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### Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARA</td>
<td>Access Restricted Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPRA</td>
<td>Child Protection Rapid Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPWG</td>
<td>Child Protection Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWD</td>
<td>Children with Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>Direct Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERW</td>
<td>Explosive Remnants of War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>Focus Group Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCMHP</td>
<td>Gaza Community Mental Health Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP</td>
<td>Internally Displaced Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KII</td>
<td>Key Informant Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoSD</td>
<td>Ministry of Social Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHPSS</td>
<td>Mental Health and Psychosocial Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCHA</td>
<td>Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHCHR</td>
<td>Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCDCR</td>
<td>Palestinian Centre for Democracy and Conflict Resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCBS</td>
<td>Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCI</td>
<td>Save the Children International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSC</td>
<td>Technical Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children’s Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNSCO</td>
<td>Office of the UN Special Coordinator for the Middle East Peace Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNRWA</td>
<td>United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of terms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child</strong></td>
<td>Any person under the age of 18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Separated child</strong></td>
<td>Any child separated from both parents, or from previous legal or customary primary care-giver, but not necessarily from other relatives. This may, therefore, include children accompanied by other adult family members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unaccompanied child</strong></td>
<td>Any child who has been separated from both parents and other relatives and is not being cared for by an adult who, by law or custom, is responsible for doing so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Orphans</strong></td>
<td>Children, both of whose parents are known to be dead. In some countries, however, a child who has lost one parent is called an orphan. For the purposes of this assessment, the terms orphans refers to children who lost both parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical violence</strong></td>
<td>The deliberate use of force on a child’s body which may result in injury, e.g. hitting, burning, shaking, and choking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexual abuse/violence</strong></td>
<td>Is any sexual activity, including inappropriate touching or rape, where the child does not fully comprehend, or is unable to give informed consent (under the legal age for consent).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exploitation</strong></td>
<td>The abuse of a child where some form of remuneration is involved whereby the perpetrators benefit in some manner – monetarily, socially, politically, etc. Exploitation constitutes a form of coercion and violence, detrimental to the child’s physical and mental health, development, and education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Worst Forms of Child Labour</strong></td>
<td>Defined by the International Labour Organisation as: (a) all forms of slavery or practices similar to slavery, such as the sale and trafficking of children, debt bondage and serfdom and forced or compulsory labour, including forced or compulsory recruitment of children for use in armed conflict; (b) the use, procuring or offering of a child for prostitution, for the production of pornography or for pornographic performances; (c) the use, procuring or offering of a child for illicit activities, in particular for the production and trafficking of drugs as defined in the relevant international treaties; (d) work which, by its nature or the circumstances in which it is carried out, is likely to harm the health, safety or morals of children. Labour that puts to jeopardy the physical, mental or moral well-being of a child, either because of its nature or because of the conditions in which it is carried out, is known as “hazardous work”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Harmful traditional practices</strong></td>
<td>Practices that are harmful to children and defended by some community members based on tradition, culture, or religion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Background and Context

The summer of 2017 marked fifty years since the June 1967 Arab-Israeli war, which resulted in Israel’s occupation of the West Bank, East Jerusalem and Gaza Strip. Gaza is a densely populated area of 365 square kilometers where by mid-2017 more than 1.94 million people live in it. The Gaza Strip is home to more than 908,239 children under the age of 18. All children aged 3 years and above in today’s Gaza lived through at least one war, and an 8 years old child already experienced three rounds of armed hostilities. Also, more than half a million of children spent their entire life under blockade. All girls and boys in Gaza Strip as of 2017 live and grow in conditions that recent UN report described as close to ‘unlivable’.

Vulnerability drivers

The situation of Gaza Strip characterizes a complex protracted crisis that is not traceable to a single acute shock but rather is a constant state of high vulnerability driven by a combination of inter-related factors.

In June 2007, following post-election hostilities between Fatah and Hamas, the latter took control of the Gaza Strip, initiating expulsion of the West Bank-headquartered Palestinian Authority (PA) and establishing separate de-facto administration in Gaza (OCHA, 2016). Following the expulsion of the Palestinian Authority by Hamas, the Israeli Government declared Gaza “hostile territory” in summer 2007. Citing security concerns, Israel subsequently announced a number of sanctions and restrictions on the access and movement of people and goods to and from Gaza, ultimately amounting to a sea, air and land blockade. The blockade devastated an already vulnerable economy and weary civilian infrastructure of Gaza and led to the closure of 95% of its industrial establishment and the loss of 120,000 jobs.

---

1 International human rights law and international humanitarian law are applicable in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, namely Gaza and the West Bank, including East Jerusalem. (A/HRC/31/44, para. 3; A/HRC/28/45, para. 3 in A/HRC/34/38 para 3).
5 The term “blockade” has been used by the United Nations to describe Israel’s imposition of prolonged closures and economic and movement restrictions in the Gaza Strip (see A/HRC/24/30, paras. 21 to 23, A/RES/69/93 and A/69/347).
7 Defined as “those environments in which a significant proportion of the population is acutely vulnerable to death, disease and disruption of their livelihoods over a prolonged period of time.” (Macrae J. and Harmer A. (2004): “Beyond the Continuum: Aid policy in protracted crises”. HPG Report 18 ODI.)
8 Defined as “events that can reduce group or individual well-being, such as illness, unemployment, or drought, and which may themselves cause or compound poverty” (Marques, 2003).
10 Palestinian Authority was formed in 1994, pursuant to the Oslo Accords between the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) and the government of Israel.
jobs (UNSCO, May 2017). By 2017, the blockade continues to undermine basic human rights, economic prospects, as well as the availability of essential services for the Gaza Strip population (OHCHR, 2016).

Concurrently, the enforcement of access-restricted areas (ARA) inside Gaza significantly reduces the availability of farming land and fishing range for local inhabitants. UNCTAD (2017) cites some estimates that ARA’s restrictions render 35% of all agricultural land in Gaza inaccessible to farmers. UNRWA (2016) estimates that more than 3,000 fishermen do not have access to 85% of the maritime areas agreed upon in the 1995 Oslo Accords. Enforcing the ARA’s limits on land and sea, Israel regularly uses force and Palestinians entering the ARA risk being shot even if they pose no imminent threat to life or serious injury to Israeli security forces (OHCHR, 2016). The OHCHR chaired Protection Cluster together with a number of Palestinian NGO’s documented the killing of 389 people (including 10 women, and 60 children), and the injury of 2,829 others (including 401 children, and 53 women) by Israeli fire in these areas between 2007 and 2017 (UNCT, 2017).

In addition to the impact of the blockade and the restrictions imposed in ARAs, three rounds of armed hostilities between Israel and Hamas harmed the Gaza’s people, society and economy as well as essential infrastructure. In the most devastating round of armed confrontation – between 8 July and 26 August 2014-, a total of 1460 civilians, including 556 children were killed (OHCHR, 2017). In the same period 171,000 homes were damaged – 17,800 of them rendered completely uninhabitable and displacing their 100,000 inhabitants (UNRWA 2016, UNCT 2017). Despite comprehensive reconstruction efforts, the concentration of conflict in Gaza has decimated its productivity and even the anticipated 2017 growth is expected to be insufficient to make up for the losses from successive conflicts (IMF, 2017).

12 Office of the UN Special Coordinator for the Middle East Peace Process (UNSCO); Report to the Ad Hoc Liaison Committee, May 2017
14 The wide “buffer areas” along Gaza’s perimeter areas are unilaterally determined by Israel to address security concerns, including the digging of tunnels. These security zones have come to be known as access-restricted areas (ARAs). For details, see: Norwegian Refugee Council/Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (NRC/IDMC): Under fire: Israel’s enforcement of Access Restricted Areas in the Gaza Strip; January 2014, available at: http://www.refworld.org/docid/53c39b004.html
16 The Oslo Accords are a set of agreements between the Government of Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) in 1993 and 1995, which form a basis the Oslo peace process aimed at achieving a peace treaty based on United Nations Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338.
18 Annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and reports of the Office of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General: Human rights situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, March 2017, A/HRC/34/38
19 United Nations Country Team in the occupied Palestinian territory: Gaza Ten Years Later, UN July 2017
20 International Monetary Fund (IMF); West Bank and Gaza, Report to the Ad Hoc Liaison Committee, August 2017
Most of the damaged businesses have been unable to fully resume operations, many services are yet to be fully restored and the damaged agricultural land – only half of which has been rehabilitated - is years away from yielding a harvest comparable to the last pre-conflict levels (UNCT, 2017).

Amplifying the chronic vulnerability drivers in Gaza has been the long-standing internal political divide of Palestinian leadership. Since June 2007, the internal divide between the PA and the de facto authorities in Gaza has had profound consequences across multiple aspects of governance, including law making process, policies, practices and administration. Compounded by the deepening socio-economic disparities and political leadership divisions and confrontations, this could directly undermine the chances of successful implementation of the ambitious National Policy Agenda (NPA) (2017-2022) and the Social Development Sector Strategy (2017-2022) of the Ministry of Social Development (MoSD). For example, the new Sector Strategy speaks of aspirations to maintain the social fabric and eliminate all forms of social exclusion, violence and vulnerability for all Palestinians (World Bank, 2017). Yet, a set of measures put in place in 2017 to reduce the PA’s fiscal expenditures in Gaza resulted in the dramatic decrease of electricity provision, which was already insufficient to meet the population needs even prior to the cut (UNSCO, September 2017). Thus, in the second half of 2017 electricity has been available on average between 3 and 6 hours per day (OCHA, 2017).

---

24 This includes establishing parallel forms of government. In addition to forming an Administrative Committee for Gaza, Hamas has taken further measures to strengthen its control of Gaza including by appointing local judicial personnel, thereby further enhancing the legal and administrative split between the West Bank and the Strip. It must be noted however that there has been a tangible progress achieved in negotiations to restore unity government in late 2017.
25 The National Policy Agenda (NPA) (2017-2022) was endorsed by the Palestinian Cabinet on December 27th, 2016. The NPA outlines the national priorities, policies and interventions towards independence, government reform and sustainable development (World Bank, 2017)
26 The Social Development Sector Strategy (2017-2022) aims to reduce poverty, eliminate of all forms of social exclusion, violence and vulnerability and maintain the social fabric. Under this new strategic vision, the MoSD aims to build a social development system that does not only protect the poor and the vulnerable but also help them grow, become independent and contribute to the economic development of Palestine. In this new system, cash would become an instrument of last resort for those who need it the most (the extreme poor) to cover basic needs, while support services would be provided to the poor to address their social vulnerabilities and to help build their economic empowerment. (MoSD and the World Bank, 2017)
27 Formerly Ministry of Social Affairs (MoSA)
28 Office of the UN Special Coordinator for the Middle East Peace Process (UNSCO); Report to the Ad Hoc Liaison Committee, September 2017
29 Gaza Electricity Distribution Company (GEDCO) in OCHA dashboard available at: https://www.ochaopt.org/page/gaza-strip-electricity-supply
The continuous worsening of living conditions of Gazan civilians in 2017 is further compounded by rapidly deteriorating access to vital environmental resources, and by environmental degradation. Access to safe drinking water in Gaza through the public water network dropped from 98.3% in 2000 to a mere 10.5% in 2014 (UNCT, 2017). The increasing population and unsustainable demands on Gaza’s sole water source due to systematic over-extraction of the underlying coastal aquifer has resulted in the intrusion of seawater and in 96.2% of the groundwater in Gaza becoming unfit for human consumption (UNCT, 2017). At the same time, the amount of untreated or partially treated wastewater released into the sea each day reached 108,000 CM per day (UNCT, 2017). This is in large part due to the lack of electricity to operate wastewater treatment facilities as well as the continued delays in completing and making operational the three central wastewater treatment plants due to the blockade.

The effects on people living in Gaza

These entwined factors driving the deterioration of situation in Gaza have manifold effects that left most of Gazans extremely vulnerable. The Office of the UN Special Coordinator for the Middle East Peace Process (UNSCO) in its recent report warns that by September 2017, it is mostly just the international humanitarian assistance and UNRWA’s large-scale social services that are keeping a major catastrophe from fully unfolding in Gaza (UNSCO, September 2017). A snapshot of 2017 comprehensive findings presented by the UNSCO and other agencies to the Ad Hoc Liaison Committee includes:

---

31 An aquifer is an underground layer of water bearing permeable material from which groundwater can be extracted using a well.
33 United Nations Country Team in the occupied Palestinian territory: Gaza Ten Years Later, UNCT July 2017
34 The Ad-Hoc Liaison Committee was established in November 1993 and aims at promoting the dialogue between the partners of the "triangular partnership", namely the donors, Israel, and the PNA
Around 40% of Gaza population live in poverty. As Gaza’s real GDP per capita has continued its decline, poverty has increased, and in the past few years has stabilized at around 40% rate. Moreover, not only has the number of people living in poverty increased, but the severity of poverty has also deteriorated. (UNSCO, May 2017)

Up to 44% of population is unemployed in 2017. Youth unemployment is particularly high, approaching two-thirds of youth population. (IMF, April 2017, UNSCO September 20) The increase in unemployment rate has been stark also for women, rising from 35.1% to 64.4%, with the gap between men and women steadily increasing over the decade (UNCT, 2017).

70 % of the population in Gaza depend on international assistance (IMF, April 2017).

One million Palestinians in Gaza (47% of the Strip’s inhabitants) are moderately-to-severely food insecure, despite many of them already receiving food assistance or other forms of social transfers (UNSCO, September 2017).

89.6% of Palestinians do not have access to safe drinking water through public water network and have to rely on water tanks, containers and bottled water. For other domestic use (i.e. not for drinking), currently 50% of the population receives water for only 8 hours every four days, 30% receives water for 8 hours every three days, and the remaining 20% receives water for 8 hours every two days. Having to rely on water trucking comes at a high cost on consumers, as trucked water is 15-20 times more expensive than water from the network. This particularly affects the most vulnerable who are often poor and unemployed and do not have access to piped network water. Trucked water is also unregulated and unreliable in terms of quality (UNCT, 2017).

All Gaza population suffers from electricity shortages, including daily power cuts of 12 -18 hours across the Gaza Strip, which continue to impede the delivery of basic services, especially water supply and healthcare (UNSCO, May 2017).

35 West Bank and Gaza, Report to the Ad Hoc Liaison Committee, May, 2017
36 West Bank and Gaza, Report to the Ad Hoc Liaison Committee, April, 2017
37 West Bank and Gaza, Report to the Ad Hoc Liaison Committee, September, 2017
With 40% of essential medicines either out of stock or nearly depleted and a significant backlog of patients requiring urgent medical referral to hospitals outside the Strip, health conditions have deteriorated seriously (UNESCO, September 2017).

24,600 people remain internally displaced in Gaza, as they wait for their homes to be rebuilt following damages sustained during the 2014 conflict (Shelter Cluster, 2017). At the same time, while significant focus has – rightly – been on reconstructing the houses damaged in 2014, the total size of the housing shortage in Gaza has increased by 2017 – in large part due to natural population growth (UNCT, 2017).

Four Palestinians were shot and killed by Israeli forces in access-restricted areas (ARA) incidents, and another 145 people, were injured between 1 April and 28 August 2017 alone (UNSCO, September 2017). From January to September 2017, 2 boys were killed and 43 children injured in the Gaza Strip (UNICEF CAAC database).

2. Methodology

The last comprehensive Child Protection Rapid Assessment (CPRA) was conducted in Gaza in 2014 in the immediate aftermath of armed hostilities. In light of the evolving situation in the Gaza Strip, in 2017 the Gaza Child Protection Working Group (CPWG) and Terre des hommes initiated new Rapid Assessment, reflecting the current situation and protection needs of children. The Gaza CPWG members determined the following priority topics and issues to be explored: Separated and unaccompanied children, Dangers and injuries, Violence against children and other harmful practices, Sexual violence, Psychosocial needs, Child labour, Children in contact with the law, Exclusion of children, and Access to information. A technical steering committee (TSC) was established on 24 September 2017, consisting of 15 CPWG members engaged in Gaza child’s protection issues. The terms of reference (TOR) of the TSC included deliverables throughout the stages of the CPRA process, including adaptation of tools, development of training materials and resources, delivery of training for assessors, support during data collection and analysis, and an interpretation meeting for data analysis, which took place on 31 October 2017.

The inter-agency CPRA opted for a mixed methodology approach that combined key informant interviews (KII) and focus group discussions (FGD). Building on previous Gaza CPWG’s child protection assessment (2014), the 2017 CPRA used and contextualized the assessment methodology of the Global Protection Cluster and the Child Protection Working Group (2012).

2.1 Sample frame

The site selection was designed for 60 sites across Gaza Strip, taking into account following site determinates: Urban, rural, camp, access restricted area (ARA). The required number and proportions of key informant interview questionnaires was calculated as follows: The overall Gaza Strip is treated as one population living in five Gaza governorates: 1) North, 2) Gaza City, 3) Midzone, 4) Khanyounis, and 5) Rafah. The sample population was derived from the population size recorded by the Palestinian Bureau of Statistics (2016). The minimum sample size was calculated using Thomsen's Equation. Accounting for 5% error, the total minimum required sample size was 398 persons to be interviewed using CPRA KII questionnaires. Further, as Gaza is

---

39 Gaza CPWG meeting convened on 13 September 2017. The 40 member meeting agreed to conduct the Gaza 2017 CPRA, to establish technical steering committee, to contribute resources to the best of member capabilities, and identified priority areas of the Gaza CPWG concern.


41 \[ n = \frac{N \times p(1-p)}{N-1 \times \left(p^2 + z^2\right) + p(1-p)} \]
predominantly urban and the rural population in the sample would be too low to be meaningfully represented, additional 10 questionnaires were collected in rural area in each Governorate. Next, the actual number of people living in the access-restricted area (ARA) is unknown. Therefore, the number of questionnaires collected in ARA was derived from the rural population calculations and weights. The final sample size accounting for these additional values was 604 key informants.

In total, 604 Key Informants from more than 60 locations were reached. Reflecting the population distribution (PCBS, 2016) and including the rural and ARA additional weights, 66.6% (n= 402) of CPRA KII questionnaires were collected from urban areas of Gaza, 10.4% (n= 63) from rural areas, 12.1% (n =73) from refugee camps and 10.9% (n= 66) from access restricted areas. Approximately 32% of all key informants were younger than 30 years, approximately 35% were 30-40 years old and approximately 33% were older than 40 years. One half of key informants were men and one half were women. The requirement for sampling was that the key informants do not have to be professionals or child protection experts but that they are community members who know their communities and everyday life in their area well. The key informants come from 30+ types of occupation, including administrative workers, community activists, doctors, dressmakers, farmers, housewives, Imams, Mokhtars, psychologists, teachers, unemployed, or students. Furthermore, a total number of 40 FDGs, with 360 adult and adolescent (15 - 17 years) participants, took place to understand the context of child protection concerns in Gaza Strip and to learn about perspectives of adolescents growing in urban, rural, camp and ARA areas of Gaza Strip. Similar to KII, the participants in focus group discussions came from diverse backgrounds, and approximately one half of them were adult women and men from urban, rural, camp and ARA communities, and one half of them were adolescent girls and boys aged 15-17 years from the same types of communities.

2.2 Assessment tools
The principal data collection tool used was the standardized CPRA KII questionnaire (CPWG), which was locally contextualized. The focus groups discussions were guided by a tested locally adapted FGD guidance tool, courtesy to the UNICEF Amman office. Both tools underwent two rounds of contextualization in Gaza: first, the tools were reviewed and adapted by the members of Gaza CPWG TSC taking into account local realities.

42 The restrictions on land are reported to cover 62.6 square kilometers, accounting for 17 % of all land in the territory. It is estimated that up to 12 % of Gaza’s population, are directly affected by ARA on land and at sea. ( Norwegian Refugee Council/Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (NRC/IDMC), Under fire: Israel’s enforcement of Access Restricted Areas in the Gaza Strip, January 2014, available at: http://www.refworld.org/docid/53c39b004.html)
43 10 FGD with adolescent girls, 10 FGD with adolescent boys, 10 FGD with women, 10 FGD with men
Next, the translated Arabic version of both tools was introduced to the data collectors. Based on their feedback and inputs, further adaptations were made. The tool package further included the list of key child protection terms and definitions, Do No Harm guidance, and child safeguarding guidance in English and Arabic.

2.3 Data collection

In total, 60 data collectors from 5 organizations took part in the data collection training. The one-day training covered an introduction to CPRA, overview of methods used, use of terms, joint review of tools, practical exercises for the tool use, as well as ethical safeguards. An assessment focal point was selected for each Governorate. The focal points in each Governorate ensured team briefings and debriefing (site reports), coordinated venues, reviewed sampling frame per Governorate, checked all tools and tested their use prior to assessment roll out.

The data collection simultaneously took place in all Governorates in a span of 4 working days. Throughout the data collection, field monitoring visits took place in each Governorate, and for the duration of the data collection 3 CPRA team members were constantly available on the phone to entertain data collectors’ questions, assist with planning and arising challenges, and to debrief the focal points in each Governorate.

The collected data were stored in Tdh local office and shared with data entry clerks and translators against confidentiality agreements. Upon entry, all KII questionnaires as well as FGD records were returned to a lockable storage and will be destroyed in October 2019. The KII data were processed using IBM SPSS software. The FGD Arabic language transcripts were produced in hard copies, analyzed and all subject relevant statements and information were translated into English as a FGD Note; one FGD Note for each FGD conducted. Each English language FGD Note was subsequently analyzed and divided into 6 sections pertaining to the themes explored by CPRA. These sections were entered into an excel information management tool, each entry denoting 1 section of FGD Note Form from 1 Focus Group Discussion. The analysis made use of Voyant software tools, including Cirrus.

2.4 Triangulation and validation

The consistency of findings generated by different data collection methods was explored at various stages of the CPRA. First, during the desk review multiple sources, findings and research conclusions were compared and contrasted to identify key emerging themes and reviewed and compared,
contrasted and complemented with findings and conclusions of the desk review a as well as with the views and analysis shared by focal points and field teams. Finally, the draft analysis was reviewed by the TSC members and Governorate focal points during an interpretation and validation meeting in order to identify inconsistencies, possible fallacies or omissions, and to ensure contextual richness and linkages where these might emerge.

2.5 Limitations
This rapid assessment is not a statistically representative study of the population in the Gaza Strip. The assessment provides information on key child protection concerns expressed by adult community members. It does not replace in depth studies on any given child protection topic. Follow-up studies in the main identified areas of child protection concerns would be very valuable.

The rapid assessment does not provide information on prevalence of any type of child protection concern among children. When available, information from secondary sources was included during triangulation. In depth prevalence study of violence against children, in collaboration with the Palestinian National Bureau of Statistics and all relevant Ministries, would be very valuable and is highly recommended.

As the issue of unaccompanied children was challenging to explore in Gaza Strip, the report section on unaccompanied children is supported by additional follow up interviews with randomly selected 1/3 of the KI (n 200). This follow up took place early October 2017.
3. Findings

3.1 Separated and unaccompanied children

The data collected as part of the 2014 CPRA confirmed that children indeed have become separated from their caregivers (but not necessarily from other relatives) during the 2014 conflict, and in 81% of sites responders indicated that they were aware of separated children. In 2017, overall 68.7% (n 604) of key informants across Gaza Strip sites have heard of or encountered a child who has been separated from their usual caregivers. The urban key informants have reported knowing of such a child slightly more frequently (70.1% n 402) than rural, camp and ARA key informants = (65.1% n 63; 67.1% n 73; and 65.2% n 66, respectively). Comparative analysis of the data suggests that key informants have reported knowing of such a child more frequently in the Midzone governorate (95.5%) and Rafah governorate (79.2%) than others governorates.

Discussing situations of separation, the 2014 CPRA raised an assumption that many of these are circumstances where one parent passed away placing enormous strain on the remaining and grieving caregiver and children. Then, the child is cared for by an extended family member. Indeed, in 2017’s CPRA, the death of a family member was cited as a cause of separation by the majority of key informants across the sites (overall 83%, n 415). It is estimated that at least 790 women were widowed because of the 2014 hostilities alone (Ministry of Women’s Affairs, 2015), and that over 9% of households in Gaza Strip are headed by women (PCBS, 2016). The discussions with participants in the focus groups explained the challenges of being a sole caregiver as well as remarriage of the widowed spouse that can result in separations of children: “We have children of martyrs whose mother would remarry and leave children to live with their grandparents who can’t raise them and bear the responsibility of taking care of them.” “Those children exist, but not that much. I know a girl...”

44 The main purpose of including this part in 2017 CPRA is to get updated figures on the issue of separated and unaccompanied children. It is well-known that separated and unaccompanied children is an issue that matters during and / or after a conflict as in 2104 conflict. The decision of adding this part came as suggestion from the Child Protection working group.
45 CPRA 2014: In 53% of sites, responders indicated that they were aware of 1-10 children in this situation in their neighborhood or site, and in 28% of sites, responders said there were between 10-20 separated children.
48 Broadly, the term martyr refers to a person killed during any kind of encounter with Israeli security and military forces
whose father is a martyr. Her mother then got married, so the girl is currently living with her aunt. She is so devastated” (FGD, Women, Camp, Gaza City). “I know a child who lives with his aunt. He used to be good at school before his mother died. After his father got married again, his educational achievement dropped and he became so stressed” (FGD, Boy, Urban, Gaza City). “I know a kid who lives with his grandfather because his mother left him and his father was martyred. No one is taking care of him and he doesn’t go to school” (FGD, Boy, Rafah, Camp).

The 2014 CPRA also notes that 38% of its respondents indicated that caregivers are sending their children to be cared for to extended family and inferred that this is a secondary pattern of separation caused by a range of combined factors including loss of livelihood, economic hardship, and the loss of family home.49 These views have been echoed in preliminary interviews (MoSD and NGOs) in 2017 when interviewees opined that such types of separations do persist. The 2017 CPRA key informants mention children being sent to extended family due to poverty or safety: 27% (n 415) of key informants' state that children are sent to extended families due to poverty of primary caregivers, and 21% (n 415) believe it is because children are being sent to safety. The proportion of these answers is highest among ARA key informants, where 37% (n 43) and 35% (n 43) of those who know of separated children cited poverty and safety as important causes for child separation. The below graph shows the comparative analysis across the five governorates of key informants mentioned children being sent to extended families to be cared for due to poverty and safety reasons.

---

49 CPWG CPRA 2014
The focus group discussants explained that: “Children are sent to relatives when families can't meet their needs” (FGD, Girl, Camp, Rafah,). “Children are separated from these parents because of divorce and poverty” (FGD, Women, Rafah, Rural). “Main causes for separation are divorces, not meeting the family needs and the economic situation” (FGD, Boy, Rafah, Camp). “Economic pressures result in inability to provide a dwelling, in poverty…. A (poor) father once expelled his kids from the house and they live in a chicken farm now” (FGD, Men, Rural, Rafah). The household challenges have been mentioned in focus group discussions frequently as compounded by divorce, which is a source of great complexity and sometimes cause children to be separating from the main caregivers. A focus group discussion participant explained for example: “I know a child who is diagnosed with diabetes and lives with his grandparents because his mother is divorced and lives in Egypt and his father got married” (FGD, Women, Urban, Gaza City). Finally, leaving children with members of extended family during relocation after 2014 in rural and camp areas was mentioned, by some key informants, as a known cause of separation, as was sending children to institutions. These were explained in focus groups discussions as related to situations when a family lost its dwelling in 2014 war, and sent children to extended family relatives. According to FGD participants and TSC, the numbers of children in institutional care remains low and they are mainly orphaned children who lost both caregivers.

When asked about the characteristics of separated children, one half of Gaza Strip key informants believe that both boys and girls become separated and there is no clear difference between them (51.6%, n 415), followed by about one quarter (27.7%, n 415) who state that there are more boys than girls who have been separated. This pattern of answers is consistent across all types of sites. More than one half of all Gaza Strip KIs

---

**Table:** Why are children separated from their main caregivers in our area?[^50]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gaza Strip All (n 415)</th>
<th>Urban (n 282)</th>
<th>Rural (n 41)</th>
<th>Camp (n 49)</th>
<th>ARA (n 43)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Death of a parent</td>
<td>Death of a parent (83%)</td>
<td>Death of a parent (76%)</td>
<td>Death of a parent (71%)</td>
<td>Death of a parent (81%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty: sent to</td>
<td>Poverty: sent to</td>
<td>Sent to institution (12%)</td>
<td>Sent to institution (27%)</td>
<td>Sent to safety in extended family (37%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extended family</td>
<td>extended family (27%)</td>
<td>(31%)</td>
<td>(12%)</td>
<td>(27%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety: sent to</td>
<td>Safety: sent to</td>
<td>Relocation (7.3%)</td>
<td>Relocation (12%)</td>
<td>Sent to extended family due to poverty (35%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extended family</td>
<td>extended family (21%)</td>
<td>(23%)</td>
<td>(7.3%)</td>
<td>(12%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^50]: Multiple choice question
[^51]: Key informants who stated that they know of separated children in their vast majority know between 1 and 5 children affected by these types of separation.
(53.7%, n 415) state that the age of separated children is mainly between 6 and 14 years, but further 21% (n 415) of Gaza Strip KIs believe that separated children are younger than that (mainly between 1 and 5 years), a pattern of opinions consistent across all sites.

Only 2.5% among 200 randomly selected key informants from the total sample (n 604) confirmed that they know an unaccompanied child who has no adult with a responsibility to care. That is indeed encouraging and confirms the 2014 CPRA premises that being unaccompanied was a temporary state for a minority of children during the conflict, and that families quickly reunited.

The usual care arrangements for separated and unaccompanied children are overall reported as occurring within each community. Only one quarter or less of Gaza Strip KIs state that there are services known to them that help separated children. One quarter of KIs (26%, n 415) knows of agency/NGO doing so, almost one quarter (22%, n 415) knows of community care service, and 18% (n 415) know of identification, tracing and reunification services available. In urban and camp areas, KIs also named government services being available to separated and unaccompanied children (19% n 282, and 25% n 49, of KIs from these areas respectively).

3.2 Dangers and injuries

Discussing dangers to children in their environment, more than half of all Gaza Strip key informants (65%, n 604) state that the number of deaths and severe injuries among children has increased since the beginning of 2017. The increase is more felt in the cities where 80% of KIs (n 402) observed a rise in dangers and injuries. Smaller but significant proportion of rural (66.7%, n 63), camp (64%, n 73) and ARA (64%, n 66) key informants also believe there has been an increase in deaths and severe injuries among children in their area.

The highest percentage of key informants who believed there has been an increase in deaths and severe injuries of children is reported in Khanyounis and North Gaza governorates with 77.6% and 76.5%, respectively. When asked where are dangers and risks for children highest, overall the Gaza Strip key informants named public space, i.e. outside house (79%, n 604) and on the way to school (66%, n 604).

The key informants expressed concerns over multiple sources of risk to children. More than three quarters of all key informants named car accidents as one of the main dangers that children are exposed to in their area (77%, n 604). It is worth mentioning that the percentage of key informants who named car
accidents as one of the main dangers that children are exposed to is higher in Khanyounis governorate (88.8%), followed by Gaza and Gaza North governorate with (79.1%, each). More than one-half of key informants also named environmental risks such as sewage leaks and overflow as a source of danger for children in their area (51%, n 604). The perceptions of these risks change only slightly depending on the urban, rural, camp or ARA character of site where the key informants live.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment: The main risks for children in our area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gaza Strip All (n 604)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car accidents (77%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental hazards (51%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environmental hazards, lack of functional local infrastructure and road accidents were frequent themes also among the adult participants in focus group discussions. Because of the electricity shortages, the Coastal Municipalities Water Utility (CMWU) is currently prioritizing the operation of 55 sewage-pumping stations to avoid localized flooding in residential areas. Those stations are pumping the sewage to the wastewater treatment plants, which have reduced functioning due to energy crisis, and thus are dumping poorly treated or untreated sewage to the sea. A survey conducted in August 2017 by the Health Ministry and the Gaza Environment Authority found that 63 percent of the 40km-long Gaza coastal line was heavily polluted with sewage. In addition, leaking sewage pipes, lack of solid waste management, presence of vectors, as well as sewage-polluted land and sea were mentioned by multiple FGD participants as posing serious risks. Of particular concern is the delay in opening the Northern Gaza Emergency Sewage Treatment Plant (NGEST), which is exposing 10,000 households in Beit Lahia in Gaza North to public health and environmental health risks. Both men and women are particularly concerned about water and sanitation during winter. Multiple areas of Gaza are prone to flooding and were exposed to devastating floods as recently as in 2014, 2016 and in February of 2017.

---

52 Multiple choice question
53 Source: Gaza Environment Authority
Because the rainwater mixes with sewage and the sewage tanks are prone to overflows, both flood water and sewage flooding is perceived by focus group discussants as a direct threat to children. Further, many roads outside the main tarmac Salah-al-Din road are sandy, and become unsafe and hard to use in winter, in particular during rains. Especially in remote areas, this translates into daily hardship: “I see violence among children, chaos in the streets as a result of the wars, absence of places for child care, and absence of places for children. [Our] area does not have infrastructure. There are not any schools or kindergartens. 2,000 of us live there; 500 of us are children. Our children have to walk for 4 km to reach their schools. This is very difficult, especially in winter. When we are raided, we have no place to turn to” (FGD, Men, ARA, Gaza North). Finally, the quality of Gaza roads, together with reckless driving especially in cities, is seen as a major cause of road accidents involving children.

Notably, more than one-half of key informants in rural areas (54%, n 63) also named landmines and unexploded ordnances (UXOs) as a risk to children. Comparative analysis across the governorates suggests that the percentage of key informants who named landmines and unexploded ordnances as a risk to children is higher in Khan Younis governorate (45.8%), followed by Gaza North governorate (33%), and Rafah governorate (23.2%).

The data shared by UN Mine Action Service (UNMAS) suggest that large quantities of explosive ordnance were used during the 2014 hostilities. Many unexploded aircraft bombs, tank projectiles, mortar shells and other munitions from both sides of the conflict were reported in civilian areas and it was assumed that there are approximately 7,200 items of explosive remnants of war (ERW) in Gaza by the end of the 2014 war. By September 2017, UNMAS reports that due to the clearing effort of 2015-2017, approximately three quarters of all items are identified and cleared. Some ERW are suspected to remain buried below the surface or in rubble and can still indeed present serious danger, particularly to children.

56 Preliminary interviews, September 2017. See also: “Eight Palestinians, including three children, were injured when one of the children detonated unexploded ordnance (UXO). The incident occurred on 4 June in Al Mughraqa area, south of Gaza city.” OCHA, Protection of Civilians, Biweekly Highlights, 30 May-12 June 2017. https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/poc_highlights_30may_12june_2017.pdf
Finally, participants in multiple focus group discussions mentioned substance abuse as a risk present in their communities. Specifically, drug dealing in and consumption of opioid pain medications such as Tramadol has been causing concern among participants in urban, camp and rural focus group discussions. Indeed, also one quarter of key informants across Gaza Strip (26%, n 604) mentioned substance abuse as a children’s stress coping mechanism.

### 3.3 Physical violence against children and other harmful practices

When discussing dangers to children, girls and boys across Gaza, all focus groups highlighted verbal abuse and physical violence as their first concern. In fact, the word ‘violence’ was one of the most frequently mentioned words in all focus group discussions of adolescents and adults. Of a total 25,306 words in 40 FGDs, the term ‘violence’ was mentioned more than 240 times.

Violence against children is reported to span both public and private spheres. In public spheres, the school is seen as the place where children face risks of violence either through disciplinary measures taken by adults, or peer violence. The PCBS’ surveys (2016) indicate that psychological violence is the most common form of violence against students by teachers (27.6%), followed by physical violence (21.4%). The findings of Terre des hommes’ participatory school reviews (Tdh, 2016) suggest that physical violence in schools might still be higher. Amongst a sample population of 229 children between 5th and 10th grades in (6) different schools, more than one half of respondents (57.2%) stated that they were subjected to “physical violence frequently” while 38% of respondents said that they are subjected to the same “all the time”.

In addition to current practices that are condoned inside schools, including physical and psychological violence in adult-child interactions, the reports of violence in schools are to be seen in a context of challenges to the education system and infrastructure.

---

57 In early 2017, Reuters report that police seized more than 100 kg (220 pounds) of marijuana, worth as much as $5 million on the streets of Gaza, and 250,000 tablets of tramadol, which sells for between 130 and 170 shekels ($35-$45) for 10 pills. ([https://www.reuters.com/article/us-palestinians-gaza-drugs/as-drugs-flood-into-gaza-hamas-to-get-tougher-on-smugglers-idUSKBN16E277](https://www.reuters.com/article/us-palestinians-gaza-drugs/as-drugs-flood-into-gaza-hamas-to-get-tougher-on-smugglers-idUSKBN16E277))

58 In 2017, the Palestinian National Institute of Public Health/UNODC report states that: “The most common drugs used in Gaza are prescription drugs. Based on interviews and focus groups, participants reported mostly using Tramadol and hashish. However, the criminalization of Tramadol use without a prescription has led to an increase in the use of Lyrica. Other drugs referred to but used less frequently are Ecstasy (called happiness drug by the participants) and sedatives such as Aritan, Asival, and Valium. The prevalence of injecting drug use is low in Gaza accoring to all study participants, including stakeholders”. In Illicit Drug Use in Palestine:A Qualitative Investigation, UNODC, 2017

59 Voyant Cirrus
By 2017, there were 36.7 teachers in average for 1000 students and 26.4 classrooms for 1000 students. Classrooms were reported to serve an average of 38.9 students in public schools and 39.3 in UNRWA schools. To meet the students’ needs, 61.7% of government schools and 70.4% of UNRWA schools currently operate on a double shift system, which gives students access to classrooms on average of four hours per day. The resulting strain on teachers and students has been considerable. The teachers raised the difficulties in managing large numbers of children in crowded and often noisy spaces. In addition, adolescents in focus groups spoke of screaming, as well as the consequent violent disciplining in classrooms. Acknowledging that home is also not always a safe place for children, more than half of Gaza Strip key informants (57%, n 604) named home as one of the highest risk places to children.

The above graph shows the comparative analysis across the five governorates of key informants mentioned acknowledged that home is not always a safe place for children. Domestic violence and severe corporal punishment are prominently evident on the list of violent risks. This correlates with the PCBS’s findings indicating that while only 28.2% of adult respondents in its 2015 cluster survey believe that a child needs to be physically punished, 79.2% of child respondents aged 11-14 reported to have experienced physical punishment at home.

---

60 Educational Statistical report, MoEHE, Gaza http://www.mohe.ps/category/reports/
61 Preliminary interviews, September 2017
62 Multiple choice question.
### Violence: What are the main risks for children in our area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Urban (n 402)</th>
<th>Rural (n 63)</th>
<th>Camp (n 73)</th>
<th>ARA (n 66)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence</td>
<td>Domestic violence (71.6%)</td>
<td>Domestic violence (73%)</td>
<td>Domestic violence (84%)</td>
<td>Domestic violence (73%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe corporal punishment – beating</td>
<td>Severe corporal Punishment (47.5%)</td>
<td>Severe corporal Punishment (50.8%)</td>
<td>Severe corporal punishment (49%)</td>
<td>Severe corporal punishment (70%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmful traditional practices</td>
<td>Harmful traditional practices (20%)</td>
<td>Harmful traditional practices (44.4%)</td>
<td>Harmful traditional practices (30.1%)</td>
<td>Harmful traditional practices (15.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The tensions at home were named as one of the main stressors for children by 87% of key informants across Gaza (n 604). Domestic violence and corporal punishment was discussed frequently in all focus groups conducted across Gaza Strip. Girls and boys shared serious concerns over violence and beating. For example: "My father beats me when he gets angry." "When my father gets angry, he hits my brother’s head against the wall or chair." (FGD, Girls, Camp, Midzone). Women and men across interview sites shared worries about domestic tensions, beating and other forms of violence. In multiple focus groups, women also discussed domestic violence as a consequence of ongoing stressors that the adults are exposed to: "The husband feels fed up due to unemployment, so he lets it out on his wife." (FGD, Women, Camp, Gaza City). Similarly, men in focus group discussions reflected on violence as a consequence of stress, poverty and unemployment: "One’s child may ask to have a shekel, but the father does not have anything to give". (FGD, Men, ARA, Gaza City). "Domestic violence is widely spread around here. The man cannot bring money to the house, so he lets it out on his wife and children" (FGD, Men, Urban, Gaza City). Another participant intervened and said that poverty and lack of viable options to change one’s circumstances leads to violence: "We are just sitting around, doing nothing" (FGD, Men, Urban, Gaza City). Yet another male participant described the dynamics and impact of violent interactions on his child: "I know that I'm violent with my kid because my child is naughty and violent. I speak to him many times but he doesn't change his behaviour. I know that when I talk to him that he will be scared of me and he won't listen to me. This causes also his bedwetting problem at night. Another
participant elaborated that there is a lot of pressure on adults and they can't find anyone to speak to (FGD, Men, Rural, Rafah). The notion of ‘not having someone to speak to’ echoed through focus group discussions of adults and adolescents alike, in all topics discussed. Children themselves are also reported to partake in violent acts, including bullying. Overall, Gaza Strip key informants stated that children take an active part in family quarrels (86% of KIs, n 604), stealing (64% of KIs, n 604) and damaging schools and infrastructure (38% of KIs, n 604). The below graph shows the comparative analysis across the five governorates of key informants reported children themselves to partake in violent acts. These patterns were reported by KIs across the urban, rural and ARA sites. In camp locations, the third violent activity most frequently named by KIs was children partaking in gang activities (37% of KIs, n 73). Notably, in discussing children’s stressors, 75% (n 63) of the rural key informants also named bullying as a stressor that children are exposed to.

In a focus group discussion, adolescents acknowledged that children may also engage in violent acts. A boy participant explained: "Wherever we go, there is violence. That's what we learnt; whoever beats you, beat them back"(FGD, Boys, Rural, North).
Almost one quarter of all key informants (23.2%, n 604) also named harmful traditional practices as a risk to children. Among these, early marriage was discussed as affecting significant proportion of adolescents. According to the Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics (PCBS), by the end of 2016, 23.7% out of the total married population in Gaza Strip married before the age of 18. The GBV Sub-Cluster (2016) notes that “marrying girls under 18 years is rooted in harmful social norms and gender discrimination... Child marriage is also a negative coping mechanism for poverty. Families marry off their daughters at an early age to reduce the economic burden of feeding, educating and supporting their girl children and passing the responsibility for her security to a husband.” Indeed, the focus group discussants across Gaza Strip placed the early marriage within the context of local social norms and practices, explaining: “If a girl turns 16, she is considered a spinster” (FGD, Girls, Rural, Gaza City), “Males and females get married early without being well aware of [the realities and demands of] marriage. The girl is sometimes forced to get married” (FGD, Men, Urban, Gaza North). The fact that marriage is not always a free choice was discussed several times in the focus groups: “Girls get married at the age of 14. Girls are forced to get married to their cousins” (FGD, Girls, Rural, Gaza North).

Further, as a matter of serious concern, femicide, or honour killings, was mentioned in several instances. The recent report of the Special Rapporteur on violence against women states that several Palestinian women’s rights groups reported being regularly confronted with cases of “honour” crimes and killing of women and girls perpetrated by family members in oPt. There are no reliable data for Gaza Strip found, although the case of honour killing was raised during focus group discussion: "Four months ago, a 15-year-old girl was murdered after [being abused] sexually. Her parents killed her because of their fear of scandal. No legal actions were taken against them" (FGD, Women, Urban, Khan Yunis).

Finally, having multiple wives has been mentioned in several instances in the women and girls focus group discussions as a practice harmful to children and women. While not illegal in Gaza Strip, the practice has been discussed as contributing factor to family life difficulties and tensions, and as “traditions that are unfair to females” (FGD, Girls, Camp, Midzone).

---

66 Report of the Special Rapporteur on violence against women, its causes and consequences, on her mission to the Occupied Palestinian Territory/State of Palestine; June 2017, A/HRC/35/30/Add.2
3.4 Sexual violence

Overall, sexual violence was identified as a danger to children by 31% of KIs (n 604) across Gaza Strip. However, more than half (59%, n 604) of all key informants also believe that the number of sexual violence incidents involving children has increased since the beginning of 2017. The percentage of key informants who believe that the number of sexual violence incidents involving children has increased which is higher in Midzone governorate (76.4%), followed by Khanyounis (64.5%), and Gaza North governorate (60%). The focus group discussions suggest that sexual violence is connected to and a part of a wider web of challenges and problems that communities face. The proportions of key informants who believe that sexual violence incidents increased differs depending on where the key informants live:

In the camps, almost three quarters of KIs (73%, n 73) state that the sexual violence increased in their areas. The camp focus group discussions reveal that sexual violence is often seen as a part of wider pattern of violence in the communities, and is connected to other challenges such as shortages of adequate housing: “Our community is full of violence such as robbery, verbal violence, road accidents, domestic violence, and sexual abuse. Girls suffer from sexual abuse and early marriages; girls don't have opportunities to learn or to go out like the boys” (FGD, Boys, Camp, Rafah). In another camp, a participant explained: “Sexual abuse is widespread as lots of people live in extended families where cousins live together in the same house. Most of the violence comes from home and parents” (FGD, Women, Camp, Gaza City).

In access restricted areas (ARA), more than half of all Key Informants (64%, n 66) believe that sexual violence increased. Similarly, to camps, the ARA focus groups participants suggested that when occurring, the sexual violence is a part of a wider web of problems within their communities: FGD Participant: “Our area is full of sexual abuse, especially in cemeteries and in schools and near landfills”. Other participant nods, adding: “Our area is full of domestic violence and family disputes” (FGD, Women, ARA, Khan Younis).

In rural areas, more than half of all key informants (56%, n63) state that sexual violence has increased. Both girls and boys mentioned sexual violence in focus group discussions, although they were not prompted; they did so mostly in the context of violence against children: “The most common types of violence are physical, verbal, and sexual violence. Sexual violence increases
in wars and conflicts because people make use of these difficult situations and abuse children” (FGD, Boys, Rural, Rafah). However, some rural FGD participants also suggest that their particular village is safe, because it is of small area where people know each other. Sexual abuse doesn't exist in the area because it’s a conservative and safe area, and we all here like a big family” (FGD, Men, Rural, Midzone).

Finally, about half of the key informants in the urban areas said there is an increase in sexual violence (56.5%, n 402). Similar to all other areas, sexual violence in cities is viewed by the participants in focus group discussions as a part of a wider pattern of violence in their community, and the views on its occurrence are not necessarily shared universally, even within one focus group: A participant said that everyone—with no exceptions—faces violence. All participants agreed that the mother is most commonly subjected to violence in the society. A participant stated: “Sexual abuse also does exist and has increased recently”. In response, another participant denied any sort of sexual abuse in the community. The first participant seemed to hesitate but then disagreed and told a story that a boy was sexually abused by an adult man at school, and the man was caught and punished (FGD, Women, Urban, Gaza City).

When asked where sexual violence against children occurs, more than half of all KIs (56%, n 604) situated these incidents in close proximity to home: while children play around the house or their village or neighborhood. Also, more than a third of all key informants (38%, n 604) state that sexual violence occurs in schools, and about the same proportion of key informants (36%, n 604) say a child’s home is where sexual violence occurs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where does sexual violence against children occur more often?</th>
<th>Gaza Strip All (n 604)</th>
<th>Urban (n 402)</th>
<th>Rural (n 63)</th>
<th>Camp (n 73)</th>
<th>ARA (n 66)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Playing around house/village (56%)</td>
<td>Playing around house/village (56.7%)</td>
<td>Playing around house/village (49%)</td>
<td>Playing around house/village (60%)</td>
<td>Playing around house/village (53%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At school (38%)</td>
<td>At school (41%)</td>
<td>Working in the fields (33%)</td>
<td>At home (56%)</td>
<td>At home (29%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At home (36%)</td>
<td>At home (36.1%)</td>
<td>At school (27%)</td>
<td>At school (43%)</td>
<td>At school (26%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

67 Multiple choice question
When asked about the age of children who suffered sexual abuse, almost three quarters of key informants across Gaza strip state that main targets of sexual violence are mostly children between 6 and 14 years of age (73% of KIs, n 604). That opinion is consistent across all types of sites.

When asked whether being a boy or a girl plays a role, the largest proportion of key informants of Gaza Strip overall (43%, n 604) state that there is no clear difference between boys and girls targeted by sexual violence. The opinions echoed throughout a number of focus group discussions was that physical sexual abuse can and does happen to both boys and girls, but girls are, more often than boys, a target of verbal harassment with sexual connotations such as lewd comments about their bodies. This might partially explain why proportion of key informants (38%, n 604) believe that there are more girls targets of sexual abuse than boys. A very similar proportion of answers was given by key informants across all types of sites, except for ARA, where only 33% of key informants think that girls are targeted more than boys. Importantly, the majority of key informants' overall (71%, n 604) state that if a girl is a victim of sexual violence, she would not normally seek help. This opinion is consistent across all types of sites, except for ARA, where a higher proportion of key informants, 79%, state that a girl victim would not normally seek help. That is perhaps not so surprising as a large proportion of KIs (45%, n 604) anticipate that in their community, a girl would be blamed for her being abused herself:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What happens if a girl is a victim of sexual violence? 68</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gaza Strip All (n 604)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blame survivor (45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punish survivor (41%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediation (34%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban (n 402)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blame survivor (51%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punish perpetrator (35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediation (35.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural (n 63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punish survivor (43.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediation (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve police/Justice (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp (n 73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blame survivor (45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punish survivor (44%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediation (37%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARA (n 66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punish perpetrator (47%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punish survivor (41%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediation (37%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blame survivor (36%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indeed, several female participants in focus group discussions said that even if they knew that they should speak to their family; they would not necessarily do so. A FGD participant explained: “If they get sexually abused, they remain silent, they fear to tell their parents about it”.

68 Multiple choice question
Another added: “In this area, we have nobody who thinks about us, or even cares for us. We keep pouring sadness inside and remain silent” (FGD, Girls, Rural, Gaza City) In case of boy victims of sexual violence, 58% of KIs across Gaza (n 604) state that he would not seek help either. The views of key informants vary slightly depending on the urban, rural, camp or ARA character of their location: Whereas 70% of key informants in rural (n 63) and ARAs (n 66) state that a boy victim would not normally seek help, in urban areas 57% (n 402) of key informants believe a sexually abused boy would not normally seek help. In camp areas, less than half, 45% (n 73), of key informants state that a boy victim of sexual abuse would not normally seek help. The key informants also state, however, the consequences for boys are likely to differ from these for girls if they are victims of sexual abuse:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What happens if a boy is a victim of sexual violence?</th>
<th>Gaza Strip All (n 604)</th>
<th>Urban (n 402)</th>
<th>Rural (n 63)</th>
<th>Camp (n 73)</th>
<th>ARA (n 66)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Punish perpetrator (46%)</td>
<td>Punish perpetrator (46.5%)</td>
<td>Punish perpetrator (38%)</td>
<td>Punish perpetrator (56.2%)</td>
<td>Punish perpetrator (41%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediate (37%)</td>
<td>Mediate (37.1%)</td>
<td>Mediate (32%)</td>
<td>Involve police-Justice (56%)</td>
<td>Involve police-Justice (41%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve police-Justice (34%)</td>
<td>Involve police-Justice (30.6%)</td>
<td>Involve police-Justice (24%)</td>
<td>Mediation (43%)</td>
<td>Mediate (38%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, while KIs and the participants in FGD believe that both girls and boys can be victims of sexual abuse, the gender of the victim will most likely affect the treatment of the child in the community, their protection, and access to justice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What happens if a child is a victim of sexual violence? (n 604)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GIRL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Blame survivor (45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Punish survivor (41%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Mediation (34%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BOY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Punish perpetrator (46%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mediate (37%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Involve police-Justice (34%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

69 Multiple choice question
Even if girls and boys were seeking help, there appears little on offer to them in terms of specialized services available. Overall only 15% of Gaza KIs (n 604) know of a place in their area where a victim of sexual violence could seek help. These proportions are slightly higher in urban areas, where 17% of KIs (n 402) know of a service that can help victims of sexual abuse, followed by key informants from ARA where 15% (n 66) know of a service available. In camps, 14% of key informants know of a service for victims of sexual abuse and only 6% of KIs in rural areas report to have such a service in their area. The participants in focus groups also elaborated that girls are often restricted in their movement as a prevention of violence “Sexual violence is not that common because we do not let the girls go out” (FGD, Men, ARA, Gaza City).
3.5 Psychosocial needs

Overall, almost all key informants (96%, n 604) across all types of sites of Gaza Strip report having observed manifestations of psychosocial distress in children. The proportion of KIs is almost universal across sites, with rural KIs responding 100% in the affirmative, and the lowest proportion being among the urban KIs, where 94.8% (n 402) report an increase in psychosocial distress.

All key informants from Khanyounis report having observed manifestations of psychosocial distress in children. This is also true across all governorates, with 92% in Gaza, 97% in Midzone, 93% in Rafah, and 98% in Gaza North. Distress manifestations include children being more aggressive (85%, n 579), bedwetting (76%, n 579), unusual crying and screaming (73%, n 579), violence against younger children (72%, n 579), unwillingness to go to school (69%, n 579), disrespectful behavior in the family (61%, n 579), having nightmares and not being able to sleep (60%, n 579), sadness (57%, n 579) and avoiding others (50%, n 579). Similar patterns were reported across all sites, except for ARA, where in addition to the above, more than half of KIs (55%, n 66) also added substance abuse. The graph below shows by percentage the distribution of distress manifestations of children as reported by key informants.

Percentage distribution of distress manifestations across Gaza Strip Governorates
Research on the mental health of children exposed to armed conflict shows consensus that armed conflict threatens children’s wellbeing both directly—through exposure to war-related violence and loss, and indirectly—through its adverse impact on the social and material conditions of everyday life. These ‘daily stressors’ are persistent in daily life and include poverty, overcrowded and unsafe housing, family violence, impaired parenting due to parental distress, lack of access to education, the marginalization of children orphaned or disabled by violence or disease, and so on. Numerous studies show that these types of daily stressors contribute to levels of distress and clinical disorder that equals or exceeds that of exposure to direct war. Indeed, the Gaza CPWG members expressed serious concerns over children’s ongoing psychosocial needs. In 2017, UNRWA’s study revealed that 48.9% of the adults surveyed were identified as having poor well-being, and 62.8% of them would warrant depression screening. Likewise, among students, younger children in particular appear to be experiencing serious difficulties.

When asked about the main stressors for children, home tensions came prominently as an answer from 87% of all KIs (n = 604). Comparative analysis of the data suggests that key informants have reported home tensions more as source of stressors for children in Khanyounis governorate (93.5%) and Midzone governorate (93.3%) than in other governorates. There has been some variation among stressors and the prevalence with which they are listed, depending on the urban, rural, camp or ARA character of site:
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73 Based on WHO-5 Well-Being Index. Source: Well-being among Palestine refugee adults and children in Gaza, Community Mental Health Programme, UNRWA Gaza, 2017
74 Based in the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ). Source: Well-being among Palestine refugee adults and children in Gaza, Community Mental Health Programme, UNRWA Gaza, 2017
### What stresses children in Gaza Strip?[^75]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gaza Strip All (n 604)</th>
<th>Urban (n 402)</th>
<th>Rural (n 63)</th>
<th>Camp (n 73)</th>
<th>ARA (n 66)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tensions within family</td>
<td>87.4%</td>
<td>87.1%</td>
<td>Lack of fuel/energy (94%)</td>
<td>Tensions within family (82%)</td>
<td>Tensions within family (94%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of fuel/energy</td>
<td>85.9%</td>
<td>Lack of fuel energy (84.6%)</td>
<td>Tensions within family (89%)</td>
<td>Lack of fuel energy (82%)</td>
<td>Lack of fuel energy (91%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of food (74.7%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Armed conflict (76%)</td>
<td>Lack of food (70%)</td>
<td>Lack of food (85%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed conflict (64.6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bullying (75%)</td>
<td>Armed conflict (63%)</td>
<td>Lack of shelter (76%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of adequate shelter (63%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Armed conflict (62.2%)</td>
<td>Lack of food (67%)</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nightmares and bad memories (55.5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nightmares and bad memories (56.7%)</td>
<td>Nightmares or bad memories (57%)</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being separated from family (51.4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Being separated from families (54.9%)</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Being separated from friends (55%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Extra hard work (53%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated in focus group discussions about risk and injuries, as well as in discussions about violence, the external environment and context in which adults live and bring up children in Gaza has been stressful for a long period. The key informants across Gaza Strip named the lack of basics provisions, including electricity, as a major stressor to caregivers (92% of all KIs, n 604). Comparative analysis of the data suggests that key informants have reported the lack of basics provisions, including electricity, as a major stressor to caregivers across the five governorates, however, the highest percentage is reported in Midzone (98.9%) and lowest percentage is reported in Gaza Governorate (79.6%). Similarly, to children, the perceptions of the main sources of stress vary slightly relative to the character of the site where key informants live:

[^75]: Multiple choice question
What stresses caregivers in Gaza Strip?\textsuperscript{76}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gaza Strip All (n 604)</th>
<th>Urban (n 402)</th>
<th>Rural (n 63)</th>
<th>Camp (n 73)</th>
<th>ARA (n 66)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of electricity, water (91.6%)</td>
<td>Lack of electricity, water (91%)</td>
<td>Lack of electricity, water (100%)</td>
<td>Ongoing blockade (93%)</td>
<td>Lost livelihood (89%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost livelihood (89.6%)</td>
<td>Lost livelihood (89.3%)</td>
<td>Lost livelihood (91%)</td>
<td>Lost livelihood (90%)</td>
<td>Lack of electricity, water (88%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing blockade (82.5%)</td>
<td>Ongoing blockade (80.1%)</td>
<td>Ongoing blockade (89%)</td>
<td>Lack of electricity, water (90%)</td>
<td>Ongoing blockade (79%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of food (72%)</td>
<td>Lack of food (70.9%)</td>
<td>Lack of food (67%)</td>
<td>Lack of food (77%)</td>
<td>Lack of food (79%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing conflict (63.7 %)</td>
<td>Ongoing conflict (64.4%)</td>
<td>Ongoing conflict (56%)</td>
<td>Ongoing conflict (70%)</td>
<td>Violence within community (64%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of shelter (59%)</td>
<td>Lack of shelter (61.7 %)</td>
<td>Lack of shelter (54%)</td>
<td>Violence within community (58%)</td>
<td>Lack of shelter (62%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence within community (58%)</td>
<td>Violence within community (58%)</td>
<td>Violence within community (54%)</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Children's safety (59%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, more than half of Gaza key informants (60%, n 604) state that there is no clear difference between girls and boys experiencing psychosocial distress, a view that echoed in similar proportions across all sites. Likewise, a slight majority believe that mainly children aged 11 and older are suffering from psychosocial distress (55% of KIs, n 604).

There have been significant efforts by a variety of active agencies in the Gaza Strip (including, but not limited to, UNICEF, UNRWA; Gaza Community Mental Health Programme, Save the Children, Terre des hommes, War Child Holland and others) to address psychosocial needs, in particular those of children. The key informants are indeed aware of services available to children to cope with stress and distress (54% of all KIs, n 604). The types and availability of services vary, depending on the character of site where key informants live. The most widely recognized and available form of support are the school counselors, who were named by three quarters of overall key informants.

\textsuperscript{76} Multiple choice question
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Gaza Strip All (n 325)</th>
<th>Urban (n 231)</th>
<th>Rural (n 38)</th>
<th>Camp (n 38)</th>
<th>ARA (n18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School counseling</td>
<td>(72.3%)</td>
<td>(72.7%)</td>
<td>Child friendly space (79%)</td>
<td>School counseling (82%)</td>
<td>School counseling (83%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child friendly space</td>
<td>(64.3%)</td>
<td>(64.9%)</td>
<td>School counseling (55%)</td>
<td>Individual counseling (50%)</td>
<td>Child friendly space (67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual counseling</td>
<td>(45.2%)</td>
<td>(50.2%)</td>
<td>Individual counseling (24%)</td>
<td>Child friendly space (45%)</td>
<td>Counseling for parents (28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational and</td>
<td>Group counseling (39.4%)</td>
<td>Vocational ad extracurricular activities (21%)</td>
<td>Group counseling (34%)</td>
<td>Individual counseling (17%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extracurricular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activities (34.2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group counseling</td>
<td>(33.8%)</td>
<td>Counseling for parents (18%)</td>
<td>Counseling for parents (34%)</td>
<td>Other support for parents (17%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parents (25.5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

77 Multiple choice question
3.6 Child labour

The Palestinian Bureau of Statistics reported, in 2016, that in the past five years, the number of working children between the ages of 10 and 17 has doubled.

The PCBS estimated that there is 9,700 working children in the Gaza Strip\(^\text{78}\), which in the opinion of experts consulted is likely a conservative figure. Indeed, child labour appears to be a frequent coping mechanism with household’s loss of income, livelihoods, poverty or loss of primary wage earners. Overall, across all Gaza Strip sites 88.1% of KIs (n 604) were aware of children doing types of work that they consider harsh or dangerous. The above diagram shows the percentage distribution of key informants across governorates who are aware of children engaged in harsh or dangerous labour. Among the key informants aware of children engaged in harsh or dangerous labour (n 532), the most frequently stated form of such work was selling goods as street vendors (81.6% of KIs, n 532), followed by collecting waste (66.5%, n 532).

Between half and three quarters of all Gaza Strip key informants also cited collecting rubble (60.7%, n 532), farm work (59.2%, n 532) and begging (59%, n 532) as common forms of child labour. Approximately half of all key informants were aware of children working to transport other people and goods, cleaning cars, working in factories, digging tunnels and engaging in construction work. Less than a quarter of all Gaza Strip key informants said they were aware of children employed in domestic labour. The below graph shows frequency distribution across governorates of Key informants aware of forms of child labour.

---

\(^{78}\) Preliminary Interviews, September 2017
### Frequency distribution of key informants aware of forms of child work across Gaza Strip Governorates

![Graph showing frequency distribution of child work forms across Gaza Strip Governorates](image)

### What stresses caregivers in Gaza Strip?[^79]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stress Factor</th>
<th>Gaza Strip All (n 532)</th>
<th>Urban (n 342)</th>
<th>Rural (n 59)</th>
<th>Camp (n 66)</th>
<th>ARA (n 65)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street vendors</td>
<td>81.6 %</td>
<td>86.5 %</td>
<td>91.5 %</td>
<td>83.3 %</td>
<td>73.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collecting waste</td>
<td>65.5 %</td>
<td>65.8 %</td>
<td>78 %</td>
<td>Begging (72.7 %)</td>
<td>Collecting waste (72.3 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collecting rubble</td>
<td>60.7 %</td>
<td>Begging (65.8 %)</td>
<td>Collecting waste (72.9 %)</td>
<td>Collecting rubble (69.7 %)</td>
<td>Collecting rubble (69.2 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm work</td>
<td>59.2 %</td>
<td>Farm work (57%)</td>
<td>Street vendors (59.3 %)</td>
<td>Transporting people or goods (62.1 %)</td>
<td>Farm work (64.6 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begging</td>
<td>(59%)</td>
<td>Collecting rubble (54.4 %)</td>
<td>Transporting people or goods (44.1 %)</td>
<td>Collecting waste (59.1 %)</td>
<td>Transporting people or goods (61.5 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transporting people or goods</td>
<td>(52.8%)</td>
<td>Cleaning cars and streets (51.2%)</td>
<td>Factory work (40.7 %)</td>
<td>Farm work (36.4 %)</td>
<td>Digging tunnels, construction work (53.8 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning cars and streets</td>
<td>(43.6%)</td>
<td>Transporting people or goods (50.9 %)</td>
<td>Digging tunnels and construction work (39 %)</td>
<td>Factory work (36.4 %)</td>
<td>Begging (41.5 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factory work</td>
<td>(41.9%)</td>
<td>Factory work (45.6 %)</td>
<td>Cleaning cars and streets (23.7 %)</td>
<td>Cleaning cars and streets (33.3 %)</td>
<td>Cleaning cars and streets (32.3 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digging tunnels and construction work</td>
<td>(38.9%)</td>
<td>Digging tunnels and construction work (38 %)</td>
<td>Begging (23.7 %)</td>
<td>Digging tunnels and construction work (28.8 %)</td>
<td>Factory work (29.2 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic labour</td>
<td>(18.2%)</td>
<td>Domestic labour (23.1 %)</td>
<td>Domestic labour (8.5 %)</td>
<td>Domestic labour (7.6 %)</td>
<td>Domestic labour (12.3 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factory work</td>
<td>(41.9%)</td>
<td>Factory work (45.6 %)</td>
<td>Cleaning cars and streets (23.7 %)</td>
<td>Cleaning cars and streets (33.3 %)</td>
<td>Cleaning cars and streets (32.3 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digging tunnels and construction work</td>
<td>(38.9%)</td>
<td>Digging tunnels and construction work (38 %)</td>
<td>Begging (23.7 %)</td>
<td>Digging tunnels and construction work (28.8 %)</td>
<td>Factory work (29.2 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic labour</td>
<td>(18.2%)</td>
<td>Domestic labour (23.1 %)</td>
<td>Domestic labour (8.5 %)</td>
<td>Domestic labour (7.6 %)</td>
<td>Domestic labour (12.3 %)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^79]: Multiple choice question
Overall, Gaza key informants believed that there were more boys than girls doing hard and dangerous labour (70%, n 532). The Palestinian Bureau of Statistics in 2016 stated that out of the estimated 9,700 working children, 2,900 were below the legal employment age of 15 years. However, almost half of all key informants (42 %, n 532) believed the proportion of working children under the legal employment age to be higher and stated that children doing harsh labour were mainly below the legal employment age - between 6 and 14 years old. Conversely a further 33% of Gaza key informants (n 532) believed that such children were mainly older than 14 years.

The majority of adult key informants stated that children engage in work voluntarily to support themselves and their families. Yet, majority of them also believed that parents send children to do such work. The economic hardship of families which drives child labour was mentioned multiple times in focus group discussions across sites. Adults, both women and men in focus groups frequently discussed how generating income is in many instances the priority of the family over education and working children often drop out of schools, or have very low educational achievement. “Children, especially boys drop out of their schools and work to help their families”. “Some children work directly after they return from schools and this affects their educational achievement” (FGD, Women, Urban, Gaza City). “Child labour is widely spread in Gaza due to poverty The boy goes to work to help his family. He could sell cigarettes and later start smoking, or learn other bad things” (FGD, Women, Camp, Gaza City).

Girls and boys from urban areas also voiced their concerns about working children leaving school: “Some boys drop out of school; they collect rubble or iron and sell them. Some girls sell goods in the streets”. “I know boys who go to destroyed houses to collect rubble and iron to sell. This is dangerous” “There should be awareness for children, boys and girls not to leave schools. There should be spaces for boys to learn some vocational professions” (FGD, Boys, Urban, Gaza City). Girls and boys in rural area focus group discussions across Gaza Strip shared that they know about working children and expressed concern: “Here in the area, we have lots of boys and girls who don’t go to school, or dropped out of school. They work in grocery, picking olives, or in farming”. “We have boys here who work in farming and use pesticides. I know a boy whose father used to make him use pesticides with crops, they didn’t wash his hands and he died” (FGD, Girls, Rural, Gaza City).
“Here’s a child who works and collects rubble in order to pay his school fees. He’s in 6th grade”. “There’s a child who collects plastic. Farm lands are also dangerous as they are located near the borders” (FGD, Girls, Rural, Khan Yunis). “The most common form of child labor is fishing. Children go to the harbor to fish. They stay up all night fishing with their fathers, the next day they go to school half asleep which affects their achievement in school” (FGD, Boys, Rural, Khan Yunis). In camp areas, boys and girls spoke also about works such as begging and stealing as a concern for children: "My friend's father made him drop out of school and go to graves to beg" “I saw a 12-year-old girl who steals in markets because her father asks her to do that” (FGD, Boys, Camp, Midzone).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who are the working children that we know?</th>
<th>(More than 10 children known to a KI, full sample)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gaza Strip All (n 604)</td>
<td>Urban (n 402)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street vendors (45%)</td>
<td>Street vendors (44.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm work (32.6%)</td>
<td>Begging (27.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collecting rubble (29%)</td>
<td>Farm work (24.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collecting waste (27%)</td>
<td>Transporting people /goods (23.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transporting people or goods (25%)</td>
<td>Collecting waste (23.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begging (25%)</td>
<td>Collecting rubble (21.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning cars and streets (18%)</td>
<td>Cleaning cars and streets (18.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digging tunnels and construction work (16%)</td>
<td>Digging/construction work (13.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factory work (13%)</td>
<td>Factory work (13.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic labour (7%)</td>
<td>Domestic labour (7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

80 Multiple choice question
Girls and boys from ARA focus groups also named begging as well as washing cars, work in mechanical workshops, begging, cleaning houses, and selling in streets as work that is hard and can be dangerous to children.

When asked about the numbers of children known to them who were working in each particular type of labour in their area (site), the highest number of children known to key informants overall was street vendors, with 45% (n 604) of all key informants knowing at least 10 such children. Also, 33% (n 604) of all key informants know more than 10 children working in farms, and 30% (n 604) know more than 10 children in their area collecting rubble.

When discussing what can be done to address child labour, the term ‘awareness’ and the need for helping both adults and children to realize the damaging consequences of child labour echoed across adolescent and adult focus groups in all sites: “There should be awareness for parents to take care of their children and their problems” (FGD, Men, Urban, Gaza City). “We should increase awareness and carry out workshops and seminars for parents, and the parents must speak to their children and meet their needs” (FGD, Boys, Camp, Midzone). “All dangerous works affect children because they should not work in the first place. There should be organizations to help families and children to stop child labor” (FGD, Women, Urban, Gaza City). “There should be certain places where dropout children could go to for education, so to make use of their education when they grow up.” “Parents should learn about the risks of child labour” (FGD, Women, Camp, Gaza City). “There should be funds to reduce poverty.” “Parents should go to awareness sessions, mosques, and institutions.” “Trust should be built between parents and their children” (FGD, Girls and boys, ARA).

### 3.7 Children in contact with law

There are three categories of children that can find themselves in contact with the law: child offenders, child victims and child witnesses. One child can be, at the same time, in more than one of the aforementioned categories when navigating police and judicial proceedings.

Currently in the Gaza Strip, the applicable national law pertaining to children in contact with the law is framed by the following instruments: (i) Juvenile Offenders Ordinance No. (2) of 1937 (main legal instruments issued during the British mandate), (ii) The Palestinian Child Law No. (7) of 2004, (iii) The Criminal Procedures Code No. (3) of 2001, (iv) Judicial Circular No. (25) of 2013.
issued by the Attorney General, (v) Judicial Circular No. (15) of 2014 issued by the Attorney General and (vi) Reform and Rehabilitation Centers Act No. 6 (1998).

The legal fragmentation between Gaza Strip and the West Bank affects as well the justice sector for children in contact with the law. Since the formation of the Palestinian Legislative Council (PLC) in 1996, there were attempts to develop, unify, and harmonize the legal processes and laws in Gaza Strip and West Bank. Between 1996 and the political split of 2007, multiple unified laws were issued and remain applicable to date, such as, in particular for the topic under analysis, the referred Criminal Procedures Code of 2001 and the Palestinian Child Law of 2004. However, the process of unification is far from completed and following the Palestinian leadership split in 2007, dozens of new proposed laws were separately issued in the Gaza Strip and the West Bank. Particularly relevant the Juvenile Protection Law No. 4 (2016) issued by the president Mahmoud Abbas, which was a breakthrough in the field of the child rights and juvenile justice in Palestine. It sheds new light on justice for children and falls squarely within the realm of restorative juvenile justice. It introduced the principle of the child’s best interests, non-custodial measures, limited sanctions, the concept of diversion. Priority is given to preventive, educational measures and rehabilitation within the community as opposed to detention. Until now, it is only in force in the West Bank. By 2017, the legislation governing multiple aspects of life including children’s protection in law, during law enforcement proceedings (including police and court, but not limited to that) remains fragmented in Gaza Strip and the West Bank.  

Linked with the lack of unified legal frameworks across Palestine introduced during different political regimes and specifically given the prolonged occupation, the stagnation of the peace process and the challenges of the state building process affecting the rule of law, a range of customary/informal legal practices and community-based alternatives dispute resolution mechanisms have flourished and are highly active. Particularly, the effects of the 2007 political division of Hamas and Fatah have resonated strongly in Gaza where mukhtars, tribal judges and islah men play a crucial role in the resolution of children’s cases. Indeed, bridges between formal and informal justice actors have been created in practice: Public Relation Officers are assigned to police stations across Gaza whose role is to precisely link the two

81 The PLC was inaugurated in 1996 and served as the legislature of the Palestinian National Authority (PA). Following the 2006 election and the subsequent split of Hamas and Fatah, the council ceased to function as the legislature of the PA. With the possible reconciliation of Hamas and Fatah, it would be re-assembled to become the Parliament of the State of Palestine.
82 Desk review and preliminary interviews, September 2017, Justice for children focus group discussion October 2017.
systems in the resolution of cases. Certainly, with respect to child victims of crimes, the key informants seem to suggest that informal justice and community-based mechanism and solutions are the most commonly used option and community leaders (mukhtars, tribal judges and/or islah men) are involved in conciliation processes to solve problems. The informal approach seems to apply even in cases of serious abuse such as rape and sexual violence. If such criminal act involves a boy, only 34% (n 604) of all key informants believe that the formal justice system should be involved. If such a crime involves a girl (in the majority of cases as victim or witness), only 26% (n 604) of key informants believe that police and the judiciary should intervene. Nevertheless, while community-based justice mechanisms in children’s cases offer better accessibility, flexibility and speediness, community ownership are more cost effective than the formal justice system but they sometimes involve harmful practices and/or violation of children’s rights and their best interests, lack of gender-sensitive procedures, are influenced by locale elites or lack of children’s participation in the process (whether they are the offenders, the victims or the witness).

The formal justice system in Gaza Strip is still weak when dealing with child victim and child witness with almost inexistent procedural child-friendly provision on the applicable regulations that focus on these two categories that require special care and protective measures from all the law enforcement actors and institutions in order to, inter alia, avoid re-victimization, preserving evidence or ensuring the physical safety of the child. The FGD\(^{83}\) states, for example, “that there is not any child friendly room set up for interviews within police stations in Gaza Strip.” While some police officers did receive basic training on the treatment of child victims and child witness, there is no continuous education and building of the capacity of police force. There also is no standard practice of involving psychologists or social workers in police interviews and during the investigation processes that sometimes involves also the families of child victims and/or victim of crime. In terms of forensic procedures concerning specifically victims of sexual crimes, there is no specialized medical room or unit for examination of children who are victims, and the medical specialists involved did not receive any training in working with child victims of abuse. The forensic medical records from victim examination are shared with law enforcement actors in the course of criminal investigation. During the course of criminal investigation, the child often stays at home, even if the suspected offender is from the same household or lives in close proximity; meaning that no protective measures taken into account from the victim and or witness sides. This is in part due to the absence of crisis shelters

83 The Focus Group Discussion with justice for children actors was conducted in Al-Rabee institution in October 2017 and involved 10 practitioners from the justice sector.
specialized in children, where victims and witnesses could find a refuge. However, as a matter of GBV and Child Protection Case Management SOP developed in Gaza Strip in 2016 and adopted by the Ministry of Social Development (MoSD), all serious cases of abuse of children, including sexual abuse, are to be referred to the MoSD, which would follow up with the child and their family if recommendable, to provide referral for child protection service providers active in the area where the child lives. It is important to consider that fear of social stigma prevents a high number of cases (families and children) from reporting them, disclosing the need to work in awareness and change of harmful social norms.

During court proceedings, the child victim of crime is not required to appear before court, and be confronted with the aggressor/offender. The child can be represented by an adult family member, or by a lawyer. The judiciary did not receive any specialized training related to appropriately handling cases of child victims and child witness of crime. During court proceedings and as a follow up, there is no mandatory social workers support sanctioned by the court- in situations when the child partakes in court hearings/proceedings. More comprehensive information is available on the situation of children in conflict with the law, that is to say, child offenders (or juveniles, as sometimes they are referred to) as the Juvenile Offenders Ordinance No. (2) of 1937 applicable in the Gaza Strip contains a number of legal provisions pertaining to their rights and duties, roles and responsibilities, proceedings stages, etc. However, those provisions are outdated and not aligned with the Convention of the Rights of the Child and specialized subsequent international standards specifically referred to juvenile justice/access to justice for children. In Gaza Strip, while the TSC emphasized that much remains to be done to ensure that a meaningful shift from punitive approaches to restorative ones occurs in everyday police and judicial practices with child offenders. The resolutions issued by the attorney general in 2013 and 2014 are reported to pave way for an improvement of the policies applied in juvenile justice. Such policies include, first, that a juvenile is arrested only if all attempts at an amicable and restorative solution have failed; second, that a juvenile must not be arrested for committing a minor crime; and third, that any interrogation must be carried out in the presence of a probation officer whose report must be attached to the juvenile’s file when submitted before the court. Also, police officers are allowed to make contact with informal justice actors, such as Mukhtars or Islah men or women, so as to release the juvenile without referring him/her to public prosecution (as stated above, through the Public Relations Officers).
The most significant development in terms of court proceedings was the setting up of a juvenile court in the Al-Rabee Institution though, it must be noted that the juvenile court was not frequently functioning in the period 2016-2017. Up to 2017, 14 court sessions have been held with the presence of probation officers from various human rights organizations.

Despite some remarkable advancements, an important number of concerns remains to be addressed. There is no specialized justice system in place for children in the Gaza Strip, but rather individuals with some knowledge stemming from the tasks to deal with child offenders. There is a need to appoint, train, coach and establish juvenile specialized police, prosecutors and judges. Children’s rights within the justice system (right to be heard, right to be informed, right to maintain contact with the families, right to have the sentences regularly revised upon social considerations, right to be legally represented in court by a lawyer, right to be separated from adults, etc.) are not systematically fulfilled. Probation officers and welfare institutions require not only logistic support but also the availability of qualitative and comprehensive rehabilitation programs (life skills support, learning support services, vocational trainings, recreational alternatives, etc.) embedded within a reintegration approach. Community and family involvement actions as well as close and sustainable follow-up mechanisms are an urgent issue to be addressed to ensure the healing and the peace restoration in the child’s environment after release. Al-Rabee Institution, run by the Ministry of Social Development, is also the only place in the Gaza Strip that is authorized to detain child offenders. It receives about 800 boys annually and houses about 48 at any given time; however, the number may reach up to 60. Rehabilitation services for children and training of the staff in charge at Al Rabi’s center requires to be urgently improved. Diversion and non-custodial measures should be guaranteed within the justice system, especially considering that approximately 80% of the cases in which a child is found to be the offender are considered minor crimes as per the applicable regulations. The institutionalization of proper specialized legal aid assistance for children (free of charge when needed) is necessary to be tackled in the Gaza Strip due to the crucial importance in the police and judicial proceedings.

84 Justice for Children FGD, also in Iyad Abu Hjayer, Juvenile Justice in Palestine, This week in Palestine, January 2017 http://thisweekinpalestine.com/juvenile-justice-gaza-strip/
3.8 Inclusion
Overall, more than half of Gaza Strip KIs (66.7%, n 604) believe that children do not have equal access to services. The below graph shows the percentage distribution of children who have equal access to existing services from key informants' point of view across the five governorates when asked about the main factors that determine inequality in access to services.

### Exclusion factors by site type (All sites; Full sample)\(^\text{85}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Urban (n402)</th>
<th>Rural (n 63)</th>
<th>Camp (n 73)</th>
<th>ARA (n66)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender is an exclusion factor</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability is an exclusion factor</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>33.3 %</td>
<td>26 %</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age is an exclusion factor</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>31.5 %</td>
<td>33.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship and personal status in an exclusion factor</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>21.9 %</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty is an exclusion factor</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Working children 18%</td>
<td>Working children 8%</td>
<td>Working children 18%</td>
<td>Children living with disabled caregivers: 23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{85}\) Multiple choice question
Gender: Out of those key informants who perceive inequality in children’s access to services (n=403), more than half (64.3%, n 403) believe that gender plays a role. Out of those who identified gender as a factor (n=259), a third state that girls have less access to services (31%, n 259) and approximately one quarter said boys have less access (26.6%, n 259). Based on focus group discussions, it can be inferred that -to prevent violence and protect girls’ honour-, girls are often restricted in moving freely and may face difficulty accessing services outside their home. It was also frequently mentioned that there are few services for girls in Gaza. Therefore, the challenge for girls is both the lack of availability and the inaccessibility of services. Boys have more freedom, but it was mentioned by many FGD participants that services, play and sports areas for boys are not available in their area.

Disability: Out of those key informants who perceive inequality in children’s access to services, half (50.6%, n 403) also state that children with disability (CWD) also face reduced access to services. The below graph shows the comparative analysis across the five governorates of key informants who perceive inequality in disabled children’s access to services.

![Graph showing distribution of key informants who perceive inequality in children’s access to services across Gaza North, Gaza, Midzone, Khanyounis, and Rafah. The percentages are 50.6%, 42.6%, 70.9%, 51.2%, and 50.5% respectively.](image-url)
A recent thorough study\textsuperscript{86} of the situation of Palestinian children, -including those living in Gaza- found those with disabilities are highly vulnerable. They were very likely to be extremely poor, woefully under-supported and do not realise their rights to an appropriately tailored education and health care, had very few opportunities to participate in the social activities required for healthy development and were poorly protected from abuse and exploitation. The study also found that, for those CWDs who were able to access programming, including schooling that provided support and fostered inclusion, the results could be transformational. It also, unfortunately, found such programming was largely unavailable—particularly for the children with the most severe disabilities, girls and those living in more remote areas. The research found that CWDs’ health, schooling and well-being outcomes were markedly worse than those of their siblings and peers without disabilities (ODI, UNICEF 2016).

Age: Out of those who reported inequality, 41.9\% (n 403) believe that the age of the child plays a role. In particular, children aged 11-14 years were believed to have fewer services available (49.5\% of KIs believe that age is a factor, n 111), and 36.9\% (n 111) of KIs said children below the age of 10 had unequal access to services. The focus group discussion record suggests that in many areas children had limited play and free time options and services other than school available to them. While many FGD participants were aware of child friendly spaces, these are not available everywhere and are considered more suitable for younger children than 11-14 years olds. The adolescent participants in focus group discussions (15-18 years old) repeatedly pointed out that very little sport, creative activities, and free learning available to them, which was echoed also in several focus groups with adults: “Teenagers are the most stressed group, which is why we have to take care of our children, [but also] men, and youth”(FGD, Women, Camp, Gaza City).

Other factors include: Citizenship and refugee status: Out of those key informants who perceive inequality in children’s access to services, 40.4\% (n 403) believe that refugee children had less access to services. Poverty: Out of those key informants who perceive inequality in children’s access to services, 36\% (n 403) of key informants believe that children from poor households were excluded from services and 24.6\% (n 403) believe that be the case for working children. Parents & caregivers: to a lesser degree, other situations related to exclusion of children according to Gaza Strip KIs overall include living with disabled parents, living with older caregivers -men and women, and living in single female headed household.

\textsuperscript{86} Every child counts: understanding the needs and perspectives of children with disabilities in the State of Palestine, UNICEF 2016.
3.9 Access to information

Overall, almost all of Gaza Strip key informants (99.7%, n 604) use information from an external source. The single most frequently sited source of information was the Internet (trusted and used by 85.3% of KIs, n 604). Much is however conveyed in person and the second most trusted source of information for Gaza Strip KIs was neighbors and family (80.3%, n 604), followed by friends (74.5%, n 604). Within mass media, radio was preferred by KIs across Gaza (50.2%, n 604) to television (48.8%, n 604), followed by much lower use of print media such as newspapers and magazine: only 11.4% (n 604) of KIs relied on printed media. Higher proportion of KIs relied on local noticeboards and posters for printed information (21.7%, n 604) than on newspapers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are the main sources of information? (top 10 per site type)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gaza Strip All (n 604)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet (85.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbors and family (80.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends (74.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio (50.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television (48.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone call (41.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMS (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid workers (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious leaders (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers and magazines (11.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For telecommunications, 41.1% (n 604) of KIs used telephone calls as a source of information, while slightly fewer (32%, n 604) regarded SMS as a source of reliable information. Other forms of information were aid workers who were a source of news to about one quarter of KIs across Gaza Strip (29%, n 604), followed by religious leaders (26%, n 604), and community leaders (22.5%, n 604). Formal institutions were not particularly trusted sources of news, as only 12.7% (n 604) of KIs across Gaza Strip would turn to a government official for information, and even fewer - 9% (n 604) - would source news from a military official.

The differences between the urban, rural, camp and ARA sites: Key informants in urban sites across Gaza Strip cited the internet most frequently as their source of information (84.8% of KIs, n 402). Personal communication was also vital, with 76.6% (n 402) of urban KIs citing family and neighbors as their source of information, and 72.1% (n 402) get information also from communication with friends. About half of urban KIs relied on mass media, the radio was used by 51.1% of KIs as a source of information, and the television was mentioned by 48.8%. Among the least frequently mentioned sources of information was government officials (16.7% of KIs) and military officials (11.5%).

In rural sites, personal communication was the most cited source of information. A total 90.5% (n 63) of KIs from rural sites received their information from neighbors and family, and 82.5% from friends. In rural areas, KIs said the internet, radio and television were sources of information, 79.4%, 47.6% and 46% respectively. Telecommunications were important where more than a quarter (28.6%, n 63) of rural KIs would use a phone to convey and receive information, although fewer 14.3% (n 63) use SMS to do so. Religious leaders, aid workers and governmental officials were regarded as a source of information by 20.6%, 17.5% and 6.3% of rural key informants respectively. Among the least used sources of information were noticeboards and posters (cited by 1.6%, n 63), and military officials (3.2 %, n 63).
In camp sites, the Internet was identified a widely used source of information (by 89%, n 73) equally important sources of information to the residents of camp sites were family and neighbors (89%, n 73), followed by friends (78.1%, n 73). Television was the most cited mass communication form of information (37%, n 73), followed by radio (27.4%, n 73).

Print communication was regarded as a source of information by some, with 19.2% (n 73) key informants citing notice boards and posters, but only 2.7% (n 73) of KIs citing newspapers and magazines as their source of information. Aid workers, community and religious leaders were also ranked among the top ten sources of information, cited by 34.2%, 27.4%, and 23.3% of camp based KIs respectively. Telecommunications also played an important role in the camp sites, as more than a quarter (28.8%, n 73) of KIs used telephones to source information, and 26% (n 73) of KIs used SMS. The government officials, both civil and military ranked among the least cited sources of information in Gaza Strip camp sites (2.7% and 6.8% respectively).

In ARA sites across Gaza Strip, the general pattern of wide use of Internet applies (89.4%, n 66). The next most trusted sources of information were neighbors and family (83.3% of KIs) and friends (77.3%, n 66). Among means of mass media, radio was a source of information to 74% (n 66) of ARA KIs, followed by telephone calls (68.2%, n 66), followed by television (65.2%, n 66) and SMS (45.5%, n 66).

Printed information was not a widely used source of information in ARA sites, with less than a quarter (22.7%, n 66) of ARA KIs reporting they sourced information from noticeboards and posters, and only 12.1% (n 66) KIs reporting they relied on newspapers and magazines. The community leaders and religious leaders were more trusted sources of information than printed in ARA, with 34.8% (n 66) of ARA KIs relying on community leaders and 31.8% on religious leaders for information.

Aid workers did not rank as highly with only 19.7% of ARA KI mentioning them, followed by government officials (6.1%, n 66) and military officials (3%, n 66).
4. Recommendations

Mainstreaming protection and child protection into other sectors’ response:

Given the complexity of Gaza’s situation and divergent needs, non-protection actors that work in education, WASH, health, economic recovery, livelihoods and other sectors can play a vital role in mainstreaming child protection in Gaza. With the support of Gaza CPWG and Protection Cluster, actors delivering assistance in Gaza Strip should incorporate protection principles in their programming throughout targeting, beneficiary selection, aid delivery, monitoring and evaluation.

To that effect, Gaza CPWG members could develop basic context specific checklist helping other actors to:

- Prevent and minimize as much as possible any unintended negative effects of any intervention, which can increase people's vulnerability to both physical and psychosocial risks, including child labour.
- Pay special attention to individuals and groups who may be particularly vulnerable or have difficulty accessing assistance and services, including girls, children with disabilities, disabled persons, single parent and children of separated parents.
- Be able to identify and refer cases of protection and child protection concern in a way aligned with the Gaza Strip Child Protection case management and GBV SOPs, and set-up appropriate mechanisms through which affected populations can address concerns and complaints.
- Support the development of self-protection capacities of boys and girls, families and communities.

Integrated programming for protection outcomes:

As much as possible, the design of planned humanitarian activities should support both protection and assistance objectives, and actively contribute to reduction of child protection risks and negative coping mechanisms.
These could include, for example, micro-credit opportunities and cash grants for the poorest families. This would strengthen and support families and prevent secondary family separation and child labour in the economic recovery sector; strengthening social protection system of cash based social assistance (benefits) and social services in the social sector; integrating vocational education, after school activities and school bridging programs for working children in the education sector interventions; or family strengthening interventions integrated in the MHPSS area.

Child Protection programming

Separated and unaccompanied children

Prevention: Focus on integrating household level vulnerabilities, which can lead to child separation, into multi-sector assistance. In child protection sector, focus on family strengthening interventions and social service support follow up, in particular for recipients of social security benefits/aid. Consider conducting a Gaza Strip study on children in street situations.87

Protection: Consider strengthening pro-bono legal services and clinics in the Governorates. Ensure that targeting of services by Family centers and other child protection actors include vulnerabilities associated with child separation. Consider including child separation as an indicator into case management (MoSD), case monitoring and case follow up visits by social service actors and child protection counselors.

Advocacy: In line with international standards, consider advocacy for laws, policies and practices for every child to enjoy basic fundamental rights related to their protection fulfilled, including rights to: a) Have their best interests taken into consideration, b) Participate, express their opinions, and have their views considered in decision making processes that affect them, c) Be protected from violence, abuse or neglect, and d) Have a relationship with both living parents.

---

87 The term “children in street situations” is used to comprise: (a) children who depend on the streets to live and/or work, whether alone, with peers or with family; and (b) a wider population of children who have formed strong connections with public spaces and for whom the street plays a vital role in their everyday lives and identities. This wider population includes children who periodically, but not always, live and/or work on the streets and children who do not live or work on the streets but who regularly accompany their peers, siblings or family in the streets. United Nations, Committee on the Rights of the Child, General comment No. 21 (2017) on children in street situations, CRC/C/GC/21.
Dangers and injuries

Prevention: Focus on awareness raising about existing risks and hazards in the communities. This could include community risk mapping clarifying which particular areas (such as sewage treatment pipes and tanks) are particularly dangerous to children and tailoring awareness raising on community level to the needs and risks in each community. Such awareness raising can be delivered by the Family support centers and other actors active in each area. To that effect, it is vital that CP actors link with rehabilitation and development actors, either via the cluster system or locally. Linking CP actors with mine action actors could enhance effectiveness of messaging and delivery in communities.

Protection: Focus on strengthening and developing the protective functions in children’s environment. These safe environments should emphasize active engagement of children and could be community led, developed and supervised. Such interventions could include both indoor and outdoor spaces for safe sport activities of variously aged children, including adolescents, and community spaces enabling access to learning materials and tools for creative activities such as fab labs or libraries without borders. Support should be given to communities for events including, but not limited to, cultural and sports events for children and youth that can also help to convey safety and security messaging.

Promotion of protective environment for children should include advocacy for a safe, clean and healthy environment as integral to the enjoyment of a wide range of child rights, including the rights to life, health, and development. Consider advocacy for investments in infrastructure and services that enhance safety and protective measures for children in their environment.
Violence against children: Prevention of violence in private sphere: Focus on family strengthening and support to families, i.e. adults and children alike, in coping with stress and daily challenges. As much of violence is daily hardship driven, it is vital that CP actors link with rehabilitation and development actors, either via the cluster system or locally to ensure that vulnerable families benefit from all tangible support locally available. Given the attitude that the use of violence is acceptable and sometimes considered beneficial for the child’s development, focus also on addressing norms and values underpinning violent interactions. In schools and public services, focus on support to teachers, counselors and other service staff, including consideration for mentoring, positive motivation and recognition of excellence. Consider capacity building for all relevant groups of professionals including teachers, counselors, and social workers in positive discipline, communication with children and stress coping skills.

Protection/Response: Focus on sustainable availability of services and support to victims of violence, including but not limited to Family centers. Consider an establishment of crisis shelters and anonymous Hotline. Learn from and build on current experience in case management and work towards a roll out of system-wide child protection case management in Gaza. Ensure that all relevant staff in agencies potentially involved in case management is trained in conducting initial interviews with child victims of abuse and aware of referral pathways, case management principles and case management steps. Promote non-violence and in line with the CRC advocate for the right of all children to be protected from violence, abuse and neglect by their parents, or anyone else who looks after them.
Consider conducting a full Violence Against Children (VAC) study in 2018 to ensure that all aspects of violence in the communities are fully explored and understood. Advocate for a development of national (Gaza Strip) violence against children strategy and action plan.

**Sexual violence**

- **Prevention:** Focus on culturally appropriate awareness raising about the existence and inadmissibility of sexual abuse.
- **Protection:** Focus on ensuring that there is a capacity within public services and non-government agencies to support victims of sexual abuse. Staff of Family centers, and all actors active in case management should be trained in good practices in supporting child victims of sexual abuse, to ensure that their rights are respected, safety is ensured, and the survivor is treated with dignity and respect.
- Consider establishing and sustainable funding of Crisis shelter, establishing anonymous Hotline where victims of sexual abuse and other forms of violence can seek advice and support, and pro bono legal service.
- Promote non-violent environment and advocate for respecting and fulfilling rights of girls and boys survivors of sexual violence to be treated with dignity and respect, to choose, to privacy and confidentiality, to non-discrimination and to information.

**Psychosocial needs**

- **Prevention:** Consider involvement of family strengthening interventions and support to school counselors for prevention of psychosocial distress.
Protection: Consider strengthening links between mental health and psychosocial support actors and child protection actors to develop holistic support strategies for cases of concern. Continue to provide structured psychosocial support activities through schools and NGO sector. Support the capacity building of school counselors and teachers to identify and refer children with protection needs. Consider interventions that strengthen community involvement and resilience, including but not limited to, interventions designed in consultation with adolescents and youth led activities.

Promotion: Promote integration of psychosocial risks and needs into multi-sector programme design and implementation, aiming to address some of the key stressors and vulnerability drivers for the children and families.

Prevention: Integrate child protection risks considerations into economic strengthening programmes, including livelihood support and value chain development support. Consider introducing child-friendly codes of conduct for private sector, business and workshops owners. Develop culturally appropriate awareness raising for children and adults about the consequences of child labour and include information where working children and their families can seek help. Consider direct tangible support to high risk families and consider social service follow up for recipients of social security benefits (i.e., the poorest families).

Protection: Ensure that there exist safe places for children that operate also in after-office hours and are accessible to working children (drop in spaces, where children can get warm, wash, relax, play, read, access internet, seek advice etc).

Child labour
Encourage after school hours education and free of charge catch up lessons accessible to working children. Consider linking schools, actors delivering child services and Family centers in regular exchange on child labour and ensure that the case management and social service follow up is conducted for cases of children engaging in worst forms of child labour.

Promotion: In line with international standards, promote the rights of children to education and full development, and advocate for the right to protection for working children.

---

**Justice for children**

Policy and Capacity building of the Justice System: Consider conducting full legal review and analysis for strengthening legal environment (including unifying laws and alignment with international standards) for children’s access to justice and legal protection in Gaza Strip, with special focus in the regulations pertaining child victims and child witness. Consider culturally and technically appropriate awareness raising and capacity building for working with child victims, witnesses and child offenders for all actors involved in justice sector: policy makers, police officer, prosecutors, judiciary, probation service, and social service. Consider in-depth training with informal justice actors as well as strengthening of bridges among formal and informal leading to ensure fulfillment of children’s rights at all times in community-based dispute resolution mechanism.

Prevention: Consider prevention of delinquency research/situational analysis. Consider establishment of prevention of delinquency programs (including primary, secondary and tertiary prevention actions).
Protection: Consider establishing child friendly interview place(s) in police station(s), serviced by adequately trained professionals. Consider introducing the presence of social worker/counselor during police interviews with child offenders, victims and witnesses of crimes. Ensure presence of probation officer/social worker/child’s custodian if appropriate during police interviews with children in contact with the law. Ensure that Juvenile court proceedings are linked with case management support to ensure case follow up and social integration. Ensure child and family participation in decisions that affect them. Ensure that the rights of children are respected throughout police and judicial processes. Consider improvement of conditions to Al Rabi’a centre as well as establishment of comprehensive rehabilitation services. Invest in diversion and non-custodial measures for child offenders. Ensure specialized legal aid assistance for child offenders, child victims and child witness at all times they require it and free of charge when needed (institutionalization).

Promotion: Consider focusing advocacy and policy efforts on the implementation of a restorative justice approach through mediation, the application of non-custodial/alternative measures including diversion and the involvement of the victim and the community in the resolution of the case when possible. Consider promote the access to a specialized justice for child victims and child witness and their right to be protected. Consider the active promotion of the rights of children offenders, victims and witness in the justice system that are currently not being systematically respected. Focus on developing age and gender-sensitive strategies in dealing with boys and girls in contact with law that are appropriate to the child’s family environment and contribute to his/her integration into society.
Advocate to include more female formal and informal justice actors to handle cases of children in contact with law.

**Inclusion**

Prevention of exclusion: Ensure that groups of children who are likely to have unique vulnerabilities and unequal access to services are considered in program design. Ensure that the needs and inclusion of girls as well as boys are considered in programming.

Protection: Consider active outreach service and social follow up for children with disabilities. Establish culturally appropriate avenues for engaging girls (this can take form of ‘girls clubs’, or girl-only after school activity groups) in safe spaces for children. Ensure that programming reflects the varying needs of different age groups of children, and consider engaging adolescents and youth in program design and delivery. Consider linking schools, Family centers and child protection actors for joint design of community level inclusive activities and services.

Promotion: In policy and advocacy promote the right of girls, children with disabilities, working children, children in street situations and other likely marginalized groups of children to protection, care and full development.

**Access to information**

Ensure that information about child rights, child protection issues, services available and paths for community involvement are communicated in ways to which communities are receptive, i.e. for example including use of internet and social media through moderated online spaces and developing online resources repository of information and tools for professionals. Ensure that as much as possible, information sharing
and messaging also includes human interaction and that various forms of messaging mutually reinforce key themes discussed in prevention, protection and promotion sections of the recommendations.
Data Collection Tool for KII

The purpose of this protocol is to guide Key Informant Interviews with adults in Gaza Strip representing urban, rural, camp and access restricted area (ARA) communities on key issues of child protection. Definitions of relevant terms can be found in the attached glossary.

KII Preparation

Key Informants should constitute a reflection of the different groups in the respective community, e.g. different types of people/professions/background within the community who know their community and the issues that children face.

Opening KII interview

Introduce yourself and your role: Good morning/afternoon. Thank you for taking the time to talk to me today. My name is [-----------------], and I’m here on behalf of The Child Protection Working Group In Gaza, working on child protection needs assessment in Gaza Strip. I would like to ask you some questions about protection issues that may affect your community so that we can better understand your needs and concerns.

Explain purpose: We are conducting a series of interviews to learn about different protection issues possibly affecting women, girls, men and boys experience in this community. This interview cannot be considered a guarantee for any direct or indirect support to you or the community you work with. But the information you provide will help us define child protection priorities and programmes. We would like to ask you some questions about the situation of children in [-------------------] since the beginning of this year. The interview should only take about 50 minutes.

Explain confidentiality: The questions we are going to be asking you today are about the way that children live every day. Your participation is voluntary and you can choose not to answer any or all of the questions. We have nothing to offer other than listening; there will be no other direct benefits related to this time we spend together today. We will not be writing your names. Your identity will be kept strictly confidential and will not be shown to others unless your written agreement is received to do so.
Summarise [After asking each of the following questions, look at the Key Informant and get implicit approval that s/he has understood]:

- All the information you give us will remain confidential
- Your participation in this interview is voluntary.
- You can stop answering questions at any time.
- Do you have any questions? (Note any questions from the key informants)

Request agreement: Do you agree to continue with this interview? Yes- No [if no, thank the key informant and stop]

**During KII interview**

The interviewer should strictly follow the KII guidelines, be familiar with the tool before conducting the interviews and receive appropriate training.

The interviewer must not provide his/her opinion, influence the conversation or argue a point with key informants, even if s/he feels that the key informant is wrong.

The interviewer should also be careful to pay attention to any non-verbal communication, including tone of voice, facial expression (use encouraging nods and smiles) and eye contact.

The interviewer should try to ensure a relaxing and comfortable environment; controlling his/her voice, body language and choosing the culturally appropriate language.

All interviewers should be familiar with their organization’s procedures if a participant (adolescent or adult) is identified with specific protection needs.

**After KII interview**

Thank the participants for their time and their contributions.

Remind the participants that the purpose of the activity is to understand concerns and needs of girls and boys in this community. Again, explain to the participants that you may be conducting this interview with other members of the community.

Ask the KI if s/he has questions.
Informed Consent Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessor’s name or code</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of assessment</td>
<td>___ / ___ / ___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(day/month/year)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governorate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality/ area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of site (cross)</td>
<td>URBAN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Informant</th>
<th>Informed consent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Code of the key informant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact details of the key informant</td>
<td>My name is ________<strong><strong>, and I’m here on behalf of The Child Protection Working Group. We are conducting a series of interviews to learn about different issues possibly affecting women, girls, men and boys experience in this community. This interview cannot be considered a guarantee for any direct or indirect support to you or the community you work with. But the information you provide will help us define child protection priorities and programmes. We would like to ask you some questions about the situation of children in [</strong></strong>__________] since the beginning of this year. The interview should only take about 50 minutes. Your identity will be kept strictly confidential and you can choose not to answer any or all of the questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of the key informant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex of the key informant</td>
<td>MALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role in the community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- All the information you give us will remain confidential.
- Your participation in this interview is voluntary.
- You can stop answering questions at any time.
- Do you have any questions?
- Do you agree to continue with this interview?

[YES] [NO]  
[If no, thank the key informant and stop]

__________________________
Signature Key Informant

__________________________
Signature Data Collector

For supervisor’s use only:
Verification done by: ____________________________
Date: __/__/__
Signature: ____________________________
Start by saying: “I will start by asking you some questions about”
1. Separated and Unaccompanied Children

1.1 Have you heard of or encountered children in …………………… who have been separated from their usual caregivers since the beginning of this year?

☐ YES  ☐ NO  ☐ DON’T KNOW  (if NO, or DON’T KNOW, skip to 2)

1.1.1 [If YES to 1.1] What do you think are the main causes of separations that occurred since the beginning of this year? [tick all that apply]

☐ 1. Losing caregivers due to death of mother or father or both;
☐ 2. Losing caregivers/children during relocation;
☐ 3. Caregivers voluntarily sending their children to institutional care;
☐ 4. Caregivers voluntarily sending their children to extended family/friends for safety;
☐ 5. Caregivers voluntarily sending their children to extended family/friends because of poverty;
☐ 6. Caregivers voluntarily sending their children to work far from parents/usual caregivers;
☐ 7. Other (specify ………………………………………………………)

1.1.2 [If YES to 1.1] How many such children separated from their usual caregivers do you know about?

1. Nr of children losing caregivers due to death of caregiver;
   ☐ 1-5  ☐ 6-10  ☐ ≥ 11

2. Nr of lost children during relocation;
   ☐ 1-5  ☐ 6-10  ☐ ≥ 11

3. Nr of children who caregivers voluntarily sent to institutional care;
   ☐ 1-5  ☐ 6-10  ☐ ≥ 11

4. Nr of children who caregivers voluntarily sent to extended family/friends for safety;
   ☐ 1-5  ☐ 6-10  ☐ ≥ 11

5. Nr of children who caregivers voluntarily sent to extended family/friends because of poverty;
   ☐ 1-5  ☐ 6-10  ☐ ≥ 11

6. Nr of children who caregivers voluntarily sent to work far from parents/usual caregivers;
   ☐ 1-5  ☐ 6-10  ☐ ≥ 11

Other (specify) ……………………………………………………………………………
1.2 [If yes to 1.1] Regarding children who have been separated from their usual caregivers since this the beginning of this year, do you think that …[read out each block separately and allow the key informant to respond block by block. Do not read out “do not know”]

1.2.1 Boys and girls
- □ There are more girls than boys who have been separated [or]
- □ There are more boys than girls who have been separated [or]
- □ No clear difference
- □ Do not know

1.2.2 Age
- □ Separated children are mainly under 1 year [or]
- □ Separated children are mainly between 1 and 5 [or]
- □ Separated children are mainly between 6 and 14 [or]
- □ Separated children are mainly older than 14 [or]
- □ No clear difference
- □ Do not know

1.3 What are the typical care arrangements for children who have been separated from their usual caregivers in areas that you know?
- □ 1. Foster care arrangement outside the community;
- □ 2. Informal foster care in the community;
- □ 3. Formal/ governmental foster care in the community;
- □ 4. Children live on their own;
- □ 5. Children live on the street;
- □ 6. Other (specify)

1.4 What services exist in the areas your work for children who have lost their primary caregivers? [select all that apply]
- □ 1. Community arranged care
- □ 2. Temporary shelter
- □ 3. institutions/children homes (longer term accommodation)
- □ 4. Identification, Tracing, Documentation and Reunification services
- □ 5. Active referral to other basic services such as health, education, water and sanitation, food, etc.
- □ 6. Governmental services  (specify)
- □ 7. Take the child to an agency/NGO that deals with children (specify)
- □ 8. Doing nothing (ask why)
- □ 9. Don’t know
- □ 10. Other (specify)
1.5. Have you heard of or encountered children in who live unaccompanied by any adult caregiver at all? (explain: children who are on their own)

- YES
- NO
- DON’T KNOW

(if NO, or DON’T KNOW, skip to 2)

1.5.1 [If YES to 1.5] What do you think are the main causes of a child being unaccompanied - on his/her own? [tick all that apply]

- 1. Losing caregivers due to death of mother or father or both;
- 2. Losing caregivers/children during relocation;
- 3. Caregivers voluntarily sending their children to live alone;
- 4. Caregivers voluntarily sending their children to spend most time, including nights, on their own on street;
- 5. Child ran away from home
- 6. Other (specify)

1.5.2 [If YES to 1.1] How many such unaccompanied children on their own do you know about?

1. Nr of children losing caregivers due to death of caregiver:
   - □ 1-5
   - □ 6-10
   - □ ≥ 11

2. Nr of lost children during relocation:
   - □ 1-5
   - □ 6-10
   - □ ≥ 11

3. Nr of children who caregivers voluntarily sent to live alone:
   - □ 1-5
   - □ 6-10
   - □ ≥ 11

4. Nr of children who caregivers voluntarily sent to spend most time on the streets:
   - □ 1-5
   - □ 6-10
   - □ ≥ 11

5. Nr of children who caregivers voluntarily sent to friends because of poverty:
   - □ 1-5
   - □ 6-10
   - □ ≥ 11

6. Nr of children who ran away from home:
   - Other (specify)
1.6 [If yes to 1.5] Regarding unaccompanied children that you know about, do you think that … [read out each block separately and allow the key respondent to respond block by block. Do not read out “do not know”]

| 1.6.1 Boys and girls | □ There are more girls than boys who are unaccompanied [or] |
|                      | □ There are more boys than girls who are unaccompanied[or] |
|                      | □ No clear difference                          | □ Do not know |

| 1.6.2. Age            | □ Unaccompanied children are mainly under 1 year [or] |
|                      | □ Unaccompanied children are mainly between 1 and 5 [or] |
|                      | □ Unaccompanied children are mainly between 6 and 14 [or] |
|                      | □ Unaccompanied children are mainly older than 14 [or] |
|                      | □ Do not know |

1.7 What services exist in the areas your work for children who live unaccompanied by adults? [select all that apply]

- □ 1. Community arranged care
- □ 2. Temporary shelter
- □ 3. Institutions/children homes (longer term accommodation)
- □ 4. Identification, Tracing, Documentation and Reunification services
- □ 5. Active referral to other basic services such as health, education, water and sanitation, food, etc.
- □ 6. Governmental services (specify .................................................................)
- □ 7. Take the child to an agency/NGO that deals with children (specify ................................................)
- □ 8. Do nothing (ask why .................................................................)
- □ 9. Don’t know
- □ Other (specify ........................................................................................................)

[Thank the respondent for answering the questions to the previous section and continue to the new section]
2. Dangers and Injuries; Physical Violence; and Other Harmful Practices

2.1 What are the existing risks that can lead to death or severe injury of children in the areas you live?

☐ 1. Environmental risks at home and outside (e.g. accidents, open pit latrines or sewage, dangerous animals)
☐ 2. Civil violence (e.g. religious, clan, election, etc)
☐ 3. Sexual violence (e.g. rape, touching, etc)
☐ 4. Domestic violence
☐ 5. Harmful traditional practices (please specify ____________________________)
☐ 6. Criminal acts (e.g. gang activities, looting, etc.)
☐ 7. Severe corporal punishment
☐ 8. Work-related accidents (e.g. for gravel workers)
☐ 9. Car accidents
☐ 10. Landmines or Unexploded Ordinance
☐ 11. Other:

2.2 Where do you think these risks are high/highest for children? [if not clear, refer the KI to the previous question] [Tick all that apply]

☐ 1. At home
☐ 2. Outside of house
☐ 3. In school
☐ 4. On the way to school
☐ 5. At work
☐ 6. On the way to work
☐ 7. At the market
☐ 8. On the way to market
☐ 9. Other (Please specify)

2.3 [If YES to 2.1] Do you think that the number of reported deaths and severe injuries has increased since the beginning of this year?

☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ DON’T KNOW

2.4 Are there children in this area who have been committing acts of violence since the beginning of this year?

☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ DON’T KNOW
2.5. [If YES to 2.1] What kind of violence are children participating in?

- 1. Gang activities
- 2. Looting and/or pillage;
- 3. Attack on schools and/or community infrastructure
- 4. Recruitment of other children;
- 5. Family quarrels
- 6. Other

[Thank the respondent for answering the questions to the previous section and continue to the new section]
3. Sexual violence

3.1 Do you think the number of sexual violence incidents has increased since the beginning of this year?

☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ DON’T KNOW

3.1.1 In which situations does sexual violence occur more often? [Only read out the options if the KI needs examples. (Tick all that apply)]

☐ 1. While at home
☐ 2. While at school
☐ 3. While playing around the house, village
☐ 4. While working in the fields
☐ 5. During armed attacks
☐ 6. In common areas
☐ 7. Other (specify)
☐ 8. I don’t know

3.2. Who is most affected by sexual violence?

3.2.1 Boys or Girls

☐ There are more girls than boys who are targets for sexual violence [or]
☐ There are more boys than girls who are targets for sexual violence [or]
☐ no clear difference ☐ do not know

3.2.2 By Age

☐ Targets are mainly children younger than 1 [or]
☐ Targets are mainly children between 1 and 5 [or]
☐ Targets are mainly children between 6 and 14 [or]
☐ Targets are mainly children older than 14 [or]
3.3 In your area, if a child or an adolescent is a victim of sexual violence, would s/he normally seek help [if not clear, say: “is it culturally acceptable to seek help”]?

3.3.1. IF the victim is a girl?
☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ DON’T KNOW

3.3.2. IF the victim is a boy?
☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ DON’T KNOW

3.4. In your experience, how does the community in .......... typically react to cases of sexual violence?

3.4.1. IF the victim is a girl?
☐ 1. Blame survivor
☐ 2. Punish Survivor
☐ 3. Punish perpetrator
☐ 4. Try to mediate so that the issue can be resolved peacefully
☐ 5. Force girl to marry perpetrator (if victim is unmarried girl)
☐ 6. Involve police/justice system
☐ 7. Involve social welfare
☐ 8. Involve local authorities
☐ 9. Provide care to the victim
☐ 10. Other.............
☐ 11. I do not know

3.4.2. IF the victim is a boy?
☐ 1. Blame survivor
☐ 2. Punish Survivor
☐ 3. Punish perpetrator
☐ 4. Try to mediate so that the issue can be resolved peacefully
☐ 5. Force boy to marry perpetrator (if victim is unmarried)
☐ 6. Involve police/justice system
☐ 7. Involve social welfare
☐ 8. Involve local authorities
☐ 9. Provide care to the victim
☐ 10. Other.............
☐ 11. I do not know
3.5. Are there places in …………..where survivors of SV can seek help?

☐ YES  ☐ NO  ☐ DON'T KNOW

Comments ........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

3.5.1. (If yes to 3.5.) Can children also seek help in these places?

☐ YES  ☐ NO  ☐ DON'T KNOW

Comments ........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

[Thank the respondent for answering the questions to the previous section and continue to the new section]
4. Psychosocial needs

4.1. Have you observed or heard of increase in manifestations of psychosocial distress among children since the beginning of this year?

☐ YES  ☐ NO  ☐ DON’T KNOW

4.1.1 (If yes to 4.1.) What kind of behaviour changes have you noticed?

☐ 1. Unusual crying and screaming  ☐ 11. More aggressive behavior
☐ 3. Unwillingness to go to school  ☐ 13. Less willingness to help caregivers and siblings
☐ 4. Disrespectful behavior in the family  ☐ 14. Sadness (example)
☐ 5. Not talking, not playing etc  ☐ 15. Substance abuse (specify)
☐ 6. Having nightmares and/or not being able to sleep  ☐ 16. Anti social (isolating themselves)
☐ 7. Helping parents more than before  ☐ 17. Spending more time on sport and playing
☐ 8. Spending more time with friends  ☐ 18. Attending school regularly/interested in education
☐ 9. Caring for others and the community  ☐ 19. Attempts at suicide
☐ 10. Engaging in high risk sexual behavior  ☐ 20. Bedwetting

4.2 What do you think makes children stressed most?

☐ 1. Armed conflict (shooting, fighter jets, sonic booms, etc)  ☐ 11. Kidnapping/abductions
☐ 2. Being displaced and not being able to return home  ☐ 12. Not being able to go back to school
☐ 3. Being separated from their friends  ☐ 13. Losing their belongings
☐ 4. Tension within the family  ☐ 14. Being separated from their families
☐ 5. Sexual violence  ☐ 15. Nightmares or bad memories
☐ 7. Lack of food  ☐ 17. Going far from home to work
☐ 8. Don’t know  ☐ 18. Bullying
☐ 9. Other (specify)  ☐ 19. Lack of fuel  energy

4.3 What do you think are the main sources of stress for caregivers in the community?

☐ 1. Ongoing conflict  ☐ 7. Lack of food
☐ 2. Lack or shelter  ☐ 8. Loss of property
☐ 3. Lost livelihood  ☐ 9. Children’s safety
☐ 4. Violence within the community  ☐ 10. Not being able to return home (if displaced)
☐ 5. I don’t know  ☐ 11. Lack of life basics as electricity, health and water services.
☐ 6. Ongoing siege and blockade  ☐ 12. Other (specify)
4.4. Who is most affected by psychosocial distress?

4.4.1 Boys and Girls

- More girls than boys suffer from psychosocial distress [or]
- More boys than girls suffer from psychosocial distress [or]
- no clear difference [or]
- do not know

4.4.2 By age

- Mainly children between 1 and 5 are most affected by distress [or]
- Mainly children between 6 and 10 are most affected by distress [or]
- Mainly children between 11 and 14 are most affected by distress [or]
- Mainly children older than 14 are affected by distress [or]
- no clear difference [or]
- do not know

4.5. Are there services or activities available in ……………………. to support children to cope with stress?

- YES
- NO
- DON'T KNOW

4.5.1. [if yes to 4.4] What kind of services are available to children?

- 1. Child friendly spaces
- 2. Individual counseling
- 3. Group counseling
- 4. General social welfare services (government)
- 5. Counseling services for parents
- 6. School counseling
- 7. Vocational and/ extracurricular activities
- 8. Other support services for parents (specify)
- 9. Other (specify)

[Thank the respondent for answering the questions to the previous section and continue to the new section]
5. Protecting excluded children

5.1. Do all children (including girls, boys of different ages and children of different ethnic, religious and tribal groups) have equal access to existing services?

☐ YES  ☐ NO  ☐ DON'T KNOW

5.1.1. If no to 5.1., what is the basis of exclusion for those children who do not have access?

☐ 1. Age (specify)
☐ 2. Sex (specify: boys or girls are excluded?)
☐ 3. Children with disabilities (specify the type of disability)
☐ 4. Children living with disabled caregivers
☐ 5. Children living in elderly persons' households
☐ 6. Children living with poor parents
☐ 7. Children who are refugees -citizens
☐ 8. Working children
☐ 9. Children living in female headed households
☐ 10. Other
☐ 11. I don't know

5.2. Are there children who are experiencing other forms of exclusion or discrimination in your area?

☐ YES  ☐ NO  ☐ DON'T KNOW

5.2.1. If yes to 5.2., please explain type of exclusion and/or discrimination here:

........................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................

[Thank the respondent for answering the questions to the previous section and continue to the new section]
6. Child labour

6.1. In your experience, are there children in your area who are involved in types of work that are harsh or dangerous for them?

☐ YES  ☐ NO  ☐ DON’T KNOW

If NO or Don’t know, go to 7.1

6.2. If yes, what types of work are these children involved in?

☐ 1. Farm work
☐ 2. Factory work
☐ 3. Collecting rubble
☐ 4. Collecting rubbish (waste)
☐ 5. Domestic labour
☐ 6. Transporting people or goods
☐ 7. Digging tunnels and construction work
☐ 8. Begging
☐ 9. Cleaning (cars, streets, etc)
☐ 10. Street vendors (selling things)
☐ Other (specify) .................................................................................................................................

6.3 [If YES to 1.1] How many such working children do you know about?

1. Nr of children in farm work;  ☐ 1-5  ☐ 6-10  ☐ ≥ 11
2. Nr of lost children in factory work;  ☐ 1-5  ☐ 6-10  ☐ ≥ 11
3. Nr of children who collect rubble;  ☐ 1-5  ☐ 6-10  ☐ ≥ 11
4. Nr of children who collect rubbish;  ☐ 1-5  ☐ 6-10  ☐ ≥ 11
5. Nr of children in domestic labour;  ☐ 1-5  ☐ 6-10  ☐ ≥ 11
6. Nr of children who transport people or goods;  ☐ 1-5  ☐ 6-10  ☐ ≥ 11
7. Nr of children in construction work;  ☐ 1-5  ☐ 6-10  ☐ ≥ 11
8. Nr of children who are begging;  
☐ 1-5  ☐ 6-10  ☐ ≥ 11

9. Nr of children who are cleaning cars;  
☐ 1-5  ☐ 6-10  ☐ ≥ 11

10. Nr of children who are street vendors;  
☐ 1-5  ☐ 6-10  ☐ ≥ 11

other (specify) .................................................................

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6.3.1. Who is most affected by harsh and hazardous labour?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.3.1.1. Girls and Boys</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
☐ More girls than boys are doing hard and dangerous work [or]  
☐ More boys than girls are doing hard and dangerous work [or]  
☐ no clear difference  ☐ do not know  

| 6.3.1.2. Age |  
☐ Working children are mainly between 6 and 14 [or]  
☐ Working children are mainly older than 14 [or]  
☐ no clear difference  ☐ do not know  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6.4. Do you know if the majority of children involved in harsh and dangerous labour are…: (ask the respondent to explain the most important reasons as the answer)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ☐ 1. Are working voluntarily to support themselves and/or their families?  
| ☐ 2. Are sent to engage in such work by their parents/caregivers  
| ☐ 3. Are sent to engage in such work by people other than their caregivers (ask for example)  
| ☐ 4. For other reasons? (specify)  
| ☐ 5. I don’t know.  

[Thank the respondent for answering the questions to the previous section and continue to the new section]
7. Access to information

7.1. What are the most important sources of information used by the people in your area? (all that apply)

- [ ] 1. Radio (name)..............................................................................................................................
- [ ] 2. TV (name)......................................................................................................................................
- [ ] 3. Newspaper/magazine (name)........................................................................................................
- [ ] 4. Telephone call
- [ ] 5. SMS
- [ ] 6. Internet
- [ ] 7. Notice boards and posters
- [ ] 8. Community leader
- [ ] 9. Friend
- [ ] 10. Neighbors and family
- [ ] 11. Religious leader
- [ ] 12. Military official
- [ ] 13. Government official
- [ ] 14. Aid workers
- [ ] 15. Don’t know
- [ ] 16. Other (specify).........................................................................................................................

If you have any other points to make, please mention them in the order of importance to you

................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................