



**THE ALLIANCE**  
FOR CHILD PROTECTION  
IN HUMANITARIAN ACTION



**Child Protection**  
Global Protection Cluster



# UNPROTECTED:

crisis in humanitarian funding  
for child protection

---

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report was written by Margot Thierry, Save the Children Norway, with the support of Gunvor Knag Fylkesnes, Director for Advocacy, Save the Children Norway, Minja Peuschel, Senior Adviser for child protection in emergencies, Save the Children Sweden and Katharine Williamson, Senior Humanitarian Child Protection Advisor, Save the Children UK.

This report was made in collaboration with the Child Protection Area of Responsibility (CP AoR) and The Alliance for Child Protection in Humanitarian Action (the Alliance).

We would like to thank all those across the Save the Children movement, the Child Protection Area of Responsibility and The Alliance for Child Protection in Humanitarian Action, who generously offered their time and shared valuable contributions. Special thanks go to Petra Heusser (CP AoR/UNICEF), Anne Marie Turmine (CP AoR/UNICEF), Audrey Bollier (The Alliance for CPHA) and Leah Finnegan (Save the Children International) for their expert comments and review. We would also like to thank all those who provided support in producing the report, and particularly to Carolyn Mahoney for editing and Kristoffer Nilsen for design.

Names in captions have been changed to protect identities. All photos by Save the Children.



**Save the Children**

---

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Acknowledgements</b> .....	2
<b>Acronyms</b> .....	7
<b>Executive summary</b> .....	8
<b>Methodology</b> .....	10
<b>Definitions</b> .....	11
<b>Introduction: Child Protection in Humanitarian Action</b> .....	13
<b>Part 1: Trends in funding child protection in emergencies</b> .....	14
1. Overall humanitarian funding continues to increase year on year but doesn't keep pace with the growth of requirements .....	14
2. Humanitarian funding for protection and child protection: an upward trend since 2010 .....	15
3. Share of humanitarian aid by sector: child protection ranks extremely low compared to other sectors .....	16
4. Donors to child protection funding .....	19
5. Recipients of child protection funding .....	20
6. Funding for child protection by emergencies: which countries in crisis are the largest recipients of funding for child protection? .....	22
<b>Part 2: Child protection in humanitarian response plans and appeals</b> .....	24
1. Almost 80% of humanitarian funding for child protection reported on the Financial Tracking System are contributions on appeal .....	24
2. Child Protection positioning in humanitarian response .....	24
3. Funding for child protection by humanitarian response plans and appeals .....	26
4. Evidence for child protection underfunding and examining children's protection needs .....	27
5. Underfunding of child protection: a shared view and a reality with dramatic consequences for many countries .....	32
6. Volatility of child protection funding .....	32
7. Final funding for child protection is shaped by needs assessments and formulation of funding requests .....	33
<b>Conclusion</b> .....	36
<b>Recommendations</b> .....	39
<b>Annexes</b> .....	40
<b>Endnotes</b> .....	45

---

# FIGURES

<b>Figure 1a:</b> Selection of 2018 HRPs and appeals: funding progress for child protection and estimates of requirements to meet all children’s protection needs based on HRP initial CP requirements .....	6, 35
<b>Figure 1b:</b> Funding per child in need of protection and cost estimates of child protection activities (US\$/child/year) .....	6, 35
<b>Figure 2:</b> Methodology - simplified schema .....	9, 36
<b>Figure 3:</b> Total humanitarian funding, 2010–2018 .....	11
<b>Figure 4:</b> International humanitarian assistance, 2013–2017 (source: GHA 2018) .....	11
<b>Figure 5:</b> Defining child protection humanitarian figures (source: CP AoR Coordination Toolkit) .....	12
<b>Figure 6:</b> Humanitarian needs and funding source: GHO 2019 UN OCHA .....	12
<b>Figure 7:</b> Humanitarian funding for protection and estimated funding for child protection 2010–2018 .....	12
<b>Figure 8:</b> Humanitarian funding for child protection 2010–2018 .....	13
<b>Figure 9:</b> Breakdown of identified funding for child protection 2010–2018 .....	13
<b>Figure 10:</b> Estimated share of humanitarian aid dedicated to child protection .....	14
<b>Figure 11:</b> Share of humanitarian aid by sector – average 2010–2018 (% of total annual funding reported on the FTS) .....	15
<b>Figure 12:</b> Treemap - Source of funding for child protection 2010–2018 .....	16
<b>Figure 13:</b> Child Protection funding by top three national donors .....	16
<b>Figure 14:</b> Treemap - Recipients of funding for child protection 2010–2018 (based on FTS data) .....	18
<b>Figure 15:</b> Funding for child protection for Syria, South Sudan, Iraq and Yemen crises 2010–2018 .....	19
<b>Figure 16:</b> Estimated humanitarian funding (including but not limited to HRPs/appeals) for child protection .....	21
<b>Figure 17:</b> Humanitarian response plans and appeals 2018, funding progress for child protection (FTS online – 29 January 2019) .....	26
<b>Figure 18:</b> Humanitarian response plans and appeals 2018: estimated funding progress for child protection (based on FTS data – excluding identified ‘CP and GBV’ funding) .....	26
<b>Figure 19:</b> Selection of 2018 HRPs and appeals: funding progress for child protection and estimates of requirements to meet all children’s protection needs based on HRP initial CP requirements .....	30

---

## TABLES

<b>Table 1:</b> Funding and requirements for child protection and number of children in need of protection, 2018 .....	7
<b>Table 2:</b> Estimated share of humanitarian aid allocated to each sector 2010–2018, (% of total funding reported on the FTS) .....	14
<b>Table 3:</b> Child protection funding by donors (national governments) 2010–2018 .....	17
<b>Table 4:</b> Funding for child protection by national emergency – Aggregated total 2010–2018 .....	19
<b>Table 5:</b> Number of HRPs and appeals receiving CP funding out of total number of plans and appeals per year .....	21
<b>Table 6:</b> Reported funding for child protection by destination plan – top 20 .....	22
<b>Table 7:</b> Needs assessment for 13 selected countries with humanitarian response plans (HRPs) in 2018 .....	25
<b>Table 8:</b> Humanitarian response plans and appeals 2010–2018 for 13 selected countries .....	25
<b>Table 9:</b> Funding and requirements for child protection in 13 selected countries and numbers of children in need of protection .....	29

---

## ANNEXES

<b>Annex 1:</b> Detailed methodology .....	40
<b>Annex 2:</b> Composition of the dataset .....	41
<b>Annex 3:</b> Child Protection Area of Responsibility 2017 Annual Survey – Selected information from the Analysis summary .....	42
<b>Annex 4:</b> CP AoR Review of Child Protection Positioning and Localisation – 2018 HNOs and HRPs .....	42
<b>Annex 5:</b> Child protection funding by donor as reported on the FTS (Top ten for the period 2010–2018 – national government) .....	43
<b>Annex 6:</b> Details on funds received and requirements for the selection of 2018 HRPs .....	44

Based on data available from November 2018 to March 2019





**Separated:** Nur, 11, takes part in activities at Save the Children's Child Friendly Space, in a Rohingya refugee camp in Bangladesh. Nur, who has been deaf since birth, became separated from his parents after their village was attacked in Myanmar. He's now living with extended family..  
PHOTO: JONATHAN HYAMS / SAVE THE CHILDREN

---

# ACRONYMS

- CAR:** Central African Republic
- CBPF:** Country-Based Pooled Funds
- CERF:** Central Emergency Response Fund
- CP AoR:** Child Protection Area of Responsibility, part of the Global Protection Cluster
- CP:** Child Protection
- CPiE:** Child Protection in Emergencies
- CPMS:** Child Protection Minimum Standards in humanitarian action
- CPWG:** Child Protection Working Group of the Global Protection Cluster (now CP AoR and The Alliance for Child Protection in Humanitarian Action)
- DRC:** Democratic Republic of Congo
- FTS:** Financial Tracking System (UN OCHA FTS)
- GBV:** Gender-Based Violence
- GHA:** Global Humanitarian Assistance Report (Development Initiatives)
- GHO:** Global Humanitarian Overview (UN OCHA)
- HNO:** Humanitarian Needs Overview
- HPC:** Humanitarian Programme Cycle
- HRP:** Humanitarian Response Plans
- IASC:** Inter-Agency Standing Committee
- INGO:** International non-governmental organisation
- IOM:** International Organization for Migration
- MYP:** Multi-Year Planning
- NFI:** Non-food Items
- NGO:** Non-governmental organisation
- NNGO:** National non-governmental organisation
- ODA:** Official Development Assistance
  - oPt:** occupied Palestinian territory
- PIN:** People in Need
- SGBV:** Sexual and gender-based violence
- The Alliance:** The Alliance for Child Protection in Humanitarian Action
- UN OCHA** United Nations Office for the  
or **OCHA:** Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
- UN:** United Nations
- UNICEF:** United Nations Children's Fund
- WASH:** Water, Sanitation and Hygiene

---

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

All children have a fundamental right to protection, but the needs of children in emergencies are far from being met. In 2018, almost 50 million children were in need of protection in humanitarian settings.<sup>1</sup> Yet child protection isn't systematically prioritised when a humanitarian response is being mobilised, and it remains both underfunded and untimely<sup>2</sup> where children's lives are at risk. During a crisis, children are among the most vulnerable, exposed to life-threatening risks, extreme violence, abuse, physical and sexual exploitation, abduction or military recruitment. Child protection programmes are essential for preventing violence against children, facilitating family tracing and reunification, and ensure proper and timely referrals of children in need of assistance in terms of healthcare, food, education, shelter and psycho-social support.

Building on the 2011 *Too little too late* report on funding for child protection in emergencies<sup>3</sup> and based on data from the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, Financial Tracking Service (UN OCHA FTS), this desk review provides a picture of funding for the child protection sector over the period 2010–2018. We highlight funding trends, main donors and recipients, and examine funding levels in comparison to financial requirements in a selection of countries in 2018.<sup>4</sup> The study assesses how well child protection needs are being met in humanitarian settings by examining the connection between needs assessments, humanitarian response plans and funding received.

---

## Key findings:


- As with overall humanitarian funding, estimated funding for child protection demonstrates a clear, although non-linear, increase between 2010 and 2018. However, relative to the increase in total humanitarian funding during this period, funding for child protection remains minimal, with an average share of only 0.5% of total humanitarian funding.
- Child protection remains too often only mentioned within a broader protection analysis. According to the Child Protection Area of Responsibility (CP AoR) only 8% of 2018 Humanitarian Response Plans have a dedicated chapter on child protection, yet for the same year, 21% of Humanitarian Needs Overviews included a sub-chapter on child protection.<sup>5</sup>
- Child protection is often underfunded, but underfunding is not systematic throughout all interventions. Figures for 13 countries in 2018<sup>6</sup> show a clear pattern of underfunding, notably for Nigeria, Niger, the Democratic Republic of Congo, the Central African Republic and Afghanistan (all of which have a coverage rate under 30%). But they also show that some crises are better funded in terms of child protection, with a coverage rate of around 70–85% for Syria, South Sudan and Bangladesh, for instance. Media attention, geopolitical and economic interests also play an important role in influencing the final amount of funding received.
- Humanitarian response plans only address a portion of those in need. The gap in funding for child protection is even more stark when looking beyond financial data (i.e. the gap between requirements and funding received) and assessing funding in view of the total number of children actually in need of protection (see Figure 1). The findings suggest that in 2018, only US\$3 on average were spent per child in need of protection for the whole year.<sup>7</sup>
- The amount requested and available per child to fund child protection services is extremely low. Requirements for child protection in the 13 HRPs analysed for the present study suggest that US\$2 to US\$ 40 were needed per child for 2018 to fund child protection activities. And even in countries where child protection interventions are seemingly well covered, such as Syria and Bangladesh with the Rohingya refugee crisis in 2018, only US\$13 and US\$31 respectively were available per child. This study shows that funding for child protection falls extremely short of meeting the actual scale of needs (See figure 1b). Child protection consists of various activities and although cost estimations vary between regions and local context, some examples show that US\$7 to US\$10 per child per year are needed for awareness activities<sup>8</sup>, where psychosocial support activities are estimated to cost US\$40 to US\$50 per child<sup>9</sup>, and case management services can range from US\$167 to US\$2423<sup>10</sup> with an average of US\$800 based on available data<sup>11</sup> (Figure 1b). Reaching 4% of total humanitarian fund-

---

**Note:** This study acknowledges that, in line with the Centrality of Protection in Humanitarian Action – which means that protection is the central outcome of humanitarian action and requires all sectoral interventions to contribute to protection outcomes – child protection is both a sector in its own right as well as a responsibility of other humanitarian sectors.<sup>12</sup> This dual function makes it difficult to fully encompass and track funding, whether specifically or marginally directed towards child protection. Moreover, it is recognised that some humanitarian funding targeting child protection interventions is not currently fully represented in the FTS whether it is bilateral funding by institutional donors or unrestricted funding from private foundations. The methodology used and the limits identified are further clarified in the report, but at the time of writing, the FTS represents the most comprehensive public data source on humanitarian funding flows to collectively agreed humanitarian response plans.



**FIGURE 1A: SELECTION OF 2018 HRPS AND APPEALS:**  
**Funding progress for child protection and estimates of requirements to meet all children's protection needs based on HRP initial CP requirements**



ing, up from 0,5%, would substantially contribute to closing the funding gap for child protection. Based on 2018 figures and these 13 HRPs, if CP funding reaches 4% of total humanitarian aid, average funding available for CP per child per year would raise from 8\$ to 41\$. This would allow for increased protection but still fall short compared to the needs and costs of some CP interventions.


### Key Recommendations

The gap in funding (Figure 1b) for child protection in humanitarian response is alarming when considering the scale of needs and costs of quality child protection interventions. Donors and humanitarian actors have a

**FIGURE 1B: FUNDING PER CHILD IN NEED OF PROTECTION AND COST ESTIMATES OF CHILD PROTECTION ACTIVITIES (US\$/CHILD/YEAR)**

The bars show the actual costs of different child protection interventions in USD, while the bottom two horizontal lines show how little the funding received and requested covers. The top horizontal line shows how much of the needs would be covered if funding level reached 4% of humanitarian aid.

(SOURCE: AWARENESS RAISING: ENDNOTE 8; PSYCHO-SOCIAL: ENDNOTE 9; CASE MANAGEMENT: ENDNOTE 10; 13 HRPS: FIGURE 9)



joint responsibility to increase funding for child protection substantially and urgently. Specifically:

- Donors are requested to increase multi-year **funding for child protection interventions from 0.5% to a minimum of 4% of total humanitarian funding** and identify new sources of funding to fill the gap.
- All actors should **ensure the centrality of child protection in humanitarian needs assessments and responses**, requiring all humanitarian sectors to measure and report on child protection outcomes in their interventions.
- Child Protection actors should ensure they submit high-quality applications and increase their capacity to absorb and deploy funding from donors effectively. *The full list of recommendations is found on page 39.*

---

# METHODOLOGY

This report is the result of desk-based research carried out between November 2018 and March 2019. It provides a picture of humanitarian financing for child protection (CP) during the period 2010–2018. The report provides a literature and data review of funding allocated to the child protection sector in humanitarian action using data from the UN OCHA Financial Tracking Service (FTS). The research team also held discussions with humanitarian practitioners, child protection and education specialists from the Save the Children Network, the Alliance for Child Protection in Humanitarian Action (The Alliance), and the Child Protection Area of Responsibility (CP AoR).

This review constitutes an update to the 2011 report entitled *Too Little, Too Late: Child protection funding in emergencies (CPiE)*,<sup>13</sup> a study conducted by Save the Children and commissioned by the Child Protection Working Group of the Global Protection Cluster. This report found that:

- a) humanitarian funding to child protection was inconsistent between 2007–2009
- b) child protection was significantly and consistently underfunded in comparison with other humanitarian sectors. Underfunding is defined as the difference between the amount of funding requested through project proposals and the amount received.

The methodology for *Too Little, Too Late* was also desk-based research, using data from the UN-OCHA FTS, but the report only covered funding for CPiE relating to the Consolidated Appeals and Flash Appeals process and pooled funding mechanisms. In the present study, we cover all humanitarian funding reported in the FTS.

---

## Data source and limitations

The main data source for this desk review is the Financial Tracking Service (FTS) managed by UN OCHA. The FTS is a global, online, real-time database, originally created in 1992, which tracks international humanitarian aid flows including Humanitarian Response Plans (HRPs) and appeals, the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF), Country-based Pooled Funds (CBPFs), and other funds reported by the European Emergency Disaster Response

Information System (EDRIS), government donors, UN agencies, NGOs and private donors.


The FTS defines humanitarian aid as follows: ‘Humanitarian aid comprises high-priority projects that are required for survival needs or that help re-establish a part of the infrastructure that is necessary to deliver emergency assistance or reduce dependency on food aid and other emergency aid.’

The UN OCHA FTS database is restricted to internationally provided aid, and therefore excludes domestic expenditures on crises and refugees within a government’s own borders. It is important to note that FTS reporting is done on a voluntary basis and relies on reporting by donors and recipient organisations. In addition, FTS data is, to date, not exhaustive and does not account for all humanitarian funds – only those that are voluntarily reported. Despite these limitations, the FTS is a well-established platform and currently constitutes the most comprehensive public data source on humanitarian funding.

To provide an overview of funding for child protection, the research team used FTS data to identify funding allocated to child protection between 2010 and 2018. Although the study acknowledges that protection outcomes are integrated in other sectors, the present study focused on two sectors within the FTS: the protection sector and the child protection sector.

Since 2017, with the creation of a new FTS website, child protection is a category of its own on the FTS, making CP funding easily identifiable. Prior to 2017, CP interventions were simply reported under the Protection Sector. That year, UN OCHA FTS did a matching exercise to retroactively integrate and re-categorise flows attributed to child protection into the newly created CP sector. This sector is described by the FTS as encompassing all humanitarian activities and projects during a crisis or its aftermath for a) child protection and b) principles set out in the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (including training and capacity-building).

For the present study, in addition to considering all funding reported under the CP Sector, we also looked at the flows categorised under protection, as the CP Sector on the FTS is new and not yet representative of all funding flows allocated to child protection. To isolate child protection projects and activities,



**FIGURE 2: METHODOLOGY - SIMPLIFIED SCHEMA**

the research team reviewed all funding flows reported in the protection Sector and agreed on specific criteria for isolating such data. This methodology relies heavily on the use of keyword searches. The resulting selection therefore contains a certain degree of subjectivity as the dataset compiled for data analysis was dependent on the chosen definition of

child protection and on criteria selected for data isolation.

The dataset for child protection is described in greater detail in Annex 1. This will allow readers to place the findings of this study in perspective and understand the data limitations and the importance of the methodology, all of which have impacted the findings.

## Definitions

**Child:** under the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, every person below the age of 18 years is considered a child unless, under the law applicable to the child, majority is attained earlier.<sup>14</sup>

**Child protection** is defined as the prevention of, and response to, abuse, neglect, exploitation of children and violence against children.<sup>15</sup> In agreement with the FTS definition of child protection, this study will also take into account interventions made under

the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (including training and capacity-building).

**Emergency:** An emergency is defined as ‘a situation where lives, physical and mental well-being, or development opportunities for children are threatened as a result of armed conflict, disaster or the breakdown of social or legal order, and where local capacity to cope is exceeded or inadequate’.<sup>16</sup>



**Psychosocial support:** Ten-year-old Narjis and her siblings Dunia, 12, and Rami, 7, lost their father when an airstrike hit their home in Mosul. They now live with their aunt and grandmother in West Mosul. Save the Children is helping the family by providing psychosocial support.

PHOTO: CLAIRE THOMAS /  
SAVE THE CHILDREN

---

## INTRODUCTION:

# Child Protection in Humanitarian Action

In 2018, around 82 million people globally were in need of protection in humanitarian settings, of whom almost 50 million (53%) were children.<sup>17</sup>

The gravity of this situation is worsened by the fact that child protection interventions typically remain underfunded,<sup>18</sup> and child protection is not systematically prioritised where timely interventions could save children, both now and in the future.<sup>19</sup> Children are resilient, but adequate protection and timely care are essential to supporting their recovery and their ability to cope with difficult experiences. Today's children are tomorrow's adults and agents of change. Children who are left traumatised, victimised and impoverished will grow into adults who are less able to cope with future crises; this will serve only to widen the existing gap between the intense demand for and inadequate supply of humanitarian aid and resources.<sup>20</sup> We cannot stress enough the importance and urgency of protecting children in emergencies and preventing the loss of entire generations. The protection of children and their rights should never be considered optional or subject to negotiation.

Although child protection has gained more recognition in recent years,<sup>21</sup> with investment in programmatic interventions, child protection capability and advocacy to prioritise this issue at all levels, this does not necessarily translate into sufficient funding to address the many needs of children in humanitarian action. The *Too Little, Too Late* report<sup>22</sup> found that child protection was significantly and consistently underfunded in comparison with other humanitarian sectors between 2007–2009. Humanitarian professionals working on child protection share the view that child protection in emergencies is an underfunded sector and observe that underfunding is one of the biggest challenges faced by CP coordination groups at the national level. Indeed, in the CP AoR 2017 Annual Survey, completed by 20 child protection coordinators, 65% of respondents stated that CPiE response has a funding gap of over 50% in each of their contexts.<sup>23</sup> The lack of sufficient funding for adequate operational capacity was, for years, the most serious obstacle they faced.

With the creation of *Minimum Standards for Child Protection in Humanitarian Action* (CPWG, 2012),<sup>24</sup>, it became easier to explain to donors

what CP involves, but there is still some confusion over how it differs from protection more generally, and how important it is to have stand-alone funding for CP. The report *Child protection in emergencies: a matter of life and death* (2015)<sup>25</sup> mentions a 'gap between the rhetoric of commitment to child protection and allocated resources'. Much effort has been devoted to demonstrating that CP is a life-saving sector and to highlight the necessity of timely and rapid intervention to save lives; but funding for CP in humanitarian action remains limited.


This study estimates the total humanitarian funding allocated to child protection over the period 2010–2018, highlights trends and gives an overview of the funding of the sector, giving examples of selected countries and emergencies. The study also considers the needs assessment in the 2018 HNOs to examine how well funding for CP meets the protection needs of children.

---

**We cannot stress enough the importance and urgency of protecting children in emergencies and preventing the loss of entire generations.**




# PART 1: Trends in funding child protection in emergencies



**FIGURE 3: TOTAL HUMANITARIAN FUNDING, 2010–2018<sup>26</sup>**

(SOURCE: UN OCHA FTS)



**FIGURE 4: INTERNATIONAL HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE, 2013–2017**

(SOURCE: GHA 2018)

## 1. Overall humanitarian funding continues to increase year on year but doesn't keep pace with the growth of requirements

As highlighted in several reports, including UN OCHA Global Humanitarian Overview 2019 (GHO),<sup>27</sup> overall total humanitarian funding is increasing year on year. According to all funds reported by public and private donors, UN agencies, UN funds, NGOs and others to the FTS, total humanitarian funding increased from US\$16 billion in 2010 to US\$23.4 billion in 2018, an increase of 46%.

According to the Global Humanitarian Aid (GHA) report for 2018,<sup>28</sup> international humanitarian response totalled US\$27.3 billion, whereas the FTS database reported US\$23.4 billion. This gap might give us an idea of the portion of humanitarian aid funding not accounted for by the FTS – a gap also reflected in this study.

Looking into the Humanitarian Response Plans (HRP) and Appeals, funding also continued to grow significantly (Figure 3) and increased from US\$7.25 billion in 2010 to US\$14.66 billion in 2018. But more importantly, the gap between estimated requirements and funds received is widening. Contributions to HRP and appeals do not meet the set requirements – and unfortunately the current funding shortfall is the largest to date (US\$10.27 billion). For the period 2010–2018, global appeal coverage varies by around 60%. As highlighted in the GHA report 2018,<sup>29</sup> the increase in funding does not keep pace with the growth in requirements.


It should be kept in mind that requirements formulated in HRP and appeals may not adequately reflect actual needs on the ground. It is important to differentiate emergency requirements identified in HRPs and appeals from the total actual needs of a population or group in a country in crisis; the latter are invariably greater. As defined by the FTS, 'Humanitarian response plans (HRPs) and flash appeals articulate a shared vision of how to respond to the affected population's assessed and expressed needs in a humanitar-

ian emergency.’ Requirements are elaborated according to a chosen strategy, and in line with the activities to be implemented, but these requirements also take into consideration factors such as the capacity of humanitarian actors to absorb funding and deliver response, particularly in contexts where operational presence is constrained for security. As such, requirements do not necessarily reflect total actual emergency needs and capacity of response. Figure 5<sup>30</sup> represents the difference between the population in need and the population targeted and can be applied to children in need vs children targeted.

According to the GHO 2019,<sup>31</sup> the number of people in need of humanitarian assistance increased from an estimated 81 million in 2014 to nearly 132 million in 2019 (a 63% growth rate). The quality of estimates of populations in humanitarian need has improved, contributing to a more accurate assessment of resulting needs. HRP now rely on strengthened planning processes and include a more systematic analysis of evidence based on needs, trends, risks, current response and constraints, as well as response capacity among governments and development actors. If the number of people in need has increased, the number of people receiving aid has also increased (growing by 79% between 2014 and 2019). In 2014, those receiving aid represented 64.5% of the total number needing it; by 2019, 71% of total number of people in need received aid. To conclude, funding for humanitarian aid increased over time but still does not keep pace with the growth of requirements – which does not itself account for all those in need. In 2019, there are still almost 30% of people in need who do not receive aid.



## 2. Humanitarian funding for protection and child protection: an upward trend since 2010

Relative to the increase in humanitarian financing, funding for protection<sup>32</sup> demonstrates the same trend, with an increase of 52% between 2010 and 2018 (from US\$502 million to US\$763 million). Based on the data reported on the FTS, the protection sector is particularly affected by underfunding. Indeed, although total funding for protection increased, the gap between requirements and funds received for protection in HRP and appeals widened substantially. The coverage for protection requirements was 42% in 2010, dropping to 21% in 2011. After peaking in 2014 at 46%,<sup>33</sup> it dropped again, reaching 34%



**FIGURE 5: DEFINING CHILD PROTECTION HUMANITARIAN FIGURES**

(SOURCE: CP AOR COORDINATION TOOLKIT)



**FIGURE 6: HUMANITARIAN NEEDS AND FUNDING**

(SOURCE: GHO 2019 UN OCHA)

in 2018. As estimated in the following section, the share of total humanitarian aid allocated to protection is 2.5%.

Regarding child protection, the study found that over the period 2010–2018, all reported humanitarian funding for CP increased, although not in a linear manner. In 2010, total funding for child protection was estimated at US\$92 million, decreasing to US\$55 million in 2011, and rising again to US\$172 million in 2018. These figures represent a cumulative increase of 87%, more than the growth of protection funding during the same period. These figures account for a total of US\$905 million identified as funding for CP from 2010–2018.

Due to the complex and overlapping nature of CP, both as a sector and a responsibility shared across sectors, some CP interventions can be strongly linked to other sectors or clusters; this is the case for CP and GBV, for instance. The research team, when going through the funding flows categorised under protection, attempted to distinguish between activities focusing on CP exclusively, those combining CP and GBV or activities where CP is either a main component or is integrated with other sectoral activities (education or WASH for instance). All projects reported under the CP sector on the FTS are tagged ‘CP FTS’. (Figure 9).

#### Examples of CP interventions considered in this study:

- monitoring, reporting, response and prevention mechanisms to protect children from grave children’s rights violations
- identification systems and provision of care for unaccompanied and separated children
- family tracking and reunification services
- protection services and rehabilitation interventions for children associated with armed forces
- establishment of child-friendly spaces, support centres and safe spaces for children
- mental health and psycho-social support to children
- sexual and gender-based violence interventions to protect children
- support for community-based child protection

### 3. Share of humanitarian aid by sector: child protection ranks extremely low compared to other sectors

Although funding for child protection increased rapidly over the period, it remained relatively stable in proportion to the growth


of humanitarian aid. The share of humanitarian aid going to child protection was at the same level until 2017 and remains minimal, at an average of 0.53% over the last eight years. (Figure 10).

To highlight how funding for protection and child protection compares with other sectors, we looked at the share of humanitarian aid allocated to each sector over time by considering all reported funds by sector on the FTS (not limited to contributions to HRP and appeals). (Table 2, p. 18).


As identified in the Norwegian Refugee Council and Save the Children report *Walk the talk: review of donors’ humanitarian policies on education* (2015),<sup>38</sup> sectors traditionally considered life-saving, such as food security or health, receive the highest allocations, with respectively 23.6% and 9.5% on average between 2010 and 2018.

But child protection is a life-saving sector as well. In their report *A matter of life and death* (2015),<sup>39</sup> the Child Protection Working Group (CPWG) demonstrated that some events require action within six hours in order to avoid the worst outcomes. The CERF defines life-saving and core emergency humanitarian programmes as actions that, “within a short time span, remedy, mitigate or avert direct loss of life, physical and psychological harm or threats to a population or major portion thereof and/or protect their dignity”. The CERF now lists several aspects of child protection as life-saving interventions.<sup>40</sup> Child protection should be prioritised in all humanitarian responses to an emergency as soon as the first phase of the response begins and continuing in the long-term response with funding to guarantee sustainability of the interventions.

‘Multi-sector’ is the third sector of humanitarian aid, with a share of 13% of the total. There is a difference between ‘Multi-sector’ and ‘Multiple sectors (shared)’ categories on the FTS. According to the FTS, ‘Multi-sector’ refers to projects and activities that do not have one dominant sector; it often applies to UNHCR assistance for refugees. By contrast, ‘Multiple sectors (shared)’ refers to funding flows directed to multiple sectors, multiple destination countries, or spread over several years. We estimate funding of the Multiple sectors (shared) that have child protection as one of their destination sectors (along with Education, Emergency Shelter and NFI, or Health) at almost US\$165 million between 2016 and 2018.<sup>41</sup> Unfortunately, we are not able to include these funding flows in our analysis, nor identify the portion of funding going to CP activities within the Multi-Sector cate-




**FIGURE 7: HUMANITARIAN FUNDING FOR PROTECTION AND ESTIMATED FUNDING FOR CHILD PROTECTION 2010–2018** <sup>34</sup>




**FIGURE 8: HUMANITARIAN FUNDING FOR CHILD PROTECTION 2010–2018** <sup>35</sup>

Notes: All numbers are estimates, based on funds reported in the FTS. The steep increase from 2017 to 2018 might be due to better reporting on CP in the FTS, with the introduction of the new CP specific sector.




**FIGURE 9: BREAKDOWN OF IDENTIFIED FUNDING FOR CHILD PROTECTION 2010–2018**



**FIGURE 10: ESTIMATED SHARE OF HUMANITARIAN AID DEDICATED TO CHILD PROTECTION** (Percentage of total funding reported on the FTS)<sup>36</sup>

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	AVERAGE (2010–2018)
Agriculture	2,97	4,03	4,43	2,55	1,43	1,18	1,21	1,21	0,32	2,15
Camp Coordination/ Management	0,38	0,16	0,13	0,17	0,23	0,22	0,41	0,27	0,37	0,26
Child Protection (estimated)	0,57	0,40	0,46	0,54	0,45	0,52	0,50	0,57	0,77	0,53
Coordination and Support Services	7,92	5,90	6,27	6,53	4,80	4,08	6,82	4,73	4,06	5,68
Early Recovery	4,07	2,53	2,02	1,82	1,78	3,00	2,61	1,13	1,95	2,32
Education	2,34	1,29	1,03	1,56	1,05	1,41	1,87	2,13	1,99	1,63
Emergency Shelter and NFI	5,23	3,41	2,97	4,00	3,35	5,14	3,26	2,99	1,89	3,58
Emergency Telecommunications	0,01	0,02	0,06	0,27	0,13	0,18	0,07	0,21	0,01	0,11
Food Security	27,86	26,98	29,16	24,50	17,97	17,27	21,70	23,22	24,14	23,64
Gender-Based Violence	0,02	0,04	0,03	0,02	0,05	0,01	0,04	0,06	0,31	0,06
Health	8,10	8,75	8,87	8,89	22,21	11,75	5,92	6,12	5,11	9,53
Housing, Land and Property	0,02	0,01	0,01	0,00	0,01	0,01	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,01
Logistics	0,85	0,84	1,13	1,15	1,17	1,18	1,25	1,45	1,00	1,11
Mine Action	1,22	1,14	1,12	1,11	0,30	0,24	0,27	0,41	0,42	0,69
Multiple Sectors (shared)	-	0,00	-	0,04	0,00	0,07	0,51	6,05	7,13	1,97
Multi-sector	1,95	3,60	4,51	19,81	15,63	19,48	19,19	18,48	17,12	13,31
Not specified	29,28	33,93	30,77	20,57	23,76	27,11	25,67	20,17	22,39	25,96
Nutrition	0,59	1,23	1,01	1,02	1,25	1,65	2,22	4,06	4,26	1,92
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0,33	0,24	0,28
Protection (excl. Identified CP)	2,58	1,77	2,55	2,05	1,98	2,67	2,78	2,82	3,21	2,49
Water Sanitation Hygiene	4,01	3,96	3,47	3,39	2,47	2,81	3,69	3,57	3,31	3,41
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	


**TABLE 2: ESTIMATED SHARE OF HUMANITARIAN AID ALLOCATED TO EACH SECTOR 2010–2018, (% OF TOTAL FUNDING REPORTED ON THE FTS)<sup>37</sup>**



**FIGURE 11: SHARE OF HUMANITARIAN AID BY SECTOR – AVERAGE 2010–2018 (% OF TOTAL ANNUAL FUNDING REPORTED ON THE FTS)**



■ National government: 52%   
 ■ UN agency: 17%   
 ■ Pooled fund: CERF and country-based: 16%   
 ■ Inter-governmental: 10%  
■ Private and international organisation/foundation 3%   
 ■ NGO: International and uncategorized 1%   
■ Not specified <1%



**FIGURE 12: TREEMAP – SOURCE OF FUNDING FOR CHILD PROTECTION 2010–2018**

gory. The FTS confirmed that these flows cannot be treated as individual contributions to a specific sector or cluster, and that there is no detailed information on the share of each destination sector within the funding flow.

This comparative analysis demonstrates that child protection ranks extremely low among humanitarian sectors, representing on average 0.53% of total humanitarian aid. By comparison, the education sector receives an average of 1.63%.

Another recent study, *Counting Pennies: a review of official development assistance to end violence against children*,<sup>42</sup> concluded that in 2015, less than 0.6% of official development assistance (ODA) was allocated to ending violence against children (out of total ODA spending that year of US\$174 billion).

#### 4. Main donors of child protection


Over the period 2010–2018, based on the identified funding for child protection (US\$905 million), the major source of funding is national governments (52%) and to a lesser extent UN Agencies (17%) and pooled funds (16%: CBPF 10% and CERF 6%)

The treemap above (Figure 12) presents the various sources of funding for CP, by organisation type, between 2010 and 2018, and showcases major sources within the organisations' categories.

Looking into national governments' reported funds over the period, the top ten donors (highlighted in Table 3, p. 20) accounted for 45% of total funding reported

for CP. The largest single donor is the US government, accounting for US\$73.7 million, followed by Japan, Sweden, Denmark and Belgium. The top five donors accounted for 30% of total funding for CP. Again, this is based on the reported funds. For further information on the importance of reporting, refer to the publication from Development Initiatives: Improving humanitarian transparency with the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) and the UN OCHA Financial Tracking Service (FTS) (2017).<sup>43</sup>

When comparing donor funding, we were not able to identify any common trends (funding trends for top ten donors are available in Annex 5). The year-on-year variation is important, but some years, such as 2013/2014 and 2016/2017 show general increases; in



**FIGURE 13: CHILD PROTECTION FUNDING BY TOP THREE NATIONAL DONORS**

<b>National Government (Amount in US\$Million)</b>		<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
#1	United States of America, Government of	9,28	3,87	3,48	3,06	12,13	10,68	6,68	11,21	13,33	73,72
#2	Japan, Government of	4,87	3,68	5,44	9,88	9,95	2,82	3,61	5,44	5,62	51,31
#3	Sweden, Government of	3,01	8,66	5,47	8,67	12,39	2,84	3,08	3,03	2,50	49,67
#4	Denmark, Government of	5,51	3,20	1,31	8,85	4,97	3,44	12,92	7,77	0,71	48,67
#5	Belgium, Government of	8,03	6,46	4,70	4,94		15,68	0,71	2,13	4,92	47,57
#6	Germany, Government of	0,90	0,60	6,56	0,56	0,89	0,68	10,02	16,24	10,23	46,65
#7	United Kingdom, Government of	0,43	0,87	0,66	0,09	2,32	1,51	3,08	9,30	12,12	30,37
#8	Canada, Government of	6,33	2,46	1,61	12,24	4,12		0,66	2,09	0,57	30,08
#9	Switzerland, Government of	0,20	0,56	0,54	2,05	1,35	1,14	3,15	4,40	4,31	17,70
#10	Norway, Government of	0,64	1,28	1,28	1,12	6,66	1,25	1,20		1,23	14,65
#11	Italy, Government of	4,06		0,90	0,30	1,26	0,28	0,37	1,98	1,93	11,08
#12	Ireland, Government of	0,28	0,84		0,93	1,84	1,11	1,23	2,19	1,75	10,17
#13	Saudi Arabia (Kingdom of), Government of					6,13			0,21	0,42	6,76
#14	Australia, Government of	1,19	1,80	1,64		1,31		0,59			6,53
#15	Netherlands, Government of	2,16	0,63	0,78			1,00			0,15	4,72
#16	Luxembourg, Government of			0,98	0,92	0,47	1,09	0,27	0,54	0,18	4,44
#17	Spain, Government of			0,90	0,51	1,95	0,44			0,57	4,38
#18	Korea, Republic of, Government of		0,90			0,20		0,10		1,00	2,20
#19	Finland, Government of					0,22		0,44		1,47	2,14
#20	United Arab Emirates, Government of	0,01					1,53				1,54
#21	Kuwait, Government of							1,00		0,53	1,53
#22	Austria, Government of								1,12		1,12
#23	France, Government of			0,01		0,28			0,69	0,12	1,10
#24	Colombia, Government of	0,97									0,97
#25	Estonia, Government of		0,04	0,13	0,18					0,23	0,58
#26	New Zealand, Government of			0,27					0,11		0,38
#27	Bulgaria, Government of							0,10			0,10
#28	Hungary, Government of		0,00	0,05							0,05
#29	Kazakhstan, Government of									0,05	0,05
#30	Slovenia, Government of								0,05		0,05
#31	Lithuania, Government of							0,04			0,04
#32	Portugal, Government of									0,01	0,01
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>47,87</b>	<b>35,85</b>	<b>36,71</b>	<b>54,29</b>	<b>68,43</b>	<b>45,49</b>	<b>49,26</b>	<b>68,50</b>	<b>63,94</b>	<b>470,36</b>

**TABLE 3: CHILD PROTECTION FUNDING BY DONORS (NATIONAL GOVERNMENTS) 2010–2018 (BASED ON FTS DATA)**

2013/14, funds are mainly for South Sudan, Iraq and the CAR and in 2016/2017, they are mainly directed to Syria, Iraq and Nigeria.

After national governments, the second largest category of donors is UN agencies, with UNICEF as the principal donor (providing 97% of funds from UN agencies). Finally, 10% of total funding for CP over the period comes from the CBPF and 6% from the CERF. The top contributors to the CBPF (2014–2018) were the United Kingdom, Germany, Sweden and the Netherlands.<sup>44</sup> The top contributors to the CERF (2006–2018) were the United Kingdom, Sweden, Netherlands, Norway, and Germany.<sup>45</sup>

Note: 'Inter-governmental' includes the European Commission and the Islamic Development Bank. It was observed that UNICEF

national committees are considered in the private organisation/foundation category on the FTS.

## 5. Recipients of child protection funding

Looking at identified CP funding for the period 2010–2018, the top recipients of reported funds are:

UN agencies (65.25% of total funding for CP over the period) with UNICEF receiving 63% of all funding for CP (US\$574 million), UNHCR receiving US\$6.6 million and the International Organization for Migration (IOM) receiving US\$4.3 million over the same period.

■ UN agencies: 65,25%   
 ■ NGOs: 33,34%   
 ■ Red Cross and Red Crescent: international and national: 0,70%  
■ Private organisation/foundation/Individual: 0,33%   
 ■ Government: 0,05%   
 ■ Not specified: 0,33%



**FIGURE 14: TREEMAP - RECIPIENTS OF FUNDING FOR CHILD PROTECTION 2010–2018 (BASED ON FTS DATA)**

Funding for CP by country in crisis	Total funding US\$ (2010–2018)	Share of total funding (%)
Uncategorised	148 517 678	16.4 %
Syria 2012–2018	118 380 480	13.1 %
South Sudan 2011–2018	86 973 368	9.6 %
Iraq 2010–12/2014–18	64 268 847	7.1 %
Yemen 2010–2018	56 642 925	6.3 %
Sudan 2010–2018	40 285 200	4.4 %
Haiti 2010–2012/2015–2016	39 781 107	4.4 %
Democratic Republic of the Congo 2010–2018	38 320 471	4.2 %
Central African Republic 2010–2018	36 535 136	4.0 %
Somalia 2010–2018	34 686 731	3.8 %
occupied Palestinian territory 2010–2018	26 916 435	3.0 %
	<b>905 395 286</b>	<b>100.00</b>

**TABLE 4: FUNDING FOR CHILD PROTECTION BY NATIONAL EMERGENCY – AGGREGATED TOTAL 2010–2018<sup>50</sup> (BASED ON FTS DATA)**

INGOs and NGOs (33.34%): INGOs capture 27% of total funding, national and local NGOs 1.58%, with an additional 4.59% received by NGOs that are not yet categorised under the FTS (these are a mix of local and international NGOs). Among the INGOs, top recipients are Save the Children, the International Rescue Committee, Terres des Hommes and Plan International.

Unfortunately, it was not possible to examine how funds received by UNICEF are disbursed to implementing partners, including INGOs and NNGOs, or the level of funding received by local and national actors – who are often the primary responders in a crisis. In the FTS, 97% of UNICEF's funds appear received by UNICEF itself.

Although the Grand Bargain agreed by major aid donors calls for a global target of 25% of humanitarian funding to go “as directly as possible” to local and national responders by 2020, an analysis by Development Initiatives<sup>46</sup> indicates that local and national responders received only 2.9% of international humanitarian assistance directly in 2017, of which local and national NGOs together received only 0.4%. In the present study, among all funds identified for child protection, only 1.58% of funding between 2010 and 2018 was disbursed to national and local NGOs.

## 6. Funding for child protection by emergencies: which countries in crisis are the largest recipients of funding for child protection?

For each funding flow, where possible, the FTS adds information on the destination emergency.<sup>47</sup> By crossing that information for all funding flows for child protection<sup>48</sup> with the ‘destination plan’<sup>49</sup> we obtained a more complete overview and could review which emergencies concentrated the most funding for CP over 2010–2018.

We found that 16% of the identified funding flows for CP are not mapped against any specific emergency or HRP; however, the main recipients of those funds (US\$148.5 million) are INGOs (44%) and UN agencies (41%, mostly UNICEF).

Between 2010–2018, the largest share of funding, 13% of the total between 2010–2018, went to Syria, with the second largest share received by South Sudan (almost 10% of all funding), followed by Iraq (7.6%), Yemen (6.3%) and Sudan (4.5%).

Of the US\$905 million in funding identified

for child protection between 2010 and 2018, the majority was directed to countries in major protracted crises: Syria, South Sudan, Iraq and Yemen. A level 3 response was activated in these four countries, which therefore commanded donor attention and priority funding mobilisation. In the present section, we are looking at aggregated funding over a period of eight years (for protracted crises), for which HRPs and appeals are formulated yearly, or at least regularly. Therefore, it is not surprising that major protracted crises command the majority of resources. UN OCHA, in its GHO 2019, also highlights this fact and found that between 2014 and 2018, just four crises – Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan and Syria – accounted for 55% of all funding requested and received. In addition, UN OCHA found that the average humanitarian crisis now lasts more than nine years.

## Level 3 Responses<sup>51</sup>

Level 3 Responses (IASC L3) are activated in major sudden-onset humanitarian emergencies to ensure a more effective response to affected populations. This is an exceptional measure, applied in cases of complex and challenging emergencies, where the gravity of the situation justifies mobilisation beyond normally expected levels.

### Activation and Deactivation of L3 Responses<sup>52</sup>

#### Yemen

- L3 activated on 1 July 2015 (for six months)
- L3 extended for six months on 7 March (until end of August 2017)
- L3 extended until end of March 2018

#### Syria

- L3 activated on 15 January 2013
- L3 extended for six months on 7 March (until end of August 2017)
- L3 extended until end of March 2018
- L3 extended until end of December 2018

#### Iraq

- L3 activated on 12 August 2014
- L3 extended for six months on 7 March (until end of August 2017)
- L3 extended until end of the year 2017


#### South Sudan

- L3 activated on 11 February 2014
- L3 deactivated on 5 May 2016



**Reunited:** Emmanuela (36) is reunited with her five children after five years apart. In the middle of the chaos when gunmen attacked Bor in South Sudan in 2014, many family members ran in different directions. Nyandor (17) and her other four siblings were among those who fled without their parents. At the time of separation in 2014, Nyandor was only 12 years, her siblings; John was 8, Sarah was 8, Asha was 5 and Hope was 1 years old. Since 2014, Emmanuela did not know the whereabouts of her children. Save the Children caseworkers traced the five children after their mother had registered them as missing children.

PHOTO: TITO JUSTIN / SAVE THE CHILDREN



**FIGURE 15: FUNDING FOR CHILD PROTECTION FOR SYRIA, SOUTH SUDAN, IRAQ AND YEMEN CRISES 2010–2018**



## PART 2

# Child protection in humanitarian response plans and appeals

### 1. Almost 80% of humanitarian funding for child protection reported on the Financial Tracking System are contributions on appeal

When examining the total estimated funding for CP based on FTS data, we realise that 78% of funding are contributions on appeal. These are funding flows which are specifically reported or mapped against funding requirements stated in HRP and appeals.

Keeping in mind the data limitations we face, and more importantly, the voluntary nature of reporting to the FTS, this could mean:

a) that funds for CP are mainly reported to the FTS when they are contributions to HRP and appeals. Indeed, reporting for contributions on appeal is now well established as a requirement when participating in inter-agency HRP. This would also imply that the quality of the dataset is higher when focusing only on CP funding on appeal, which we will do in this part of the study.


Or b) that donors give little or no funding for CP outside of HRP and appeals. In this case it would showcase the vital importance of HRP and appeals for funding protec-

tion and child protection. It also reinforces the responsibility to formulate thorough and accurate requirements with regards to assessed needs when launching appeals.

### 2. Child Protection positioning in humanitarian response

This finding gives a sense of the importance of CP positioning in humanitarian response, how integrated it is, how it is prioritised, and whether it is systematically addressed or if it varies from one crisis or HRP to another. Indeed, the way CP needs are assessed and the subsequent formulation of requirements in the humanitarian response strategy process defines to a considerable degree the funding that will ultimately be received. If it became evident that CP has gained in recognition and is now prioritised among donors, we wondered whether it is well positioned and integrated within the humanitarian programme cycle compared with other sectors.

Based on the database created for the purpose of this study,<sup>53</sup> we reviewed how many 'destination plans' (HRPs and appeals) received funding for CP compared to the total



**FIGURE 16: ESTIMATED HUMANITARIAN FUNDING (INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO HRPS/APPEALS) FOR CHILD PROTECTION**

**Refugee:** Aleisha (13) is a Rohingya refugee girl who benefited from attending Save the Children's Child Friendly Space.

PHOTO: KRISTIANA MARTON /  
SAVE THE CHILDREN



number of plans and appeals formulated each year. Results are presented in Table 5.

Between 2010–2018, we found that on average, more than 66% of all HRP and appeals received funding for child protection activities. We can assume that the rest either didn't formulate any requirements for CP and didn't receive any funding for it, or reporting was not accurately done on the FTS – although it's now established as a requirement when participating in HRPs/appeals.

In addition, a review from the CP AoR entitled *Child Protection Positioning and Support for Localisation*<sup>54</sup> examined 23 HRPs and 24 HNOs in 2018. The review found that only 8% of HRPs have a dedicated child protection chapter, although 21% were able to secure a dedicated sub-chapter in their HNO. The same comparison shows that 22% of HRPs and 13% of HNOs did not mention child protection (see Annex 4).

Clearly, there is room for improvement in terms of including child protection in needs assessment and subsequent formulation in response strategy.

### 3. Funding for child protection by humanitarian response plans and appeals

Previously (see Part 1.6), we looked at aggregated total funding received by crisis over a period of eight years. But it is in many ways more pertinent to examine funding received and reported for CP by individual HRP/appeal, and therefore by crisis and by year.

Among the 20 plans in receipt of the largest amount of funding (Table 6), only two were humanitarian responses to climate and or hazard-related crises. with the Haiti 2010 appeal at the top of the list, receiving almost US\$33.5 million. Over the last eight years, conflict-related crises, and more specifically protracted crises, get more funding for CP, even when looking at annual funding. Syria (HRP 2015 and 2018) and South Sudan (HRP 2014 and 2015) received the largest funding for CP, but it is worth noting that both countries are IASC Level 3 Responses.

However, the proportion of conflict-related crises compared to climate-related crises is higher over the period under investigation, and the cluster system is not routinely activated where countries have existing national disaster response capacity to respond to the crisis. UN OCHA, in its *World Humanitarian Data and trends 2018*,<sup>56</sup> stated that out of 75

HRPs and appeals receiving funds for CP vs total number of plans and appeals by year	
Year	
2010	17/25
2011	14/24
2012	21/26
2013	16/23
2014	19/31
2015	18/32
2016	22/38
2017	25/38
2018	24/30

**TABLE 5: NUMBER OF HRPS AND APPEALS RECEIVING CP FUNDING OUT OF TOTAL NUMBER OF PLANS AND APPEALS PER YEAR**

humanitarian crises between 2013 and 2015, only three were climate-related disasters. Moreover, humanitarian crises are increasing in number and duration. As mentioned previously, according to UN OCHA the average humanitarian crisis now lasts more than nine years. But despite the fact that humanitarian crises are increasing in duration, as of 2018, multi-year planning (MYP) cycles and appeals were used in only five crises (Afghanistan 2018–2021, oPt 2018-2020, DRC 2017–2019, Haiti 2017–2018, and Sudan 2017–2019, with three additional MYP cycles starting in 2019, namely, Haiti 2019–2020, Ukraine 2019–2020 and Nigeria 2019–2021).

As identified in the study *Placing protection at the centre of humanitarian action* (2013),<sup>57</sup> commissioned by the Global Protection Cluster, protection funding concentrates in certain types of emergencies. The same is observed for child protection funding: although no specific trend can be highlighted, it is clear that some crises and emergencies get more attention than others and therefore receive more funding. The *Placing protection* study also points out that “responses to humanitarian crises are generally driven by need but then further shaped by the media and geopolitical or economic interests. Protection funding seems to be guided by similar factors”. This is also noticeable here; some crises, such as Syria and South Sudan, for instance, received more funds for CP but they do not necessarily concentrate the largest number of children in

	<b>Destination Plan (HRP/Appeal) 2010-2018</b>	<b>Funds received for child protection (US\$)</b>	<b>Children in need of humanitarian assistance (millions)</b>	<b>Children in need of protection (millions)</b>
	(blank)	201 774 838		
1	Haiti Humanitarian Appeal (Revised) (January - December 2010)	33 489 093	n.a	n.a
2	Syria Humanitarian Response Plan 2018	31 707 903	5,6	5,50
3	Syria Response Plan 2015	23 876 097	5,6	n.a
4	Republic of South Sudan - Crisis Response Plan 2014	23 486 792	3,75	n.a
5	Republic of South Sudan 2015	22 676 670	3,4	n.a
6	Bangladesh - Rohingya Refugee crisis 2017	21 548 758	0,7	0,34
7	Yemen 2018	20 064 088	11,3	6,53
8	Syria Humanitarian Response Plan 2017	18 324 322	5,8	5,80
9	Iraq 2017	18 006 529	5,1	4,26
10	Iraq 2016	13 957 826	4,7	3,61
11	Philippines - Typhoon Haiyan Strategic Response Plan (November 2013 – October 2014)	13 277 668	7,4	n.a
12	Iraq 2014	12 460 676	2,6	n.a
13	Iraq 2018	12 118 473	4	2,49
14	Syria Humanitarian Response Plan 2016	11 032 498	5,8	6,00
15	Nigeria 2018	10 624 251	4,5	3,20
16	Republic of South Sudan 2012	9 806 305	n.a	n.a
17	Sudan 2011	9 758 476	n.a	n.a
18	Nigeria 2017	9 075 738	4,4	3,29
19	Central African Republic 2014	8 933 487	2,4	n.a
20	Republic of South Sudan 2017	8 043 529	4,2	4,45

**TABLE 6: REPORTED FUNDING FOR CHILD PROTECTION BY DESTINATION PLAN – TOP 20<sup>55</sup>**

need of humanitarian and/or protection assistance. The proportion of population in need surely influences where and how funds will be allocated, but it doesn't seem to be the sole deciding factor. If it was the only determinant, we would probably have seen Yemen on the top of this list and the Rohingya refugee crisis in Bangladesh much lower down.

There is a typical pattern and profile for protection funding as emergency situations are declared, as they evolve, are resolved or become protracted crises, as identified in the Placing Protection study<sup>58</sup>. It finds that at the outset of an emergency, there is a clear underfunding for the protection sector as a whole, mainly as it is not, or not sufficiently, considered life-saving. In year two after the emergency, protection is better funded, as funding requirements are based to a higher degree on measured or estimated needs. It is also noticeable that when more evidence is provided, with clearer needs assessments and a greater degree of effectiveness of activities demonstrated, more funding can be obtained. Finally, over years three, four and five following the start of the emergency, funding for protection decreases. This happens either because organisations are moving their pro-

tection work from stand-alone activities to more mainstreamed/integrated channels, and/or because donor interest declines. This is useful for reflecting on how funding for CP for a specific crisis can evolve over time. It is also true that the way the crisis evolves, is remediated or even worsens would also influence the funding trend.

#### **4. Children's protection needs and underfunding**

Underfunding is generally understood as the difference between the amount of funds requested and the amount received. The way requests are formulated, first and foremost, is extremely important: do they accurately address actual needs? When assessing funding levels, most organisations focus on the difference between requests and funds received, rather than looking at needs on the ground and how, in setting out requirements, they plan to meet the needs of children in the first place.

Underfunding is unfortunately a major issue in humanitarian response across all



sectors; for 2017 and 2018, 60% and 56% of total requirements respectively were funded across all sectors. However, some sectors, such as protection, are more affected than others. In addition to the sectoral difference, a geographical factor in underfunding can also be identified. According to UN OCHA World Humanitarian Data and Trends 2018, for instance, the funding gap for the Sahel and Lake Chad Basin regions has been, on average, 20% above the global average since 2005.

We have observed that the protection sector is heavily underfunded (Figure 7); the underfunding of CP is well identified by a range of humanitarian actors. Nonetheless, it is difficult to estimate the precise level of underfunding of the CP sector – although what we know of protection underfunding gives a relatively good indication. Indeed, in HRP and appeals, CP is often mentioned under the protection sector, but as the CP-specific sector on the FTS is very new, finding exact information on the requirements for CP is challenging. This is a major impediment to examining the coverage and evolution of funding mapped against requirements for CP. Requirements are (with some recent, rare exceptions) calculated for protection in general, and we cannot, for obvious reasons, map CP funding against protection requirements. We hope that with the new CP sector listing on the FTS, and an improved positioning of CP in HNOs and HRPs, there will be an incentive to get precise data on the requirements for CP in the future. It would be useful to have a breakdown of overall protection requirements, clarifying the portion for each AoR. But in the meantime, the research team, by focusing on a selection of HRPs and appeals from 2018, has attempted to supply evidence for funding levels for CP.

Some 13 countries are examined in this study. Nine of these – Afghanistan, the Central African Republic (CAR), the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), Iraq, Nigeria, Somalia, South Sudan, Syria and Yemen – have been identified as the worst conflict-affected countries in which to be a child (2017).<sup>59</sup> Additionally the occupied Palestinian territory was included, as well as Bangladesh - with the Rohingya refugee crisis - plus Niger and Ukraine since detailed data on CP in these three countries were available on the FTS platform for 2018.

After gathering data on needs in the various countries, we examined the 2018 HRPs and appeals for which CP requirements and funding were clearly tracked on the FTS website; namely, Syria, Nigeria, Iraq, Bangladesh, Ukraine and Niger. For this exercise we focus

on FTS data provided online and accessed on 29 January 2019. The table in Annex 6 provides further details on the funding for each HRP in our dataset, and the amount tracked by the FTS system.

For the other 2018 HRPs/appeals, where there are no easily accessible details on the FTS website in terms of funding and requirements for CP, we located other sources and contacted local CP coordinators to obtain the CP requirements. We then mapped CP requirements against funding estimated for CP via the database developed for the study. This gave us an overview of the level of funding/underfunding for Yemen, the DRC, the CAR, Somalia, South Sudan, Afghanistan and the occupied Palestinian territory. When mapping requirements against funding identified as CP funding, we excluded funding for activities containing both CP and GBV interventions; in order to map CP specific funding against CP specific requirements. Detailed funding estimates for 'CP and GBV' (CP+GBV) for each of these response plans is however available in Annex 6.

#### 4.1. Needs overview

Based on HNOs and HRPs, Table 7 reveals, by country, the number of children in need of protection and targeted by humanitarian response, for 2018. These figures are sourced from the protection statistics of each HNO and/or HRP (i.e. number of children within the population in need of protection). For some countries, specific data was provided for children and caregivers in need within the child protection sector.

This information is of great importance for reflecting on the amount of funding required and received for each country in relation to actual needs. Crossing the financial data with data from needs assessments allows us to calculate the funding available per child targeted in each country and helps us to assess how well children's protection needs are being met. It will allow us to examine the difference between the number of children in need of protection versus the number of children targeted by the humanitarian response; that is, the number of children not receiving aid.

Note: The present study considers the number of children in need of protection when the number of children in need of child protection is not available. As a side note, the Child Protection Area of Responsibility (CP AoR) continues to advocate for appropriate positioning of child protection in HNOs and HRPs with, among others, the aim to show specific data for children (and caregivers) in need of child protection.



CHILDREN IN NEED OF PROTECTION (data: HNO and HRP 2018)				
2018	Children in need of protection	Children targeted	Sector (within HRP/HNO)	Source
Iraq	2 496 000	1 056 000	Protection	HRP 2018
Niger	413 400	358 280	Protection	HNO 2018; HRP2018
Nigeria	3 200 000	1 000 000	Child Protection (incl. caregivers)	HNO 2018; HRP2018
'	2 500 000	700 000	Child Protection (excl. caregivers)	HNO 2018; HRP2018
'	3 364 000	1 566 000	Protection	HRP 2018
Syria	5 500 000	3 977 000	Protection	HNO 2018; HRP2018
Ukraine	495 000	260 000	Protection	HNO 2018; HRP2018
Bangladesh: Rohingya refugee crisis	505 439	505 439	Child Protection	Joint Response Plan
'	501 886	501 886	Protection	Joint Response Plan
Yemen	6 530 000	3 400 000	Protection	HRP 2018
DRC	7 781 400	7 781 400	Protection	HRP 2017-2019 - 2018 Update
CAR	1 250 000	950 000	Protection	HRP 2018
Somalia	2 268 000	990 000	Protection	HNO 2018; HRP2018
South Sudan	3 904 000	2 440 000	Protection	HRP 2018
occupied Palestinian territory	878 850	878 850	Protection	HRP 2018
'	340 000		Child Protection	HNO 2018
Afghanistan	915 000	671 000	Protection (Acute 2018)	HNO 2018; HRP2018
'	1 525 000		Protection (Chronic needs)	HNO 2018

**TABLE 7: NEEDS ASSESSMENT FOR 13 SELECTED COUNTRIES WITH HUMANITARIAN RESPONSE PLANS (HRPS) IN 2018**


HRP (✓) or other appeals (✗)	2018	2017	2016	2015	2014	2013	2012	2011	2010
Afghanistan	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Bangladesh: Rohingya refugee crisis	✗	✗							
CAR	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
DRC	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Iraq	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓				✗
Niger	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Nigeria	✓	✓	✓	✓					
occupied Palestinian territory	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Somalia	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
South Sudan	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	(Sudan)
Syria	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
Ukraine	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓				
Yemen	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

**TABLE 8: HUMANITARIAN RESPONSE PLANS AND APPEALS 2010–2018 FOR 13 SELECTED COUNTRIES**

**Protection:** Boys play table football at a Save the Children Child Protection Center in Mosul, northern Iraq.

PHOTO: CLAIRE THOMAS /  
SAVE THE CHILDREN





**FIGURE 17: HUMANITARIAN RESPONSE PLANS AND APPEALS 2018, FUNDING PROGRESS FOR CHILD PROTECTION (FTS ONLINE – 29 JANUARY 2019)**

The majority of these crises have had an HRP (Table 8, p. 29) every year for the seven last years. These are multi-year crises relying on annual funding cycles. Indeed, multi-year planning was used in only four countries in this list, starting from either 2017 or 2018: Afghanistan 2018–2021, oPt 2018–2020, DRC 2017–2019, and Sudan 2017–2019.

#### 4.2. UN OCHA FTS online: requirements and funding for child protection, 2018


As indicated previously, for a few 2018 HRPs and appeals, progress in CP funding is tracked separately from the protection sector on the FTS.<sup>60</sup> These CP-specific data on funding and requirements are available for Syria, Nigeria, Iraq, Bangladesh, Ukraine and Niger for 2018 and presented in Figure 17.

This illustrates underfunding more clearly, but the problem doesn't seem to affect all crises in the same way (Figure 17). The Rohingya refugee crisis in Bangladesh and the Syrian crisis, for instance, show relatively high coverage for the CP requirements formulated in their response plans, with coverage rates of 82% and 71% respectively. However, based on the FTS data, the funding gap is indisputably wide for Niger and Nigeria, for instance; their coverage rates are 17% and 28% respectively. Finally, CP interventions in Iraq and Ukraine also appear underfunded, with funding covering only half of the requirements.

#### 4.3. Estimates based on HRP details and FTS data: requirements and funding for child protection, 2018

For the remaining countries, namely Yemen, the DRC, the CAR, Somalia, South Sudan, the occupied Palestinian territory and Afghanistan, the study had to resort to other sources of information than the FTS to examine the funding level. Requirements for CP for the 2018 humanitarian responses in Somalia, South Sudan and the occupied Palestinian territory are sourced from UN OCHA Online Planning/Project System (OPS) where details of projects are provided for each HRP for 2018. These documents provide a summary table of requirements by IASC Standard Sectors, where CP is a specific sector and CP requirements are therefore available. When such information was not available (i.e. for Yemen, Afghanistan, the CAR and the DRC), CP coordinators in the field were contacted (January 2019) as well as the CP AoR to obtain information on the amount of funding requested for CP in terms of the humanitarian response needed.

To estimate the funding of CP in these countries, we then compared the requirements with funding allocated to CP as shown in our dataset for the same crisis. However, we had to exclude funding for CP+GBV as these funds might need to be mapped against requirements for GBV and not CP. Funding categorised by the research team as 'integrated CP/CP as a main component of the intervention' were kept. The table in Annex 6 provides details on funding for CP+GBV and 'integrated CP' for each country.



**FIGURE 18: HUMANITARIAN RESPONSE PLANS AND APPEALS 2018: ESTIMATED FUNDING PROGRESS FOR CHILD PROTECTION (BASED ON FTS DATA – EXCLUDING IDENTIFIED ‘CP AND GBV’ FUNDING)**

Here again, we found that underfunding of CP was not uniform across all countries (Figure 18). Afghanistan, the DRC and the CAR seem to be the most affected, with coverage rates estimated ranging from 18% to 29%. Somalia and Yemen also seem to be seriously underfunded, with funding covering only 46% and 58% of requirements respectively.

## 5. The consequences of underfunding

Although funding for CP grows over time, relative to the growth of humanitarian funding and increasing needs, CP receives a very minimal share of humanitarian aid (averaging only 0.53% over the last eight years). CP funding is clearly extremely limited compared with other sectors, but also in view of the needs of the children involved. Underfunding of the sector has been cited as a significant problem by CP professionals. According to the CP AoR 2017 Annual Survey, “CP funding remains the top or second main challenge faced by coordination groups. 50% of groups report a marginal or substantial decrease in funding in 2017, whereas in 2016, 57% of CP groups reported a funding increase.”

The graphs and data provided above (Figures 17 and 18) demonstrated clear underfunding for CP in many countries, leading to dramatic consequences for CP interventions. With underfunding and limited funding, child protection services are often drastically downscaled as service delivery capacity is seriously impacted. The outreach is also increasingly limited to certain areas, and it

becomes impossible to retain staff and ensure continuity. The 2018 mid-year review of Afghanistan’s 2018–2021 HRP mentions that some child protection services for returnee children at border crossing points had to be stopped temporarily due to a shortage of financial resources for partner service providers. As a result of limited resources and lack of investment in crucial services, children in need of protection won’t have access to the services and assistance they require.

## 6. Volatility of child protection funding

Although we should refer to this data with caution, the study also highlighted examples of emergencies that are relatively well funded with regards to CP. There is, however, a noticeable volatility at work, with levels of funding for CP varying according to the crisis, the country, the year, etc. This volatility was also identified for the protection sector between countries, years, but also between Protection AoRs (in the study *Placing protection at the centre of humanitarian action*, commissioned by the Global Protection Cluster in 2013). This study on protection stressed the importance, not only of the needs themselves, but also of media attention and geopolitical and economic interest in shaping the response and attracting greater protection funding. Added to these factors could be the donor’s sense of where they can best make a difference. In CP, the same tends to apply. It is clear that crises and countries are differently affected by CP underfunding; some crises do

seem to attract more attention and therefore higher levels of funding for CP.

As these observations point to the conclusion that underfunding of CP is not systematic, one should reflect on how we could improve resource mobilisation in all crises. It is crucial to reinforce advocacy and dialogue with donors and highlight the life-saving character of CP interventions while informing donors of the enormous needs of the sector as assessed by many HNOs. Actors in the field need to continue collecting evidence of needs and demonstrating CP interventions' effectiveness; this will also facilitate access to new and existing funding to invest in protecting children in humanitarian crises.

## 7. Final funding for child protection is shaped by needs assessments and formulation of funding requests

Even if CP can seem well funded in some cases, our analysis above only assesses funding levels relative to requests. But we must also question how funding requests are formulated and whether they reflect actual needs. This will permit to outline the gap between actual needs and funding received.

First and foremost, funding requirements are often calculated for a targeted portion of the population in need (children in need vs children targeted) – not necessarily to support all children in need. Various considerations such as capacity to absorb funding, access to population in need and security restrictions could limit the ability of some organisations to address the total population in need. However, based on discussions with CP practitioners,<sup>61</sup> there are indications that requirements and financial needs for CP might not always reflect actual needs, an asymmetry that some refer to as 'under-asking'. The Humanitarian Response Planning Quick Guide (Sept. 2017)<sup>62</sup> mentioned that the Global Protection Cluster was also warned by the CERF that "funding requests for protection do not reflect the importance placed on it by the IASC, and that it seemed particularly true for child protection and response to SGBV". In addition to describing the often-limited visibility of CPs in HRPs, some CP coordinators mentioned (in the CP AoR 2018 annual survey) that "financial needs were not reflected properly" in HRPs. Finally, the same survey affirms that "Some local NGOs tend not to apply for HRP funds as CP is often underfunded, thus discouraging NNGOs from applying; national NGOs often don't get

direct funds, and a lot of national CBOs end up not applying for the HRP".

In assessing CP funding, we've compared the number of children in need with the number of children actually targeted by each humanitarian response. Additionally, our study also crossed financial data with needs assessment data (detailed needs assessments are presented in Table 7 above). The findings of this cross-analysis are presented in Table 9 below. Table 9 and the following discussion illustrate the gap between funding received for CP compared with actual needs.

By dividing the funding available for CP (Column B in table 9) in each humanitarian response by the number of children in need targeted to receive CP services (Column D), we obtained the average amount available per child for CP services for 2018 (Column E). This is a simplified way to view the data, as it doesn't consider the difference in activities or geographical context. Nevertheless, the results are worrying: humanitarian actors in the 13 countries studied have between US\$1 and US\$31 available to spend per child to provide CP services to those targeted in 2018. Even the highest amount in this analysis (US\$31/child/year, in Bangladesh) is extremely low. We are left wondering what could possibly be funded, and at what level of quality, with such small amounts.

The research team also reflected on how to estimate funding requirements if we were to meet all children's needs for protection in these 13 countries. Our ambition was to visualise the gap between current funding for CP and actual needs. We made the assumption that in a humanitarian response, funding requirements are (in theory) calculated to provide certain services to meet the needs of the targeted population. In this case, requirements for child protection are supposedly set to provide the required CP services to all targeted children in need of protection. By dividing the funding requirements by the number of children targeted by each HRP, we get an estimation of the average cost of providing CP services for each targeted child for the whole year (Baseline (1)). Finally, by multiplying this baseline (average cost per child) by the actual number of children in needs (Column C) we obtain the estimated requirement funding to meet all children in need in each country, based on how requirements were initially formulated in the HRP and if we were to scale up the various programs without additional costs. The results are provided in the second column from the right (Estimated requirements).



HRP and Appeals 2018	Requirements (US\$ million) for Child Protection (A)	Funding received for child protection (US\$ million) (B)	Coverage (%)	Children in need of protection/child protection (C)	Children in need of protection/child protection targeted by the humanitarian response (D)	Sector of needs (HRP/HNO 2018)	Funds (US\$) available per child targeted for 2018 (E =B/C)	Baseline (1): HRP requirement per child targeted (=A/D)	Estimated requirements to meet all children's needs (US\$ million) (using Baseline (1))
Syria 2018	42,87	30,44	71 %	5 500 000	3 977 000	Protection	8	11	59,29
Nigeria 2018	39,72	10,99	28 %	2 500 000*	1 000 000	Child Protection	11	40	99,30
Iraq 2018	22,18	11,45	52 %	2 496 000	1 056 000	Protection	11	21	52,42
Bangladesh	19,40	15,82	82 %	505 439	505 439	Child Protection	31	38	19,40
Ukraine 2018	6,35	3,36	53 %	495 000	260 000	Protection	13	24	12,08
Niger 2018	4,88	0,82	17 %	413 400	358 280	Protection	2	14	5,63
Yemen 2018	34,65	20,06	58 %	6 530 000	3 400 000	Protection	6	10	66,54
DRC 2018	21,00	6,11	29 %	7 781 400	7 781 400	Protection	1	3	21,00
CAR 2018	18,41	4,63	25 %	1 250 000	950 000	Protection	5	19	24,22
Somalia 2018	6,86	3,16	46 %	2 268 000	990 000	Protection	3	7	15,71
South Sudan 2018	4,90	4,23	86 %	3 904 000	2 440 000	Protection	2	2	7,84
occupied Palestinian territory 2018	1,95	2,71	139 %	878 850	878 850	Protection	3	2	1,95
Afghanistan 2018	9,38	1,65	18 %	915 000	671 000	Protection	2	14	12,79

Data sources: **FTS online data - accessed on 10/01/2019**  
**Estimated funds received for CP - based on FTS data (Set 3); excl. CP+GBV**  
**Requirements for CP sourced from HRP project details (requirements per IASC sector)**  
**Data provided by CP local coordinators and by the CP AoR for DRC**

**TABLE 9: FUNDING AND REQUIREMENTS FOR CHILD PROTECTION IN 13 SELECTED COUNTRIES AND NUMBERS OF CHILDREN IN NEED OF PROTECTION**

Note: The figure 'Children in need of protection/child protection' for Nigeria HRP 2018 does not include the 700 000 caregivers in need of child protection identified.

To illustrate the calculation, the following is an example from Syria's HRP 2018:


- Requirements for child protection interventions in 2018 amount to US\$42.9 million; the number of children targeted by protection interventions in the same HRP is almost four million.
- Assuming that requirements are put forward to finance activities to meet the need of all children targeted, the cost per child is US\$10.7 (Baseline (1)).
- If we were to finance the same activities to meet the need of all children in need, in the same country and in the same year, we would estimate requirements at US\$59.2 million. This doesn't account however for potential additional costs for security measures and access to beneficiaries.

Again, the ambition of our review is not to provide precise funding requirements for CP interventions to meet all child protection needs in these 13 countries. These are merely estimates based on data available and initial requirements of the various humanitarian responses. But our aim is to provide a useful, graphic illustration of the enormous gap between funding available and funding

needed to provide CP services to all children in need in each of these countries. We want to demonstrate as clearly as possible that the overall funding for CP is too little compared with actual needs.

In addition, the CP requirements in the 13 HRPs studied suggest that the average annual cost of providing CP services for each targeted child varies between US\$2 to \$40 per child/per year (Baseline (1) in Table 9; average of US\$16 per child). Further research, based on information publicly available, show that many CP specific activities would cost a lot more (Figure 1b). For instance, it was found that case management services for children at risk are estimated to range from US\$167 up to US\$2423 per child according to geographies and context of intervention.<sup>63</sup> Other examples, from Iraq and Ethiopia, indicates that some activities aiming at providing psychosocial support to children can reach US\$40-50 per child.<sup>64</sup> In addition, Yemen's HRP for 2018- a level 3 humanitarian response - suggests that US\$1016 per child are needed to provide critical child protection services. Last, at the lower end of the spectrum, awareness raising activities are estimated to cost US\$7 to US\$10 per child.<sup>65</sup>


**FIGURE 1A: SELECTION OF 2018 HRPS AND APPEALS:**  
**Funding progress for child protection and estimates of requirements to meet all children's protection needs based on HRP initial CP requirements**



**FIGURE 1B: FUNDING PER CHILD IN NEED OF PROTECTION AND COST ESTIMATES OF CHILD PROTECTION ACTIVITIES (US\$/CHILD/YEAR)**

The bars show the actual costs of different child protection interventions in USD, while the bottom two horizontal lines show how little the funding received and requested covers. The top horizontal line shows how much of the needs would be covered if funding level reached 4% of humanitarian aid.

(SOURCE: AWARENESS RAISING: ENDNOTE 8; PSYCHO-SOCIAL: ENDNOTE 9; CASE MANAGEMENT: ENDNOTE 10; 13 HRPS: FIGURE 9)



Naturally these costs vary between regions, countries and contexts. Some of the drivers of cost differences are indicated to be:

- local price levels
- scale of the case management program (programs operated at larger scale or sharing fixed costs with other programs are most cost-efficient)
- proportion of international staff deployed vs national staff
- geographical proximity and accessibility of population

The various cost estimations identified indicate that the gap in CP funding is wider and even more alarming than initially thought. It is urgent to act on this knowledge by:

- making sure funding requests accurately reflect the scale of the needs and costs of CP interventions of quality;
- increasing substantially the funding for CP services to meet all children's needs of protection;
- undertake value for money analyses for key CP interventions in order to understand and communicate cost ranges for quality intervention.

---

## CONCLUSION

Funding for CP has increased over the last decade, but relative to the growth of total humanitarian funding and funding for other sectors it is very limited, representing on average only 0.5% of total humanitarian funding (2010–2018). Child protection, although it is a life-saving sector, is not generally perceived as such. CP is increasingly a specific area of focus in Humanitarian Needs Overviews (HNOs), but its position remains inferiorly positioned in Humanitarian Response Plans (HRPs). CP should be addressed systematically in both HNOs and in HRPs, according to identified needs, as it is well recognised that children face increased risks and vulnerabilities during a crisis<sup>66</sup> and that timely CP interventions are life-saving.<sup>67</sup> In addition, as documented by the CPWG: “While mainstreaming protection is valuable, the reality is that children have specific protection needs which are not provided by other sectors. These require a tailored response.”<sup>68</sup> In other

words, stand-alone CP interventions during emergencies are absolutely essential.

Our study has identified clear underfunding of CP in a number of humanitarian response plans in 2018. However, the underfunding is even more alarming when we look beyond the difference between funding available and funding required. Funding requests are often formulated to meet the needs of only a portion of children in need (children in need vs children

targeted), leaving many neglected. There are indications that requirements may not reflect actual needs, that there often is an asymmetry between the funding requirements and the financial resources that would actually be needed to protect all children effectively in humanitarian responses. Some CP practitioners describe this as ‘under-asking’. By examining actual needs and available cost estimations of child protection activities, our study has found that the gap appears to be even wider and more distressing than we had thought. Overall, the protection needs of children in emergencies are far from being met, and this is unacceptable. All children, no matter where they live, have the right to protection from violence, abuse or neglect.<sup>69</sup>

With low levels of funding and even critical underfunding in some areas, the quality of child protection services is directly impacted and does not permit the needs of all children to be addressed. This has direct consequences for the lives and suffering of children affected by conflicts and disasters.

Ensuring robust funding for child protection is crucial to alleviating children’s suffering, reunifying them with their families and loved ones, providing appropriate and to facilitate quality case management and referral services and security to their recovery. Additional funding is needed to protect all children in need and to ensure the continuity of these life-saving interventions.

Political and community leaders, governments, humanitarian actors and CP practitioners can all do more to increase the level of funding for CP in emergencies. We share a common responsibility to ensure that sufficient funding is in place to protect children in emergencies.

---

**Ensuring robust funding for child protection is crucial to alleviating children’s suffering**

**Internally displaced:** Jamal Ismail Mohamoud, counselor at a Save the Children Child Friendly Space in the city Burao in Somaliland. More than 1.5 million people have become internally displaced in Somalia since November 2016 as a result of drought, conflict and flooding.

PHOTO: CLAIRE THOMAS /  
SAVE THE CHILDREN





**Separated and reunited:**  
When cyclone Idai struck their home in Buzi, Mozambique, Lorenzo's grandmother had to hand him to the rescue helicopter. Now Lorenzo (13) is back with his grandparents.

PHOTO: RIK GOVERDE / SAVE THE CHILDREN



---

## RECOMMENDATIONS

It is time for all leaders, governments and humanitarian actors to re-commit to protecting children in emergencies and to act on our shared responsibility for upholding children's rights by increasing funding for child protection interventions. We call for an increase in the proportion of overall humanitarian funding to be devoted to for child protection interventions: at least 4% of total humanitarian aid is needed.

**We call on humanitarian actors, child-protection practitioners at local and global level, and donors to:**

- fully recognise and promote the life-saving character of child protection in all humanitarian responses and to prioritise child protection, as per identified needs, throughout the Humanitarian Programme Cycle
  - strengthen the integration of child protection outcomes across sectors in line with the principle of the Centrality of Protection in Humanitarian Action,<sup>70</sup> while also supporting stand-alone child protection interventions that are essential to alleviate suffering and save the lives of children
  - increase the quality of child protection interventions and invest in monitoring and evaluation to demonstrate effectiveness
  - ensure funding requests accurately reflect the needs and significance of child protection interventions. Further analysis should be undertaken to define the cost of high-quality child protection interventions and ensure that real costs are reflected in stated funding requirements.
- Additionally, we ask donors to:
    - commit to increased multi-year funding to better meet the protection needs of children in crisis with the aim of increasing the proportion of global humanitarian funding for child protection programmes from 0.5% to 4% at a minimum
    - improve reporting for child protection funding on the UN OCHA-hosted Financial Tracking Service (FTS) so that child protection funding is clearly identifiable and trackable within the protection sector.
  - We also ask child protection actors to prioritise child protection in strategic partnership with donors. Ensure high-quality funding applications and increase operational capability to be able to absorb increased funding and deliver high-quality programmes.
  - In addition, we ask UN and humanitarian actors to ensure that Humanitarian Needs Overviews and Response Plans always provide detailed needs and funding requirements for child protection within the protection sector.
  - Finally, we urge donors and humanitarian actors to investigate new sources of funding for child protection and mobilise new child-focused recovery funding as a core element of post-conflict reconstruction, building human capital by investing in children's education, mental health and psychosocial support.

---

**We call for an increase in the proportion of overall humanitarian funding to be devoted to for child protection interventions: at least 4% of total humanitarian aid is needed.**

---

# ANNEXES

## ANNEX 1: DETAILED METHODOLOGY

Elaboration of a new and consolidated child protection dataset with data sourced from the FTS.

Two datasets were downloaded from the FTS website on 29 November 2018:

- Set 1: all funding flows for the protection sector
- Set 2: all funding flows for the child protection sector

The following data options were selected: organisation, organisation type, emergency, usage year, plan, field cluster, flow ID, flow status, flow data, flow type, description, amount, reporting organisation. Pledges were not considered, only commitment and paid contributions.

From 'Set 1', data focusing on CP was isolated by using keyword searches and conditional formatting. A 'Set 1-bis' was created by removing all flows whose descriptions<sup>71</sup> didn't include one of the following key words: 'child', 'youth', 'young', 'adolescent', 'orphan', 'girl', 'boy', 'minor', 'infant', 'baby', or 'babies', 'family' or 'families', 'right to play'. Keywords used include the translation of the afore-mentioned terms in French, as some flows were reported with a French description.<sup>72</sup> By inserting a keyword in its singular form, the plural of the same word was included, as well as words derived from the same root. For instance, the keyword 'child' will allow inclusion of funding flows containing in their descriptions words such as 'children' and 'childhood'. Likewise, by using the keyword 'child' or 'minor', interventions focusing on 'separated children' or 'unaccompanied minors' will be included when the description of the project contains said keywords.

After this initial phase (Set 1-bis), the research team embarked began looking more closely at the funding flows. First, we excluded all funding flows whose description focused on vulnerable groups including children (and not specifically for children).<sup>73</sup> Likewise, we excluded all activities targeting women (keywords: women, woman, and, in French, femme(s)). The rationale behind this choice is that integrating activities focusing on the protection of both women and children, or women and girls, could skew the way we perceive funding for child protection. However,

we retained for our study those funding flows which mention 'children and families' as well as 'mothers and children'. We also removed all activities focusing on 'minorities' (sexual or religious minorities for instance), as well as funding flows for assistance to returnees 'including unaccompanied minors' (i.e. not specifically for minors). Finally, 'young/youth'-related funding flows were also removed when there was no indication that these were activities for children and not young people over 18 years old.<sup>74</sup> However, we decided to retain all funding flows whose description mentioned for 'children and young people' or 'children and youth' as the focus was on children.


We also kept funding flows that stated a double focus on child protection and sexual-and gender-based violence (SGBV). These two sectors are strongly interlinked, and when funding flows are directed at both CP and GBV (where specific portions are not identifiable) we decided to consider them as part of CP. However, we added the following categories to our dataset in order to track in greater detail the various funding flows considered as CP in the study (see Annex 2 for the composition of the dataset used in this study):

- CP FTS: reported under the CP sector on the FTS
- CP est: reported under the protection sector on the FTS, identified as CP by the research team
- CP+GBV est.: reported under the protection sector on the FTS, identified as CP+GBV by the research team
- CP integ/mainstreamed est.: reported under the protection sector on the FTS, identified as CP mainstreamed or integrated with other sectoral activities by the research team (for instance CP and Education or CP and WASH projects)

Within the protection sector, activities described as 'protection' with no additional details given, were not taken into consideration. Naturally, some of these might have dedicated activities for child protection, but as we had no information on the details of the activities undertaken, we removed them from the dataset. Likewise, some funding reported on the FTS under the health or education sectors might have included support CP activities, as protection outcomes are integrated across multiple sectors. However, it was

unfortunately impossible to account for all these funds when the focus was not on protection specifically (and therefore not reported under the protection sector). In addition, we adopted as our working assumption that all funding flows under the protection category were exclusively or primarily directed towards protection activities. Our criteria thus aimed at isolating all funding flows where child protection was a major focus. Another assumption was that all funding flows already categorised or re-categorised as child protection by the FTS team in 2017 are indeed funding for child protection – we did not challenge the FTS categorisation of these funds.

A ‘Set 3: Child protection modified’ was thus created on 30 November 2018,<sup>75</sup> compiling Set 1-bis and Set 2, downloaded from the FTS and modified by Save the Children. This Set 3 is the basis of all CP-related graphs and figures in our study, unless expressly indicated. In our data analysis, we considered the year of destination usage for each funding flow. When CP funding is compared with other sectors or total humanitarian funding, data is sourced directly from the FTS website. The FTS is a real-time online database; our study was based on data available on the FTS on 21 and 28 November 2018, except when expressly indicated.



**FIGURE 2: METHODOLOGY - SIMPLIFIED SCHEMA**


	CP funding - data sourced from UN OCHA FTS	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	Grand Total
Set 1-bis	Reported under the Protection sector	78 899 917	53 292 157	50 218 025	67 439 859	100 532 396	96 271 708	93 180 297	96 219 305	49 415 247	692 855 373
	CP	79 319 802	47 521 721	43 717 064	61 902 569	77 784 280	81 682 727	69 619 729	64 202 329	32 817 667	558 567 888
	CP+GBV	6 588 853	700 000	1 978 082	2 038 759	9 733 792	6 020 089	7 063 391	8 459 040	4 590 528	47 172 534
	CP integrated or as a main component of the intervention	2 613 909	4 770 436	5 615 284	3 498 531	12 487 752	9 115 598	13 448 453	23 557 936	12 007 052	87 114 951
Set 2	Reported under the Child Protection sector	3 290 189	1 931 686	8 001 809	10 286 941	7 374 044	8 155 811	23 915 518	27 131 350	122 452 565	212 539 913
	CP FTS	3 290 189	1 931 686	8 001 809	10 286 941	7 374 044	8 155 811	23 915 518	27 131 350	122 452 565	212 539 913
Set 3	Grand Total	82 190 106	55 223 843	58 219 834	77 726 800	107 906 440	104 427 519	117 095 815	123 350 655	171 867 812	905 395 286

**ANNEX 2: COMPOSITION OF THE DATASET**

**Q42:** Compared to this time last year, would you say funding for CPIE has:



**Q43:** How does the current level of funding for Child Protection compare to the CP funding needs in your context?




**Q44:** What percentage (%) of the Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP) for Protection was allocated to Child Protection?

❖ Ten respondents were unsure how much was specifically allocated to Child Protection

❖ Seven countries reported the following percentages allocated to Child Protection:

- 1 – 10% - 2 countries
- 11 – 20% - 1 country
- 21 – 30% - 1 country
- 31 – 40% - 0
- 41 – 50% - 1 country
- 51 – 60% - 2 countries

**Q45:** Do the members of your coordination group think that the HRP allocation to CP was fair and proportional to the numbers of children in need, required activities, & coordination group targets?




**Why not?**

- Child protection is often not viewed as a priority
- Under-funding does not allow for scale-up or capacity development
- In one case, only one UN agency was funded, and no other CP Coordination group members were funded

**Comparison between 2015 – 2017 Data on Top Challenge**



2017 showed more varied perceptions of top challenges as compared with 2015 & 2016, with **lack of sufficient funds, CP technical capacity, and low visibility** ranked by five countries each as their top challenge.



**ANNEX 3: CHILD PROTECTION AREA OF RESPONSIBILITY 2017 ANNUAL SURVEY.**


Selected information from the Analysis summary

**Comparison of CP in 2018 HNOs vs HRPs**



**ANNEX 4: CP AOR REVIEW OF CHILD PROTECTION POSITIONING AND LOCALISATION – 2018 HNOS AND HRPS.**

Summary of the analysis – accessed online 30 January 2019



**ANNEX 5: CHILD PROTECTION FUNDING BY DONOR AS REPORTED ON THE FTS**

(TOP TEN FOR THE PERIOD 2010–2018 – NATIONAL GOVERNMENT)



Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP) 2018	Estimated funding for CP (SET 3)	Funding for CP: reported under 'CP' on the FTS (29/01/2018)	Requirements	Coverage rate (with estimated funding for CP)	Coverage rate (with FTS funding for CP)	
<b>Syria Humanitarian Response Plan 2018</b>	<b>31 707 903</b>	<b>30 441 053</b>	<b>42 873 615</b>	<b>74 %</b>	<b>71 %</b>	Requirements were indicated in the HRP
CP FTS	31 707 903					
<b>Nigeria 2018</b>	<b>10 624 251</b>	<b>10 992 349</b>	<b>39 719 941</b>	<b>27 %</b>	<b>28 %</b>	
CP FTS	10 624 251					
<b>Iraq 2018</b>	<b>12 118 473</b>	<b>11 454 879</b>	<b>22 177 235</b>	<b>55 %</b>	<b>52 %</b>	
CP FTS	12 118 473					
<b>Bangladesh</b>	<b>17 380 643</b>	<b>15 824 617</b>	<b>19 400 000</b>	<b>90 %</b>	<b>82 %</b>	
CP FTS	17 380 643					
<b>Ukraine Humanitarian Response Plan 2018</b>	<b>2 723 316</b>	<b>3 358 382</b>	<b>6 346 138</b>	<b>43 %</b>	<b>53 %</b>	
CP FTS	2 723 316					
<b>Niger 2018</b>	<b>3 189 578*</b>	<b>821 769</b>	<b>4 883 579</b>	<b>65 %</b>	<b>17 %</b>	
CP FTS	3 189 578					
<b>Yemen 2018</b>	<b>20 064 088</b>	n.a.	<b>34 645 077</b>	<b>58 %</b>		Requirements were found in HRP projects details (requirements per IASC sector) or communicated by local CP coordinators / CP AoR
CP est.	11 309 207					
CP FTS	8 754 881					
<b>Democratic Republic of the Congo 2018</b>	<b>6 794 325</b>	n.a.	<b>21 000 000</b>	<b>32 %</b>		
CP est.	943 090		CP funding without GBV			
CP FTS	1 564 903		6 110 239	29 %		
<b>CP Integ/maintreamed est.</b>	<b>3 602 246</b>					
<b>CP+GBV est.</b>	<b>684 086</b>					
<b>Central African Republic 2018</b>	<b>4 630 814</b>	n.a.	<b>18 409 008</b>	<b>25 %</b>		
CP est.	4 178 807					
<b>CP Integ/maintreamed est.</b>	<b>452 007</b>					
<b>Somalia 2018</b>	<b>4 506 171</b>	n.a.	<b>6 859 590**</b>	<b>66 %</b>		
CP est.	1 254 294		CP funding without GBV			
CP FTS	1 166 594		3 164 529	46 %		
<b>CP Integ/maintreamed est.</b>	<b>743 641</b>					
<b>CP+GBV est.</b>	<b>1 341 642</b>					
<b>Republic of South Sudan 2018</b>	<b>4 333 297</b>	n.a.	<b>4 899 875</b>	<b>88 %</b>		
CP est.	1 016 798		CP funding without GBV			
CP FTS	1 571 500		4 228 677	86 %		
<b>CP Integ/maintreamed est.</b>	<b>1 640 379</b>					
<b>CP+GBV est.</b>	<b>104 620</b>					
<b>occupied Palestinian territory 2018 (part of 2018-2020 HRP)</b>	<b>2 707 148</b>	n.a.	<b>1 949 334</b>	<b>139 %</b>		
CP est.	756 061					
CP FTS	1 951 087					
<b>Afghanistan 2018</b>	<b>2 438 657</b>	n.a.	<b>9 378 000</b>	<b>26 %</b>		
CP est.	1 167 082		CP funding without GBV			
CP FTS	189 774		1 647 584	18 %		
<b>CP Integ/maintreamed est.</b>	<b>290 728</b>					
<b>CP+GBV est.</b>	<b>791 073</b>					

Note:

**CP FTS:** reported as CP on the FTS

**CP est:** reported as Protection on the FTS, identified as CP by the research team

**CP+GBV est.:** reported as Protection on the FTS, identified as CP+GBV by the research team

**CP integ/mainstreamed est.:** reported as Protection on the FTS, identified as CP mainstreamed or integrated with other sectorial activities by the research team

\*This amount was reported for Niger HRP 2018 in November 2018. However in December 2018 it was confirmed that the contribution of US\$2,9 million from UNICEF National Committee Germany was for a Nutrition project.

\*\* Sourced from UN OCHA HRP project details and adjusted to the final protection requirements for Somalia's HRP 2018. UN OCHA estimated CP requirements = US\$ 6 675 351, and Protection requirements = US\$ 95 357 332, where final HRP protection requirements are = US\$ 97 989 189.

## ANNEX 6: DETAILS ON FUNDS RECEIVED AND REQUIREMENTS FOR THE SELECTION OF 2018 HRPs

---

## ENDNOTES

- 1 Child Protection Area of Responsibility (CP AoR), 'Review of Child Protection Positioning and Support for Localisation' (Online summary of the analysis), Child Protection Area of Responsibility, 2018, [https://gallery.mailchimp.com/29a879678bc603215f0a197d1/files/0e10d0c3-48f9-4953-8df5-e9ee91dc457c/Final\\_HNO\\_and\\_HRP\\_Baseline\\_2018\\_CP\\_Positioning\\_and\\_Visibility\\_of\\_Localis....pdf](https://gallery.mailchimp.com/29a879678bc603215f0a197d1/files/0e10d0c3-48f9-4953-8df5-e9ee91dc457c/Final_HNO_and_HRP_Baseline_2018_CP_Positioning_and_Visibility_of_Localis....pdf)
- 2 Discussions with CP and humanitarian experts in Save the Children and CPWG, *A matter of life and death: child protection programming's essential role in ensuring child wellbeing and survival during and after emergencies* (Briefing Paper), CPWG, The Child Protection Working Group, 2015 [https://resourcecentre.savethechildren.net/node/9462/pdf/saving\\_lives\\_briefing\\_paper\\_31032015.pdf](https://resourcecentre.savethechildren.net/node/9462/pdf/saving_lives_briefing_paper_31032015.pdf)
- 3 S Lilley, J MacVeigh, C McCormick and M Buswell, *Too little, too late: Child protection funding in emergencies*, CPWG, The Child Protection Working Group, 2011, <https://resourcecentre.savethechildren.net/node/4382/pdf/4382.pdf>
- 4 The Humanitarian Programme Cycle was activated in 21 countries in 2018.
- 5 See note 1.
- 6 Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Central African Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Iraq, Niger, Nigeria, occupied Palestinian territory, Somalia, South Sudan, Syria, Ukraine, Yemen
- 7 This is calculated by dividing US\$172 million, corresponding to the funding identified for child protection in 2018, by the total number of children in need of protection in the world in 2018, i.e. 50 million. This figure does not reflect the variety of interventions, scale of needs and or costs according to geographical difference.
- 8 Iraq Child Protection Operational Framework with costing (30 December 2018) and indications from the Global Protection Cluster (GPC), Unit-based costing methodologies from HRPs and Protection clusters, 2018, GPC <http://www.globalprotectioncluster.org/wp-content/uploads/Protection-Cluster-HRPs-unit-based-costing.pdf>
- 9 Ethiopia's HRP for 2019: \$40 per child for psychosocial support through child-friendly spaces; Iraq Child Protection Operational Framework with costing (30 December 2018): US\$40 to US\$50 per child for structured PSS
- 10 The IRC's case management services cost an average of \$764 per child over the course of one year in urban settings in the Middle East, \$187 in refugee/IDP camps in eastern Africa, and \$874 in rural Sahel areas. Case management services cost an average of \$167 in camp settings in Tanzania, and \$2423 in rural Mali. International Rescue Committee (IRC), Cost efficiency Analysis: Child Protection Case Management, IRC, 2016 <https://www.rescue.org/sites/default/files/document/955/cpcmdesignedbrieffinal.pdf>
- 11 In addition to figures reflected in the IRC's study (2016) (see note 10) other examples used to calculate the average include: US\$1900 for Lebanon (Child Protection Case Management in Lebanon, XXX (to be completed), 2017) US\$250 for Ethiopia (HRP 2019); for Iraq US\$400 (The Cluster for Early Recovery, HRP costing methodology options, Cluster for Early Recovery, July 2017 <https://reliefweb.int/report/world/hrp-costing-methodology-options>) and US\$550 (Iraq Child Protection Operational Framework with costing, 30 December 2018), and US\$750 (J Baker and M Salway, Development of a proposal for a methodology to cost inter-agency humanitarian response plans, October 2016 [https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/system/files/reponse\\_plan\\_costing\\_study\\_oct\\_2016.pdf](https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/system/files/reponse_plan_costing_study_oct_2016.pdf))
- 12 CPWG, Minimum standards for child protection in humanitarian action, CPWG The Child Protection Working Group, 2012, [https://resourcecentre.savethechildren.net/node/6819/pdf/cp\\_minimum\\_standards\\_english\\_2013\\_v2.pdf](https://resourcecentre.savethechildren.net/node/6819/pdf/cp_minimum_standards_english_2013_v2.pdf)
- 13 See note 3.
- 14 United Nations, Convention on the Rights of the Child, Article 1, United Nations, 1989
- 15 See note 12.
- 16 Definition adopted by the Global Protection Cluster and Save the Children
- 17 See note 1.
- 18 See note 3.
- 19 H Thompson, *A matter of life and death: child protection programming's essential role in ensuring child wellbeing and survival during and after emergencies*, CPWG, The Child Protection Working Group, 2015 [https://resourcecentre.savethechildren.net/node/9462/pdf/a20matter20of20life20or20death\\_lowres.pdf](https://resourcecentre.savethechildren.net/node/9462/pdf/a20matter20of20life20or20death_lowres.pdf)
- 20 Save the Children, Eight Proposals for

- Narrowing the Humanitarian Finance Gap: A Summary of Save the Children's Recommendations to the High-Level Panel on Humanitarian Financing, Save the Children, <https://www.savethechildren.org/content/dam/global/reports/advocacy/humanitarian-fin-gap.pdf>
- 21 In 2018, 87% of HNOs and 78% of HRP mentioned Child Protection. See note 1.
- 22 See note 3.
- 23 Plus an additional 15% stated that the CPiE has a funding gap of between 25%-50%. Child Protection Area of Responsibility (CP AoR), 'Country-level Coordination Group 2017 Annual Survey Results', Child Protection Area of Responsibility, 2018, <http://cpaor.net/sites/default/files/cp/2016/CP%20AoR%20Annual%20Survey%202017.pdf>
- 24 See note 9.
- 25 See note 19.
- 26 FTS data – accessed on 18/01/2019
- 27 UN OCHA, Global Humanitarian Overview 2019, UN OCHA, 2019, <https://www.unocha.org/sites/unocha/files/GHO2019.pdf>
- 28 *Development Initiatives, Global Humanitarian Assistance Report 2018*, Development Initiatives, 2018, <http://devinit.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/GHA-Report-2018.pdf>
- 29 See note 28.
- 30 Child Protection Area of Responsibility (CP AoR), Guidance note on 'Defining the child protection humanitarian figures', CP AoR, <http://cpaor.net/sites/default/files/cp/2016/2017%2010%2001%20Defining%20In%20Need%20and%20Targeted%20Populations%20for%20Child%20Protectio...docx>
- 31 See note 27.
- 32 According to the FTS categorisation as of November 2018, therefore excluding some GBV and CP funding
- 33 The humanitarian response in Afghanistan and Cameroon seems to have been the main driver, as well as the response in Chad to a lesser extent
- 34 Protection: FTS data as of 21/11/2018 ; Child Protection: Set 3 based on FTS data
- 35 Estimation based on FTS data
- 36 FTS data as of 21/11/2018 – CP estimated (Set 3) based on FTS data accessed on 28/11/2018
- 37 FTS data as of 21/11/2018 – CP estimated (Set 3) based on FTS data accessed on 28/11/2018
- 38 E Wilson, B Majewski and K Tebbe, *Walk the talk: Review of donors' humanitarian policies on education*, Save the Children Norway and NRC, Norwegian Refugee Council, 2015, [https://resourcecentre.savethechildren.net/node/9174/pdf/docs-299840-v1-walk\\_the\\_talk\\_review\\_of\\_donors\\_humanitarian\\_policies\\_on\\_education\\_-\\_nrc\\_and\\_save\\_the\\_children\\_report.pdf](https://resourcecentre.savethechildren.net/node/9174/pdf/docs-299840-v1-walk_the_talk_review_of_donors_humanitarian_policies_on_education_-_nrc_and_save_the_children_report.pdf)
- 39 See note 19.
- 40 See note 19. And CERF, Central Emergency Response Fund - Life saving criteria, CERF, 2010 <https://www.humanitarianresponse.info/sites/www.humanitarianresponse.info/files/documents/files/CERF%20Life-saving%20criteria.pdf>
- 41 US\$18,65 Million in 2016 ; US\$70,9 Million in 2017; and US\$75,33 Million in 2018.
- 42 R Tew, *Counting pennies: A review of official development assistance to end violence against children*, ChildFund Alliance, Save the Children, SOS Children's Villages International, World Vision International, and Development Initiatives, 2017, [https://resourcecentre.savethechildren.net/node/12157/pdf/counting\\_pennies\\_web.pdf](https://resourcecentre.savethechildren.net/node/12157/pdf/counting_pennies_web.pdf)
- 43 Development Initiatives and UN OCHA, Improving humanitarian transparency with the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) and the UN OCHA Financial Tracking Service (FTS), IASC Inter-Agency Standing Committee, 2017, <https://fts.unocha.org/sites/default/files/improving-humanitarian-transparency-with-the-iati-and-the-un-ocha-fts.pdf>
- 44 OCHA, CBPF Grant Management System (GMS), CBPF Contributors (webpage) <https://gms.unocha.org/content/cbpf-contributions>
- 45 CERF, 'Contributions' (webpage), <https://cerf.un.org/our-donors/contributions>
- 46 Development Initiatives, 'Direct funding to local and national responders shows slow progress: Briefing', Development Initiatives, 2018, <http://devinit.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/direct-funding-to-local-and-national-responders.pdf>
- 47 UN OCHA, FTS glossary: 'An emergency is a crisis that calls for a humanitarian response. The emergency may or may not have a humanitarian response plan, flash appeal or regional response plan.' <https://fts.unocha.org/glossary>
- 48 Identified by the research team and amounting to US\$908 million for the period 2010-2018
- 49 Destination plan is a category on the FTS specifying the name of the inter-agency response plan or appeal.
- 50 Based on FTS data accessed on 28 November 2018 – (Set 3)
- 51 IASC, IASC Transformative agenda reference document '2. Humanitarian System-Wide Emergency Activation: definition and procedures', IASC, 2012 <https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/system/>

- files/legacy\_files/2.%20System-Wide%20%28Level%203%29%20Activation%20%2820Apr12%29.pdf
- 52 IASC, 'L3 IASC System-wide response activations and deactivations' (webpage), <https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/iasc-transformative-agenda/news-public/l3-iasc-system-wide-response-activations-and-deactivations>
- 53 Set 3 elaborated by Save the Children Norway, based on FTS data – see Annex 1
- 54 See note 1.
- 55 Funding for CP based on FTS data; Figures for children in need of humanitarian assistance are sourced from UNICEF HAC; Figures for children in need of protection sourced from HNO or HRP.
- 56 UN OCHA, *World Humanitarian Data and Trends 2018*, UN OCHA, 2018, [https://www.unocha.org/sites/unocha/files/WHDT2018\\_web\\_final\\_spread.pdf](https://www.unocha.org/sites/unocha/files/WHDT2018_web_final_spread.pdf)
- 57 J Murray and J Landry, *Placing protection at the centre of humanitarian action: Study on protection funding in complex humanitarian emergencies*, Global Protection Cluster, 2013, [http://www.globalprotectioncluster.org/\\_assets/files/news\\_and\\_publications/GPC\\_funding\\_study\\_online\\_EN.pdf](http://www.globalprotectioncluster.org/_assets/files/news_and_publications/GPC_funding_study_online_EN.pdf)
- 58 See note 57.
- 59 PRIO and Save the Children's analysis on grave violation for 2017. G Graham, M Kirolos, G Knag Fylkesnes, K Salarkia and N Wong, *Stop the war on children: Protecting children in 21st century conflicts*, Save the Children, 2019, [https://resourcecentre.savethechildren.net/node/14409/pdf/report\\_stop\\_the\\_war\\_on\\_children.pdf](https://resourcecentre.savethechildren.net/node/14409/pdf/report_stop_the_war_on_children.pdf)
- 60 A CP-specific sector was introduced in the FTS in 2017. CP-specific funding and requirements are available for Syria, Nigeria, Iraq, Bangladesh (Rohingya refugee crisis), Ukraine and Niger (accessed on 29/01/2019).
- 61 CP and education specialists from Save the Children
- 62 Global Protection Cluster, *Humanitarian Response Planning: Quick Guide*, Global Protection Cluster, [http://cpaor.net/sites/default/files/cp/2016/Humanitarian%20Response%20Plan%20Quick%20Guide\\_EN.pdf](http://cpaor.net/sites/default/files/cp/2016/Humanitarian%20Response%20Plan%20Quick%20Guide_EN.pdf)
- 63 See note 10.
- 64 See note 9.
- 65 See note 8.
- 66 Children in particular face increased risks and vulnerabilities and make up half of the affected population. IASC, *Protection in humanitarian action (Policy)*, IASC, 2016, [https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/system/files/iasc\\_policy\\_on\\_protection\\_in\\_humanitarian\\_action.pdf](https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/system/files/iasc_policy_on_protection_in_humanitarian_action.pdf)
- 67 CPWG, *A matter of life and death: child protection programming's essential role in ensuring child wellbeing and survival during and after emergencies* (Briefing Paper), CPWG, The Child Protection Working Group, 2015 [https://resourcecentre.savethechildren.net/node/9462/pdf/saving\\_lives\\_briefing\\_paper\\_31032015.pdf](https://resourcecentre.savethechildren.net/node/9462/pdf/saving_lives_briefing_paper_31032015.pdf)
- 68 See note 19.
- 69 See note 14.
- 70 Protection is recognised as the purpose and intended outcome of humanitarian action.
- 71 Descriptions are added to each funding flow when reported on the FTS. The dataset elaborated for this study is therefore based on the descriptions provided and not on detailed documentation of projects and programmes.
- 72 Few funding flows included a description in Spanish, but none concerned child protection activities.
- 73 For instance, funding for 'protection services (...) for persons with special needs mainly women, children, disabled and elderly' or 'Responding to the protection needs of vulnerable at-risk groups in Yemen, including children' was not included.
- 74 For statistical purposes, the UN defines youth as those aged 15-24, and young people as those aged 10-24. But this is a fluid category.
- 75 With minor adjustments in December and January to fine-tune the quality of the dataset





**Child friendly space:** Children play in a child friendly space in Za'atari refugee camp in Jordan.  
PHOTO: PIM RAS / SAVE THE CHILDREN