that benefit directly or indirectly, from the UNICEF Pacific CP Programme?

To what extent are the **ways** that the UNICEF Pacific CP Programme works, are relevant to and are appropriate for the country context?

If yes, how has UNICEF ensured this? What has worked well to achieve this?

If not, why not, what are the gaps, what could be improved?

For example:

- How well aligned is it to the country's political, social and cultural context?
- Does it recognise the country's child protection strengths and well as your challenges?
- How well are the cultural practices in the country understood, and those relating to children in particular?
- Does the UNICEF Pacific CP Programme value Pacific or country-specific knowledge and ways of working? Does it work in ways that are culturally appropriate?
- Does it account for the availability an engagement with non-government and community organisations as partners?
- To what extent does it understand the capacity of government's organisation to engage on child protection activities?

### ***Effectiveness and Impact***

Over the past 5 years or so, to what extent do you believe that children have been increasingly protected in [your country] from violence and abuse?

This might be because Government child protection institutional frameworks have been strengthened; Government and other service providers have increased capacities to provide services that prevent child abuse and neglect; and/or that caregivers, families and communities have increased awareness, knowledge and skills to eliminate harmful practices and better protect children from violence and abuse.

Why do you say this? What has changed for the better?

#### **Probes:**

- *Ask for each output area the subject is familiar with:* (1) strengthened institutional frameworks; (2) increased capacities of government officials and other service providers; (3) increased awareness, knowledge and skills among caregivers, families and communities
- Do you have specific evidence or data? If yes, can you share it with us?
- Has progress been better or less than expected? Why is that?

*If positive progress made, to what degree do you think the UNICEF CP Programme has helped to create these positive conditions and changes for the protection of children?*

Would they have been achieved without UNICEF's CP Programme of support? Why or why not?

*If no/limited change, what do you think the reasons for this are? (probe for both internal/external factors)*

Have there been any unexpected impacts – either positive or negative?

What else/more/different could the UNICEF CP Programme offer to help bring about desired change?

### **Efficiency**

How has UNICEF Pacific worked with your organisation to support or deliver interventions and support under its CP Programme?

*For example [check/confirm with relevant UNICEF country programme managers], through use of UNICEF programme managers/staff, UNICEF funded international or local consultants/contractors, UNICEF funding for positions within your organisation, engagement of locally based non-government/community providers to design/deliver activities, etc.*

Is this relationship/engagement/partnership working effectively and efficiently? Why or why not?

Do you think this has been the best way to implement the CP programme? Why or why not? If not, what else could be done, or done differently?

To what extent do you think that the work of UNICEF Pacific has improved coordination throughout the child protection system in your country, across the various stakeholder and interest groups and agencies?

*If improved, how has coordination been improved? Has this contributed to positive results for child protection? How did UNICEF do this?*

*If no/not much, what more/different could UNICEF do in this regard to support this?*

### **Gender equality and human rights-based approach**

*UNICEF is committed to the principles of gender equality, human rights and disability inclusion throughout its programme of interventions and support activities.*

How would you say children from marginalised communities, children with disabilities, girls and other disadvantaged groups have benefited from the UNICEF CP Programme in your country?

Do you have evidence or data to support this? If so, can you share it with us?

#### **Probes:**

- Do you know to what extent marginalised groups have been involved in the process for identifying needs, developing interventions, and participating in activities?

- Are these principles actively and explicitly considered, discussed and referred to in technical advice or support provided, and interventions that are designed and delivered? Is there a specific focus on them?

### ***Sustainability***

Overall, do you think the UNICEF CP Programme and its activities, and the ways in which it works is sustainable? Why/why not?

What would make them more sustainable?

#### **Probes:**

- formal systems linking with community based and customary practices
- CP more fully integrated into government policies or plans
- government funds allocated to CP issues
- local providers taking up the implementation of activities
- UNICEF embedded into a key ministry that focuses on CP issues
- key government and other staff being retained
- CP capability and capacity growing

Are these activities, strategies, and ways of working that can be scaled up and extended in your country? Why/why not? What would it take for that to happen?

### **In summary – Key Strengths & Areas for Improvement**

In summary, what would you say is the one thing that UNICEF Pacific and its CP Programme does really well in supporting your country in improving protection for children?

And what would you say is the one key improvement that UNICEF Pacific could make in terms of the design and delivery of the CP Programme, and the support provided in this area?

### ***Thanks & Close***

Provide contact details if any data/evidence is able to be shared with us, or if participant has any further information they wish to share in relation to the matters talked about.

Remind participants of assurances of confidentiality and protection of data/privacy.

Expectation that UNICEF Pacific will share findings from the evaluation once the report is completed.

## Questions for Development partners

Includes international development partners/organisations funding/delivering child protection related services across the Pacific and within target countries: Samoa, Kiribati, Vanuatu, and Solomon Islands.

<b>Introduction</b>
<p>What is your role with the [Name of Partner Agency]? How long have you been in the role and agency?</p> <p>What is the focus of your Agency's efforts and engagement in the Pacific in relation to Child Protection issues?</p> <p>Which aspects of the UNICEF Child Protection Programme are you familiar with?</p> <p><i>Note: Tailor references to the UNICEF CP Programme to those the subject is familiar with.</i></p>
<b>Relevance</b>
<p>Over the past 5 or so years, how well aligned, relevant and consistent have the UNICEF CP Programme interventions and support been to respective Governments' child protection strategies and priorities?</p> <p>How well aligned, relevant and consistent have they been in relation to your Agency's priorities and efforts in this space, across the Pacific?</p> <p><b>Probes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• If aligned, how has this been achieved? What mechanisms are in place to support this? What has worked well?</li><li>• If not, or not always aligned, can you explain why not/give an example(s)?</li></ul>
<p>What about now, and moving forward? Are the UNICEF CP Programme interventions and support currently relevant to, and consistent with your Agency's current child protection strategies and priorities, and those of the Pacific countries you operate in?</p> <p><b>Probes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• If not, or there are gaps, should this be addressed? If so, how? What needs to change?</li></ul>
<p>How well do the UNICEF CP Programme interventions and strategies link to and address the demonstrable needs for improving child protection systems and outcomes across Pacific countries? Are they addressing the right things?</p> <p><b>Probes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Are they relevant to and appropriate for contexts Pacific countries' political, social and cultural context?</li><li>• Does it recognise the country's child protection strengths and well as your challenges?</li></ul>

- How well are the cultural practices in the country understood, and those relating to children in particular?
- Does the UNICEF Pacific CP Programme value Pacific or country-specific knowledge and ways of working? Does it work in ways that are culturally appropriate?
- Does it account for the availability and engagement with non-government and community organisations as partners?
- To what extent does it understand the capacity of government's organisation to engage on child protection activities?

If not well, or there are gaps, what are these? What could the UNICEF Programme do better to link to beneficiaries' needs?

### ***Effectiveness***

From your perspective, over the past 5 years or so, how effective has the UNICEF CP Programme been in helping to create positive conditions and changes for the protection of children across the Pacific?

What have been the main impacts, positive/negative, expected/unexpected?

- Do you have specific evidence or data? If yes, can you share it with us?

Where progress/changes have been less than expected, what do you think the reasons for this are?

#### **Probes:**

- Any internal CP Programme factors to do with design, delivery, management, focus, capacity, etc? (Only ask for DFAT?)
- What external factors have impacted? Could these have been (better) mitigated by UNICEF Pacific?

What else/more/different could the UNICEF CP Programme offer to help bring about desired change?

Has the work of UNICEF Pacific improved coordination in the child protection systems within and across Pacific countries, across the various stakeholder and interest groups and agencies?

If yes, how has coordination been improved? How has UNICEF contributed to this?

If no/not much, is it a role for UNICEF to do this? If so, what more/different could UNICEF do to support this?

Are relationships/engagements/partnerships between UNICEF Pacific, your agency and other development partners working effectively and efficiently?

Why is that? or why not? How important is it that they are working effectively and efficiently?

***Gender equality and human rights-based approach***

*UNICEF is committed to the principles of gender equality, human rights and disability inclusion throughout its programme of interventions and support activities.*

How would you say children from marginalised communities, children with disabilities, girls and other disadvantaged groups have benefited from the UNICEF CP Programme in your country?

Do you have evidence or data to support this? If so, can you share it with us?

**Probes:**

- Do you know to what extent marginalised groups have been involved in the process for identifying needs, developing interventions, and participating in activities?
- Are these principles actively and explicitly considered, discussed and referred to in technical advice or support provided, and interventions that are designed and delivered? Is there a specific focus on them?

***Sustainability***

Overall, do you think the UNICEF CP Programme and its activities, and the ways in which it works is sustainable? Why/why not?

What would make them more sustainable?

**Probes:**

- formal systems linking with community based and customary practices
- CP more fully integrated into government policies or plans
- government funds allocated to CP issues
- local providers taking up the implementation of activities
- UNICEF embedded into a key ministry that focuses on CP issues
- key government and other staff being retained
- CP capability and capacity growing

Are these activities, strategies, and ways of working that can be scaled up and extended in your country? Why/why not? What would it take for that to happen?

***DFAT specific Efficiency***

How has UNICEF Pacific supported or delivered interventions and support under its CP Programme in the areas you are familiar with?

Probe: For example [*check/confirm with relevant UNICEF country programme managers*], through use of UNICEF programme managers/staff, UNICEF funded international or local consultants/contractors, UNICEF funding for positions within your organisation, engagement of locally based non-government/community providers to design/deliver activities, etc.

Do you think this/these have been the best ways to implement the CP programme? Why or why not? If not, what else could be done, or done differently?

Are you satisfied with the activities UNICEF is delivering with your funding, and the impact those activities are having on improving child protection outcomes? On what do you base these views?

**In summary – Key Strengths & Areas for Improvement**

In summary, what would you say is the one thing that UNICEF Pacific and its CP Programme does really well in improving protection for children?

And what would you say is the one key improvement that UNICEF Pacific could make in terms of the design and delivery of the CP Programme, and the support provided in this area?

***Thanks & Close***

Provide contact details if any data/evidence is able to be shared with us, or if participant has any further information they wish to share in relation to the matters talked about.

Remind participants of assurances of confidentiality and protection of data/privacy.

Expectation that UNICEF Pacific will share findings from the evaluation once the report is completed.

## Proposed discussion groups

The discussion groups will be conducted and lead by our Pacific Evaluation Team members in Samoa, Solomon Islands, Kiribati, and Vanuatu. Ingrid and/or Iain will be observers if present in-country when these are scheduled.

There will be between six to eight participants in each discussion group.

Opening introductions and closing of the discussion groups will be done in a culturally appropriate manner and be relevant to each country. The discussion group approach will use relevant Pacific approaches and frameworks, and conducted in the local language. Therefore, what follows is a high-level guide only that provides UNICEF with an overall understanding of the primary purpose for these discussions.

### *Pre-consent Briefing*

We have been engaged to evaluate the UNICEF Pacific Child Protection Programme. This means we want to find out whether the Programme is achieving its goals, what it means for groups of people like you, and how it could be improved.

What we learn will be reported to UNICEF and published in a report.

We have brought you all together because you attended one of UNICEF's training programmes or workshops in the last 12 or so months. That training programme was delivered by *[insert name(s) of providers]*.

We want to get your thoughts on how useful the training was, how it could be improved and whether it helped make you a better at doing your job.

This discussion will take around an hour to an hour and a half of your time. The information you gift us will be kept confidential and no names will be used in our reports.

Your participation in this group discussion is entirely voluntary. You may decide not to answer any question you do not wish to answer, and you can leave the discussion at any time. If you leave the discussion, you can also choose to withdraw any information you have provided to us.

### **Do you agree to proceed with the discussion group?**

*[If facilitator plans to record]* We would also like to be able to record the discussion group to ensure we capture what you say accurately. Only our Evaluation Team will have access to these recordings and the notes of this discussion. The recordings will be deleted once we have completed the evaluation.

### **Do you consent to this interview being recorded?**

*[Have participants sign Consent forms]*

### *1. Social work practitioners*

Who: front-line social workers and/or central social work focal point who have received UNICEF-sponsored training in CP issues within the past 12 months or so.

Propose eight groups: Samoa, Vanuatu, Kiribati, and the Solomon Islands

### *2. Other practitioners working with children and young people and child protection issues in the Pacific.*

Who: includes school principals, teachers, police, judiciary, health workers (eg, nurses) who have received training in the last 12 months or so

Propose two groups:

- Kiribati - judicial, lawyers and magistrates including outer islands (ZOOM mini-groups -TBC)
- Samoa - Police

### *3. Community leaders*

Who: includes churches, community elders, youth leaders/volunteers, community counsellors and/or facilitators in geographical areas that have had UNICEF CP Programme interventions and have received some form of training and/or advice or support within the past 12 months on child protection issues.

Propose three groups: Samoa, Vanuatu, and the Solomon Islands

### *Proposed question areas – Social workers, Other practitioners, Community Leaders*

Can you tell us a bit about your role, and what training you have received from UNICEF [or agency on behalf of UNICEF/government agency] over the last 12 months or so, in relation to dealing with child protection issues?

Do you believe that the training that you attended was relevant and useful to you in your role? Why/why not?

- Did it increase your awareness of and/or knowledge of CP issues and how to deal with these?
- Did it enhance your skills? Did you learn new skills or things?
- What did it help you to do that you could not have done before?
- Did it address real issues that you have to deal with in your role?

What difference (if any) has the training made to doing your job (eg, as a child protection worker/community care/youth facilitator)?

- Have you had the opportunity to apply what you learned? Why/why not? If applied, how did you apply it?
- Has it made you a better, more effective and/or efficient (social worker)? Why/why not?
- What difference has it made to your clients/the people you have to deal with relating to CP issues?

Did the people delivering the training have a good understanding of the training material, and make it relevant to the context you work in? Why/why not?

Could the training be improved and strengthened to achieve even better results regarding child protection issues in your country/area? In what ways?

- Any gaps in the material?
- The way it was delivered?
- Who was it delivered by?
- What other skills or knowledge are relevant to you?

UNICEF is helping countries improve their child protection services, to reduce and eliminate the harm to children. They do this by ... [3 output areas].

In your roles, do you see any improvements in the status of child protection, in your communities, as a result of these sorts of initiatives?

To what extent are the needs of children from marginalized communities, children with disabilities, girls, and other disadvantaged groups being addressed through the UNICEF CP Programme?

What would be one thing that UNICEF could do more of/do less of/ stop doing to strengthen its Programme in these areas to deliver even better results regarding child protection issues in your country?

[Close with thanks]

#### *4. Community members – Tanfeva Province Vanuatu*

**Who:** community members who have been exposed to awareness raising events or interventions, and/or received advice and/or support regarding child protection issues

**Note:** Waiting on clarification of nature and focus of community outreach programmes/interventions to determine appropriate areas of questioning.

Where did you learn about key messages regarding (eg, positive parenting – context specific)? Who from (eg, local priest/pastor/community counsellor/community facilitator/youth leader)?

What key messages did you hear?

What new things did you learn? (eg, greater awareness, particular skills, new ways of communicating, etc)

- If not much, why was that? What could have been done differently/better to get the messages across?

What difference, if any, have these made to your way of thinking, and how you act, when ... [eg, parenting – context specific]?

Did the [intervention] address issues that are relevant to your community? Why do you say that?

Was the way in which the [intervention] was delivered the right way to do this (eg, made it meaningful , accessible, understandable, sensitive, appropriate, etc.)?

Have you noticed changes in how parents and children interact in your community? What changes? What do you think caused these?

Do you think the [intervention] met the needs of children from marginalized communities, children with disabilities, girls, and other disadvantaged groups? Why/how or why not?

Is there anything else that you would like to learn about [this context]?

[Close with thanks]

## Annex C: Agencies for Key Informant Interviews

### Solomon Islands

#### Government Agencies:

- Child Protection Taskforce chair
- Ministry of Health and Medical Services (Social Welfare Division)
- Ministry of Women, Youth, Children and Family Affairs
- Ministry of Home Affairs (Civil Registration and Vital Statistics)
- Ministry of Education and Human Resource Development
- Office of the Ombudsman of Solomon Islands/Children's Guardian
- Ministry of Justice and Legal Affairs<sup>1</sup>
- Royal Solomon Islands Police Force<sup>1</sup>
- Correctional Services of Solomon Islands<sup>1</sup>
- Public Solicitors Office<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Covered in one small group interview

#### NGOs/Other Agencies:

- Think Place Global <sup>2</sup>
- Save the Children <sup>2</sup>
- World Vision <sup>2</sup>
- Oxfam Solomon Islands <sup>2</sup>
- People with Disability Solomon Islands <sup>3</sup>
- Empower Pacific <sup>3</sup>
- Family Support Centre <sup>3</sup>
- Christian Care Centre <sup>3</sup>
- Seif Ples, Rove <sup>3</sup>
- Hope Trust <sup>3</sup>

<sup>2,3</sup> Covered in separate small group interviews

#### UNICEF:

- Country Manager/Team

### Kiribati

#### Government Agencies:

- Ministry of Women, Youth, Sport and Social Affairs
- Ministry of Justice
- Kiribati Police Service, Domestic Violence Unit
- Office of the Public Legal Services
- Ministry of Education
- Ombudsman (Human Rights Division, MoJ)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National Advisory Committee on Children</li> </ul> <p>NGOs/Other Agencies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local Government Association [tbc]</li> </ul> <p>UNICEF:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Country Manager/Team</li> </ul>
<p><b>Vanuatu</b></p> <p>Government Agencies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ministry of Justice and Community Services (x2)</li> <li>• Ombudsman (CP focus, in MoJCS)</li> <li>• Ministry of Youth Development and Sports</li> <li>• Ministry of Education and Training</li> <li>• Ministry of Health</li> </ul> <p>NGOs/Other Agencies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vanuatu IGF</li> <li>• National Child Protection Working Group (Civil society rep's)</li> </ul> <p>UNICEF:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Country Manager/Team</li> </ul>
<p><b>Samoa</b></p> <p>Government Agencies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CRC Partnership Committee (Chair, CEO for MWCSO)</li> <li>• Ministry of Women, Community and Social Development (Division for Social Development), including the Child Protection/Case Management Unit and the Prevention Early Intervention Unit</li> <li>• Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (Disaster Management Office)</li> <li>• Office of the Ombudsman/National Human Rights Institution</li> <li>• Ministry of Health</li> <li>• Ministry of Justice and Courts Administration</li> <li>• Ministry of Police, Prisons and Corrections Services</li> <li>• Ministry of Education Sports and Culture</li> <li>• Samoa Bureau of Statistics</li> </ul> <p>NGO/Other Agencies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Samoa Victim Support Group</li> </ul> <p>UNICEF:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Country Manager/Team</li> </ul>

## **Regional**

### Development Partners:

- Australia Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade
- UN Population Fund
- UN Women

### NGOs/Other Agencies:

- Save the Children
- Child Fund Alliance (x2 - Australia & NZ)
- Pacific Council of Churches
- Supreme Court of Samoa Judge Vui Clarence Nelson and former UN CRC Committee member (potential pan-Pacific perspective)

### UNICEF:

- UNICEF Pacific Representative
- UNICEF Pacific CP Managers (x2 - past & current)

## Annex D: Roles and responsibilities

<b>Key informant interviews</b>		
<b>Who</b>	<b>What</b>	<b>When - By</b>
UNICEF Pacific	Send an email to heads of respective agencies targeted for interviews, advising them of the evaluation being conducted, introducing PS Services as the evaluation consultants, and requesting their participation or permission to engage with their staff, as appropriate.  <b>UNICEF copies PS Services into emails.</b>	Fri 1 March
PS Services	Draft email to be provided to UNICEF Pacific by PS Services	Mon 25 February
	Approach participants via email, providing a participant information sheet, and utilising the UNICEF in-country resource to help facilitate the interviews, working in conjunction with the lead and local evaluators	Fri 8 March
<b>Focussed discussion groups</b>		
UNICEF Pacific	Approach implementing partners to inform them of the evaluation and its purpose, and to provide an information sheet regarding the evaluation.  Request that front-line practitioners be released to participate, and that implementing partners ask local managers to release their staff to attend the discussion groups.  Request that social workers and/or the appropriate role inform the respective community leaders of the visit of the evaluation team and the purpose of the evaluation.  <b>UNICEF copies PS Services into emails.</b>	Fri 1 March  Target 2 weeks prior to FDGs being scheduled (varies per country – to be agreed with local evaluators)
UNICEF Country Teams	Liaise with social workers and/or the appropriate role inform the respective community leaders of the visit of the evaluation team and the purpose of the evaluation and provide an information sheet regarding the evaluation (which will set out the key principles of consent and protection of privacy).	Fri 8 March
PS Services	Provide UNICEF Pacific with draft email, letter of introduction and information sheet.	29 February
UNICEF Country Team	UNICEF Pacific Country Teams or its implementing partners (TBC with each UNICEF country team) approaches prospective participants to request their participation (after community leaders informed), providing information about what will be covered, the discussion group process, and processes for informed consent and protection of privacy through anonymity of reporting. Recruits 8-9 participants per group (in expectation 6-8 will turn up), provides details re time, place, how to get there, and (for community members) assistance with travel costs.	As above - Target 2 weeks prior to FDGs being scheduled

	<p>Organises venues, catering for FDG liaising with local evaluator; costs to be met by PS Services.</p> <p>Confirms recruited participants to PS Services and local evaluator; invoice costs as applicable.</p> <p>Supplies pens/pencils, and consent forms.</p>	
PS Services (Local evaluator)	Organise gift/iloloma/ meaalofa for community members.	March/April

## Annex E: Risks and mitigation

Key risks associated with this evaluation, and proposed mitigations, include:

Risk	Mitigation
<b>Limited nature of administrative data</b>	From the evaluability assessment and desk review, this appears to be a fact rather than a risk. We will look to address gaps by requesting administrative data directly from key informants in conjunction with our interviews.
<b>Concerns about participants not being sufficiently trusting and open</b>	As a New Zealand-based firm, we are acutely aware of the challenges (and opportunities) that arise when the principal evaluators are based in other countries. However, whether in a Pacific or child protection context, Ingrid, Iain and our Pacific team members have extensive experience, often on sensitive topics, of building rapport and mutual respect, and putting interviewees and focus group participants at their ease. We are also very strengths-based and looking forward to hearing about the four countries' distinctive solutions rather than coming from a perspective that western approaches are best (and effective).
<b>Scheduling and cancellation issues</b>	In association with UNICEF Pacific and our local Pacific evaluators, we'll be making contact with prospective participants as early as possible. Ingrid or Iain will be in two of the target countries for a full working week and so we'll prioritise those that appear to be more critical to the evaluation, which may vary from country to country, earlier in the week so that if they are cancelled there may be a possibility of rescheduling them. The local researcher in each country will also be able to conduct interviews independently of the lead evaluators. For key informants in countries that are not visited, and for those that are not available during country visits, remote interviews can be scheduled with a more flexible approach to timing.
<b>Ethics approval</b>	Submission of ethics application to Kiribati, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu and Samoa may in fact be required, which will pose delays to data collection. In this circumstance, we will seek to submit ethics applications as swiftly as possible and seek low-risk approval.
<b>Diversity in sampling</b>	Our approach to sampling for the focused discussion groups will aim to capture some degree of variation in the context in which respondents, particularly social workers, are based. However, we recognise that it will not be possible to capture all the full breadth of contexts in which social workers operate in all four countries and the full breadth of their perspectives, or community leader, care-giver and youth perspectives on the programme, within the agreed budget for this evaluation.
<b>Public health measures or emergencies prohibiting travel</b>	Public health concerns or other emergencies (eg, natural disasters) may lead to restrictions that impact planned data collection efforts; for example, face-to-face interviews and discussion groups might not be possible with particular target groups. Timing and nature of data collection will remain flexible to accommodate changing circumstances, and any impacts for the evaluation project deliverables will be brought to the attention of the UNICEF EMT as soon as these are known.

## Annex F: List of documents reviewed for the Inception Report

Carswell, S. & Loughlin, S. (2016). Evaluation of capacity development for Police on child protection in Fiji, Kiribati and Vanuatu: Report commissioned by UNICEF Pacific. UNICEF Pacific.

<https://evaluationreports.unicef.org/GetDocument?fileID=35199&documentID=136>

Coram International. (2017). *Situation analysis of children in the Pacific Island Countries*. UNICEF Pacific.

<https://www.unicef.org/pacificislands/media/661/file/Situation-Analysis-Pacific-Island-Countries.pdf>

Coram International. (2021). *Situation analysis of children in the Pacific Island Countries*. UNICEF Pacific.

<https://www.unicef.org/pacificislands/media/3341/file/Situation%20Analysis%20of%20Children%202021.pdf>

Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade. (ca. 2018). *Draft investment design: Child protection programme [2019-2023]* (unpublished report excluding annexes 1-5 and 7-10).

Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade. (ca. 2018). *UNICEF-Pacific-multi-country child protection programme* <https://www.dfat.gov.au/sites/default/files/unicef-pacific-multi-country-child-protection-programme-management-response.pdf>

End Corporal Punishment. (2018). Corporal punishment of children in the Solomon Islands (updated)

<https://www.endcorporalpunishment.org/wp-content/uploads/country-reports/SolomonIslands.pdf>

End Corporal Punishment. (2021). Progress towards prohibiting all corporal punishment in East Asia and the Pacific (updated).

End Corporal Punishment. (2022). Corporal punishment of children in Kiribati (updated).

<https://www.endcorporalpunishment.org/wp-content/uploads/country-reports/Kiribati.pdf>

End Corporal Punishment. (2022). *Corporal punishment of children in Samoa* (updated)

<https://www.endcorporalpunishment.org/wp-content/uploads/country-reports/Samoa.pdf>

End Corporal Punishment. (2023). *Corporal punishment of children in Vanuatu* (updated)

<https://www.endcorporalpunishment.org/wp-content/uploads/country-reports/Vanuatu.pdf>

Fiji Bureau of Statistics. (2022). *Fiji: Multiple indicator cluster survey - 2021 survey findings report*.

[https://mics-surveys-prod.s3.amazonaws.com/MICS6/East%20Asia%20and%20the%20Pacific/Fiji/2021/Survey%20findings/Fiji%202021%20MICS\\_English.pdf](https://mics-surveys-prod.s3.amazonaws.com/MICS6/East%20Asia%20and%20the%20Pacific/Fiji/2021/Survey%20findings/Fiji%202021%20MICS_English.pdf)

Kanas, B, Norton, A., Tarileo, B., & Wernham, M. (2009). Protect me with love and care: A Baseline Report for creating a future free from violence, abuse and exploitation of girls and boys in Vanuatu. UNICEF Pacific. <https://www.slideshare.net/FiaNorton/unicefvanuatureport1>

Manitou. (2022). *Draft evaluability and baseline assessment of UNICEF Pacific's child protection programme: Inception report*.

<https://evaluationreports.unicef.org/GetDocument?fileID=48255&documentID=19206>

Manitou. (2023). Evaluability assessment of the UNICEF Pacific Child Protection Programme. <https://evaluationreports.unicef.org/GetDocument?fileID=48256&documentID=19206>

Ministry of Justice and Community Services. (n.d.). Vanuatu national child care and protection policy 2016-2026. [https://mjcs.gov.vu/images/policy/Vanuatu\\_National\\_Child\\_Protection\\_Policy\\_2016-2026\\_FINAL\\_Nov16.pdf](https://mjcs.gov.vu/images/policy/Vanuatu_National_Child_Protection_Policy_2016-2026_FINAL_Nov16.pdf)

Ministry of Women, Community and Social Development. (2020). *Samoa national child protection policy 2020-2030*. <https://www.mwcsd.gov.ws/assets/policy/Samoa%20National%20Child%20Care%20and%20Protection%20Policy%202020-2030.pdf>

Nichols, T., Adorna, C., de los Angeles Bautista, F., Adorna, F., Abitria, R., & Ealedona, L. (2023). *Evaluation of the UNICEF Improving Access to Justice for Children and Women (J4C) in Papua New Guinea (PNG) project*. UNICEF. <https://www.unicef.org/png/media/3126/file/Justice%20for%20Children.pdf>

Norton, A., Taylor, P., Vakaoti, P, Wernham, M., & McCormack, F. (2009). Protect me with love and care: A Baseline Report for creating a future free from violence, abuse and exploitation of girls and boys in Fiji. UNICEF Pacific. [https://www.toksavepacificgender.net/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/Norton\\_A\\_2009.pdf?utm\\_source=website&utm\\_medium=website&utm\\_campaign=PDF\\_Download](https://www.toksavepacificgender.net/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/Norton_A_2009.pdf?utm_source=website&utm_medium=website&utm_campaign=PDF_Download)

Save the Children. (2019). Unseen and unsafe: Underinvestment in ending violence against children in the Pacific and Timor-Leste. Report on joint research by Save the Children, Save the Children, Plan International and ChildFund. Save the Children. <https://www.savethechildren.org.nz/assets/Uploads/Report-embargoed-until-15-July-Unseen-Unsafe-Main-report.pdf>

Secretariat of the Pacific Community. (2010). *Kiribati Family Health and Support Study: A study on violence against women and children*. [https://pacific.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/pub-pdf/Kiribati-Family-Health-and-Support-Study\\_0.pdf](https://pacific.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/pub-pdf/Kiribati-Family-Health-and-Support-Study_0.pdf)

Sheehan, R. (2021). Child welfare in the South Pacific: Deciding child protection matters across Pasifika nations. *International Journal on Child Maltreatment*, 4, 477–491. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42448-021-00085-7>

Szamier, M. & Attenborough, J. (2017). *Review of UNICEF Pacific Child Protection Programme: Final report*. UNICEF Pacific. <https://www.dfat.gov.au/sites/default/files/unicef-pacific-multi-country-child-protection-programme-independent-review.pdf>

Tonga Statistics Department. (2020). Tonga Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey 2019: Survey findings report. [https://spccfpstore1.blob.core.windows.net/digitallibrary-docs/files/f2/f26b5c1f96a5d72b9dc78eb15e2ec68c.pdf?sv=2015-12-11&sr=b&sig=KxDqpHFseBfgw3xrQShl1PPNcTugDLLNvIPSy8j98q0%3D&se=2024-07-09T21%3A44%3A57Z&sp=r&rsc=public%2C%20max-age%3D864000%2C%20max-stale%3D86400&rsc=application%2Fpdf&rscd=inline%3B%20filename%3D%22Tonga\\_2019\\_MICS\\_Survey\\_Findings\\_Report\\_English\\_sml.pdf%22](https://spccfpstore1.blob.core.windows.net/digitallibrary-docs/files/f2/f26b5c1f96a5d72b9dc78eb15e2ec68c.pdf?sv=2015-12-11&sr=b&sig=KxDqpHFseBfgw3xrQShl1PPNcTugDLLNvIPSy8j98q0%3D&se=2024-07-09T21%3A44%3A57Z&sp=r&rsc=public%2C%20max-age%3D864000%2C%20max-stale%3D86400&rsc=application%2Fpdf&rscd=inline%3B%20filename%3D%22Tonga_2019_MICS_Survey_Findings_Report_English_sml.pdf%22)

- UN Economic and Social Council. (2017). *Multi-country programme document: Pacific Island countries*. [https://sites.unicef.org/about/execboard/files/2017-PL11-Pacific\\_Islands-MCPD-ODS-EN.pdf](https://sites.unicef.org/about/execboard/files/2017-PL11-Pacific_Islands-MCPD-ODS-EN.pdf)
- UN Economic and Social Council. (2022). *Multi-country programme document: Pacific Island countries*. [https://www.unicef.org/executiveboard/media/14847/file/2023-PL1-Pacific\\_Island\\_countries\\_MCPD-EN-ODS.pdf](https://www.unicef.org/executiveboard/media/14847/file/2023-PL1-Pacific_Island_countries_MCPD-EN-ODS.pdf)
- UNICEF. (n.d.). Programme cooperation agreement [relating to the UNICEF programme for Government of Fiji]. [https://open.unicef.org/sites/transparency/files/documents/PCA\\_1430\\_Fiji\\_2021.pdf](https://open.unicef.org/sites/transparency/files/documents/PCA_1430_Fiji_2021.pdf)
- UNICEF Pacific. (2010, 14 April). *“Protect me with love and care” children say* [Press release]. <https://www.scoop.co.nz/stories/WO1004/S00236/protect-me-with-love-and-care-children-say.htm?from-mobile=bottom-link-01>
- UNICEF Pacific. (2015). Report on the Pacific conference on ending violence against children. <https://www.unicef.org/pacificislands/media/896/file/Pacific-EVAC-Preview.pdf>
- UNICEF Pacific. (2015). Child protection in emergencies: A toolkit for practitioners in Pacific Island Countries. <https://www.unicef.org/pacificislands/media/961/file/Child-protection-toolkit.pdf>
- UNICEF Pacific. (2015). *Child protection systems governance: Four Pacific countries - regional overview*. <https://www.unicef.org/pacificislands/media/911/file/Four-Pacific-Countries-Preview.pdf>
- UNICEF Pacific. (2015). *Review of the child protection system in Nauru*. <https://www.unicef.org/pacificislands/media/881/file/CP-Nauru.pdf>
- UNICEF Pacific. (ca. 2017). *Programme implementation plan*. <https://open.unicef.org/sites/transparency/files/documents/1430A006804001000%20Programme%20Implementation%20Plan.pdf>
- UNICEF Pacific. (ca. 2017). Outcomes 4 child protection: Pacific multi-country programme 2018-2022. <https://open.unicef.org/sites/transparency/files/documents/2017%20Fiji%20PSN%20Child%20Protection%20TOC.pdf>
- UNICEF Pacific. (2017). CP legal & policy frameworks (The UNICEF Transparency Portal, 1430/a0/06/804/001) [webpage]. <https://open.unicef.org/country-output?output-id=1430A006804001000>
- UNICEF Pacific. (ca. 2019). *Country programme full approved reports* (RAM 2018\_1, RAM 2018\_2, RAM 2018\_3, & RAM 2018\_4) (unpublished reports).
- UNICEF Pacific. (ca. 2020). *Country programme full approved report* (RAM 2019\_1, RAM 2019\_2, RAM 2019\_3, & RAM 2019\_4) (unpublished reports).
- UNICEF Pacific. (2020). Review of the UNICEF Pacific multi-country Programme Strategy Note (PSN) consolidated addendum (unpublished report).

UNICEF Pacific. (2021). Child protection programme in Kiribati, Vanuatu and Solomon Islands: Progress and utilization report - submitted to the government of Australia's Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (unpublished report).

UNICEF Pacific. (ca. 2021). *Country office annual report 2020*.

<https://www.unicef.org/media/101086/file/Pacific-Islands-2020-COAR.pdf>

UNICEF Pacific. (ca. 2021). *Country programme full approved report* (RAM 2020\_1, RAM 2020\_2, RAM 2020\_3, & RAM 2020\_4) (unpublished reports).

UNICEF Pacific. (ca. 2022). *Country programme full approved report* (RAM 2021\_1, RAM 2021\_2, RAM 2021\_3, & RAM 2021\_4) (unpublished reports).

UNICEF Pacific. (ca. 2022). Costed evaluation plan – Pacific Island countries – UNICEF multi-country programme of cooperation, March 2023–December 2027.

[https://www.unicef.org/executiveboard/media/13731/file/2023-PL1-Pacific\\_Island\\_countries\\_CEP-EN-2022.11.14.pdf](https://www.unicef.org/executiveboard/media/13731/file/2023-PL1-Pacific_Island_countries_CEP-EN-2022.11.14.pdf)

UNICEF Pacific. (ca. 2022). *Country two-pager profiles 2023-2027*.

<https://www.unicef.org/pacificislands/media/3711/file/Country%20two-pager%20profiles%202023-2027.pdf>

UNICEF Pacific. (ca. 2022). *UNICEF Pacific Islands: Child protection (CP)*.

<https://www.unicef.org/pacificislands/media/3716/file/Child%20Protection%20Programme%20Brief.pdf>

UNICEF Pacific. (ca. 2022). *UNICEF Pacific multi-country profiles 2023-2027*.

<https://www.unicef.org/pacificislands/media/3706/file/Country%20Profile%20Document%202023-2027.pdf>

UNICEF Pacific. (ca. 2022). UNICEF Pacific multi country programme 2023-2027: Programme rationale document - child protection (Unpublished report).

UNICEF Pacific. (ca. 2023). *Country programme full approved report* (RAM 2022\_1, RAM 2022\_2, RAM 2022\_3, & RAM 2022\_4).

UNICEF Pacific. (ca. 2023). *Country office annual report 2022: Pacific Islands*.

<https://www.unicef.org/media/136306/file/Pacific-Islands-2022-COAR.pdf>

UNICEF Pacific. (ca. 2023). Kiribati: UNICEF Programme of Cooperation 2023-2027 – 2023-2024 consolidated workplan (unpublished report).

UNICEF Pacific. (ca. 2023). Samoa: UNICEF Programme of Cooperation 2023-2027 – 2023-2024 consolidated workplan (unpublished report).

UNICEF Pacific. (ca. 2023). Solomon Islands: UNICEF Programme of Cooperation 2023-2027 – 2023-2024 consolidated workplan (unpublished report).

UNICEF Pacific. (ca. 2023). Vanuatu: UNICEF Programme of Cooperation 2023-2027 – 2023-2024 consolidated workplan (unpublished report),

UNICEF Pacific. (2023). *UNICEF evaluation management response template: Evaluability assessment of the UNICEF Pacific Child Protection Programme.*

<https://evaluationreports.unicef.org/GetDocument?fileID=50204&documentID=19206>