
INDEPENDENT MID-TERM EVALUATION REPORT

Project Childhood: Child Sexual Exploitation in Travel and Tourism (CSETT), Mekong Sub-Region

Thailand, Cambodia, Viet Nam, and Lao PDR

**Martina Nicolls
Shelley Casey**

GRM International Pty Ltd

17 November 2013

Initiative Summary

Initiative Name	PROJECT CHILDHOOD
AidWorks Initiative Number	INI940
Commencement date	August 2010 End date: June 2014
Total Australian \$	\$7.5 million (2010-2014)
Delivery organisation(s)	Prevention Pillar: World Vision Australia (WVA), Feb. 2011-2014 Protection Pillar: United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), Nov. 2010-2014
Implementing Partner(s)	Prevention Pillar: World Vision Australia (WVA) Protection Pillar: United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime Protection Pillar: INTERPOL
Country/Region	Mekong Sub-Region Thailand, Cambodia, Viet Nam, Lao PDR
Primary Sector	Human Security

Acknowledgments

The Evaluation Team would like to thank AusAID Bangkok staff for their assistance, organization and oversight. The Evaluation Team acknowledges the logistical support provided by AusAID Bangkok, GRM International, and Project Childhood Implementing Partners in Thailand, Viet Nam, Cambodia and Lao PDR, and in particular for our site visits in Chiang Mai, Hai Phong, and Siem Reap. The team appreciates the time and inputs by Ministerial and provincial staff; police, judges, and prosecutors; tourism and travel stakeholders; and Project partners in all four countries throughout the field work, many of whom made themselves available during regional meetings. The translation services from various translators and interpreters, which were essential to discussion facilitation and data collection, were greatly appreciated. Finally, particular acknowledgment is made to community members, local NGOs and CSOs, school staff, and students.

Martina Nicolls
Shelley Casey

Disclaimer:

This report reflects the views of the Evaluation team rather than those of the Government of Australia or of the Governments of the Kingdom of Thailand, the Kingdom of Cambodia, Lao People's Democratic Republic or the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam.

ACRONYMS	DEFINITIONS
AAPTIP	Australia Asia Program to Combat Trafficking in Persons
ADP	Area Development Program (World Vision)
AFP	Australian Federal Police
ARTIP	Asia Regional Trafficking in Persons
ASEAN	Association of South East Asian Nations
ASEC	ASEAN Secretariat
AusAID	Australian Agency for International Development
C1, C2, C3, C4	Component 1 etc.
CHC	Child Helpline Cambodia
CO	Commissioned Officer
CPCCW	Chiang Mai Protection Centre for Children & Women
CSETT	Child Sexual Exploitation in Travel and Tourism
CST	Child Safe Tourism
DFAT	Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Australian Government
DSDH	Department of Social Development & Human Security (Thailand)
ETIP	End Trafficking in Persons
FANC	Foreign Anti-Narcotic and Crime Community
FLO	Front-line Officer
HE	His(Her) Excellency
IE	Independent Evaluation
ILO	International Labour Organisation
INTERPOL	International Criminal Police Organisation
IP	Implementing Partner
IPEC	International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour
LNTA	Lao National Tourism Association
M&E	Monitoring & Evaluation
MCST	Ministry of Culture, Sport & Tourism (Viet Nam)
MFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Thailand)
MIC	Ministry of Information & Culture (Lao PDR)
MIC	Ministry of Information & Communications (Lao PDR)
MLAT	Mutual Legal Assistance Treaty
MLSW	Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare (Lao PDR, Viet Nam)
MOE	Ministry of Education (Lao PDR)
MOET	Ministry of Education & Training (Viet Nam)
MOEYS	Ministry of Education, Youth & Sports (Cambodia)
MOFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Lao PDR, Viet Nam)
MOIN	Ministry of Information (Cambodia)
MOJ	Ministry of Justice (Lao PDR, Thailand, Viet Nam)
MOLISA	Ministry of Labour, Invalids & Social Affairs (Viet Nam)
MOSAVY	Ministry of Social Affairs, Veterans and Youth (Cambodia)
MOT	Ministry of Tourism (Cambodia)
MOTS	Ministry of Tourism & Sport (Thailand)
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MPI	Ministry of Planning & Investment (Viet Nam)

MPS	Ministry of Public Security (Lao PDR, Viet Nam)
MSDHS	Ministry of Social Development & Human Security (Thailand)
NCO	Non-Commissioned Officer
NGO	Non-Government Organisation
PCCC	Project Childhood Coordinating Committee
PCRO	Project Childhood Regional Office
PDD	Project Design Document
PDR	People's Democratic Republic
PIDD	Project Implementation Design Document
PSC	People's Supreme Court (Lao PDR, Viet Nam)
QAE	Quality at Entry
QAI	Quality at Implementation
RHAC	Reproductive Health Association of Cambodia
RTP	Royal Thai Police
SOP	Standard Operating Procedure
TIP	Trafficking in Persons
TLSDF	The Life Skills Development Foundation (Thailand NGO)
TOR	Terms of Reference
TOT	Training of Trainers
UNIAP	United Nations Inter-Agency on Human Trafficking
UNODC	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
VIL	Victim Identification Laboratory
VNAT	Viet Nam National Administration for Tourism
WVA	World Vision Australia

CONTENTS

Initiative Summary	ii
Acknowledgments	ii
No table of figures entries found	vi
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
EVALUATION FINDINGS	1
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE PREVENTION PILLAR	8
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE PROTECTION PILLAR	8
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE CROSS PILLAR	9
Evaluation Criteria Ratings	10
1. INTRODUCTION	14
1.1 Project Childhood	14
1.2 Evaluation Terms of Reference	14
1.3 Scope of the Evaluation	14
1.4 Methodology	15
2. DESIGN AND INCEPTION PHASES	16
2.1 Australian Aid Programming in South East Asia	16
2.2 CSETT Project Design Document (PDD)	16
2.3 Inception Phase - Project Implementation Design Document (PIDD)	17
2.3.1 <i>Inception Timeline</i>	17
2.4 Design Concerns	18
2.5 Cross Pillar Coordination	18
2.6 Stop-Go Review Point	19
2.7 Challenges for Project Implementation	20
2.8 Mobilization and Transition from Inception to Implementation	20
2.8.1 <i>Staffing Timeline</i>	20
3. EVALUATION FINDINGS: OUTCOMES, ACHIEVEMENTS AND IMPACTS	22
3.1 Outcomes and Achievements	22
3.2 Impacts	24
4. EVALUATION FINDINGS: RELEVANCE	25
4.1 Prevention Pillar	26
4.2 Protection Pillar	28
5. EVALUATION FINDINGS: EFFECTIVENESS	31
5.1 Prevention Pillar	31
5.2 Protection Pillar	34
5.3 Project Activities Remaining	37
6. EVALUATION FINDINGS: EFFICIENCY AND RISK MANAGEMENT	39
6.1 Prevention Pillar	39
6.2 Protection Pillar	40
6.3 Cross Pillar	41
7. EVALUATION FINDINGS: MONITORING AND EVALUATION	43
7.1 Prevention Pillar	43

7.2	Protection Pillar	44
7.3	Cross Pillar	44
8.	EVALUATION FINDINGS: SUSTAINABILITY	45
8.1	Prevention Pillar	45
8.2	Protection Pillar	46
9.	EVALUATION FINDINGS: LESSONS/LEARNING	48
9.1	Prevention Pillar	48
9.2	Protection Pillar	48
9.3	Lessons/Learning	48
10.	EVALUATION CRITERIA RATINGS.....	50
10.1	Project Childhood.....	50
10.2	Prevention Pillar	51
10.3	Protection Pillar	52
11.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	54
11.1	Prevention Pillar	54
11.2	Protection Pillar	54
11.3	Cross Pillar.....	55
11.4	DFAT Programming Beyond 2014.....	56
ANNEX 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE.....		57
ANNEX 2: EVALUATION PLAN		64
ANNEX 3: PEOPLE CONTACTED		65
ANNEX 4: LIST OF REFERENCES AND READING		68

No table of figures entries found.

Executive Summary

Project Childhood is a four-year \$7.5 million Australian Government initiative (2011-14) to combat child sexual exploitation in travel and tourism (CSETT) in target locations across four target countries: Thailand, Viet Nam, Cambodia, and Lao People's Democratic Republic. Project Childhood's two Implementing Partners are World Vision Australia (WV) and the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) in partnership with INTERPOL. Their components are outlined below:

PREVENTION PILLAR	PROTECTION PILLAR
PROJECT COMPONENTS	
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Build resilient vulnerable communities2. Enhance national information, reporting & referral mechanisms3. Support public & private sector response4. Assist governments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Progress laws & regulations related to CSETT2. Ensure informed & capable officers3. Enhance cooperation & communication4. Review scope & quality of operational outcomes

Purpose of the Evaluation

The aim of this mid-term independent evaluation is to determine the following: (1) progress within and between the Prevention and the Protection Pillars, (2) lessons learned in the first two years of Project Childhood's activity (2011-2012), and (3) the relevance of the Project in the context of the Australian aid program's regional priorities in South East Asia. The evaluation, over 29 days from June to September 2013, commenced with a desk review of relevant background and Project documentation provided by AusAID¹ Bangkok. It included fieldwork in three of the four countries in which Project Childhood operates for 16 days from July 15 to August 1, 2013. The two evaluators visited Thailand, Viet Nam, and Cambodia for five days each. Within the three countries, the evaluators visited the capital city and one location designated by the Project as a CSETT hotspot. Hence the evaluation was conducted in Bangkok and Chiang Mai in Thailand; Hanoi and Hai Phong in Viet Nam; and Phnom Penh and Siem Reap in Cambodia (Annex 3).

EVALUATION FINDINGS

Inception Phase

Project Childhood is a complex, multi-country initiative involving diverse government partners in each country, spanning communities, multiple levels of government, travel and tourism businesses, and law enforcement. Participating countries are also diverse in terms of their socio-economic and political contexts, and degree of capacity and experience in dealing with CSETT. As such, the project design allowed for an initial Inception Phase to identify and secure agreements with relevant counterparts in each country, and to develop detailed implementation plans.

The process of finalising Project Implementation Design Documents for both pillars took longer than initially planned (9-12 months instead of six months), resulting in a delayed start to implementation. A number of factors contributed to the protracted Inception Phase, including: (1) delays in recruitment of national staff; (2) the time needed to build counterpart relationships; (3) the sensitivity of CSETT, and the fact that this was a relatively new issue for some stakeholders (particularly in Vietnam and Laos PDR); and (4) protracted government processes involved in

¹ On 1 November 2013, the Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID) was integrated into the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT). As a result of the integration, AusAID no longer exists as an organisation or a donor agency. The overseas aid program of the Australian Government is administered by DFAT. This integration aims to bring together the Australian Government's foreign, development and trade policies and programs in a coherent, efficient and effective manner, in pursuit of Australia's national interests.

The term "AusAID" is used in the report where the reference is made to an entity of the Australian Government that administered Australian international aid and development initiatives prior to 1 November 2013.

finalising host country government agreements and Memoranda of Understanding (MOU). This resulted in delays in: (1) the identification of Project locations for implementation; (2) finalisation of agreements with key counterparts (stretching into 2012 and 2013); (3) implementation of activities; and (4) Cross Pillar cooperation and activities. More importantly, these delays now leave limited time for both Pillars to shift from a central (i.e. Bangkok-based) generic training and communications materials to a four-country-specific contextualization of activities.

Key Outcomes and Achievements

The following chart presents the major outcomes and achievements of both the Prevention Pillar and the Protection Pillar reported to July 2013:²

OUTCOME	ACHIEVEMENT
Prevention Pillar³	
OUTCOME 1: Selected vulnerable communities are more resilient against child sexual exploitation in travel and tourism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support to 6 CSOs working to prevent CSETT; • Education initiatives to 410 children (246 F, 164 M) and 122 parents and carers (90 F, 32 M) in tourism hotspots; • Training to 525 community representatives (233 F, 283 M), including local government officials, social workers and teachers on how to prevent children from sexual exploitation in tourism hotspots
OUTCOME 2: Selected national information and communication mechanisms for vulnerable girls and boys are improved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extending the existing Cambodia Child Helpline to 2 tourism CSETT hotspots resulting in 14,625 total helpline beneficiaries
OUTCOME 3: Tourism sector and traveling public participate in the development of a protective environment for children in travel and tourism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development of Child Safe Tourism (CST) campaign concepts with endorsement from National Tourism Organisations; • Trainings for CST campaign to 490 private tourism personnel (220 F, 223 M) on keeping children safe from abuse in travel and tourism; • Market research surveying over 300 international travellers to the region resulting in a publication on their perspectives of CST; • The launch of a regional Child Safe Tourism campaign to promote child safe travel for people coming to South East Asia; • Training to 15 media members (7 F, 8 M) on child protection in tourism.
OUTCOME 4: Key government ministries and agencies take increased action to strengthen the protective environment to prevent the sexual exploitation of girls and boys sustainably	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training to 494 public servants (232 F, 259 M); • Support to ministerial staff to increase their knowledge and capacity; • Technical assistance on the implementation of national action plan; • Child Safe Tourism Committee meeting conducted in Cambodia with Ministry of Tourism; • Delivery of a presentation at the World Vision Asia Pacific Urban Forum in Bangkok, March 2013.
Protection Pillar	
OUTCOME 1: Legislative frameworks meet International standards and obligations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legal Analysis Reports completed in all countries (Feb. 2012) & formally approved in Cambodia & Laos; • Increased understanding of sexual abuse and CSETT issues amongst key justice sector stakeholders; • New Prakas (decree) on inter-agency coordination in Cambodia. • Viet Nam agreed to incorporate report's recommendations in its on-going Penal Code & Penal Procedure Code reform process; • Establishment of Lao Legal Responsible Committee to follow up on

² Project Childhood Standing Brief (Jan 2013), pp2-3, World Vision (2012) 2012 Annual Report 1, p2, WV 2013 Six-Monthly Report, p4, UNODC Project Childhood Annual Report 2012 and Semi-Annual Progress Report June-July 2013

³ Not all targets are provided in the M&E Plan; At mid-way through program - support to CSOs on track to achieve target of 8, training of children under-target of 560, training of parents under-target of 840, training of community representatives over-target of 400, and training of private tourism personnel over-target of 320 (see Section 3.1 for details)

OUTCOME	ACHIEVEMENT
	<p>legal report finding. Will conduct further surveys and introduce a new CSETT Decree, or incorporate CSETT reforms into the planned Penal Law review in 2015;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional Legal Research Group established and first meeting held (with 62 participants), 1-2 Aug. 2013.
OUTCOME 2: Informed and capable front-line law enforcement officers, prosecutors and judges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment of Police Training Technical Working Groups in Thailand, Viet Nam & Cambodia in 2012, and in Laos in 2013; • Regional generic training manuals for front-line police officers & specialist investigators finalized in Jan. 2013, translated into 4 languages (editing and country contextualisation ongoing); • Strong sense of counterpart ownership over the process, and improved understanding on CSETT issues amongst Working Group members. • Regional Training of Trainers delivered to 45 trainers in June 2013; • Training for Cambodian police gender focal point-people on sexual exploitation of children and gender-based violence; • Training for 6 police officers in March 2013 on use of INTERPOL's Victim Identification Laboratory; • Regional training of 32 police (Sept 2012) and 32 prosecutors and judges (July 2013) on computer-facilitated crimes against children in collaboration with ICMEC; • Equipment needs assessments completed Feb. 2013 in Thailand, Cambodia & Viet Nam (one hotspot location each & two in Viet Nam).
OUTCOME 3: Mechanisms established to enhance cooperation between criminal justice agencies within and across borders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bilateral police cooperation meeting conducted in Thailand/Cambodia in Aug 2012 and Regional Law Enforcement Cooperation Workshops in Oct. 2012; • Establishment of INTERPOL Specialists Group on Crimes against Children in South East Asia, & first regional meeting in March 2013.
OUTCOME 4: Joint Investigation Teams (JITs) established and operational	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designated focal point police agencies agreed in Thailand, Vietnam and Cambodia (Laos still pending); • Ad hoc information sharing and operational support from Interpol in relation to cases of child trafficking, sexual abuse and CSETT.

Relevance

All host government ministries expressed the view that the Project was relevant to the needs of their countries and were aligned with their national child protection and tourism strategies

The original two locations identified by the Prevention Pillar for community support were appropriately identified through baseline information and the needs of host governments. For example, Mondulkiri in Cambodia, an emerging eco-tourist site was targeted by the government for support because there are currently no existing child protection services in the location. In Pattaya, the Project operates alongside an existing project with street children and on HIV/AIDS mitigation, thus appropriately targeting children identified in the baseline as being at high risk of CSETT. However, in Hai Phong, Chiang Mai, and Mondulkiri, the Prevention Pillar targeted eco-tourist areas, backpackers, high-end five-star hotels, and areas peripheral to high risk children as their 'hotspot' location. The government's choice of Mondulkiri was appropriate, but within Mondulkiri, the Project could have more specifically targeted a high-risk area. Therefore the Pillar's work in hotspots has not consistently and specifically targeted appropriate districts or high risk children and families.

The focus of the Prevention Pillar's community training and awareness activities has been on the prevention of child abuse in general rather than CSETT in particular. The Prevention Pillar's rationale for placing its focus in low-risk sites with limited current protection services was that the Project would thus *prevent* exploitation from occurring. Similarly, the Prevention Pillar's rationale for focusing on child abuse prevention more broadly, rather than CSETT more narrowly, was that it

would not be in the best interests of the child to focus on only one aspect of abuse to the exclusion of other, inter-related vulnerabilities. However, these generalised approaches have resulted in less specific attention to risk factors and protection strategies specific to CSETT.

The Protection Pillar appropriately identified government ministries for partnerships, working primarily with national ministries of justice (for law reform), national police forces, specialist police units responsible for crimes against children, and police training schools. The specific districts and police units for the operational component were not identified until early 2013 (yet to be confirmed in Laos PDR), and activities under this component have not yet commenced, therefore it is too premature to assess their relevance. The legal reform activities have generally been relevant and well-targeted, with a focus on a broad range of legal reforms needed to provide a robust legal framework for addressing CSETT-related crimes. However, the creation of a CSETT-specific crime was not addressed in the legal analysis reports or subsequent discussions with government counterparts, and some of the legal recommendations were less practical and relevant. For example, CSETT-specific MOUs, mutual legal assistance treaties (MLATs) and extradition agreements would not normally be pursued for such a narrow topic and would unnecessarily duplicate existing instruments such as the ASEAN MLAT. Generic police training manuals on child sexual exploitation have been developed for front-line officers (FLOs) and specialist investigators and cover all aspects of the investigative process, with a specific focus on CSETT. These are currently in the process of being adapted to each country's context by incorporating national laws, standard operating procedures, and investigative and referral processes.

Effectiveness

The findings of a small-scale online survey, conducted by the Prevention Pillar from May to June 2012, aided the development of their Child Safe Tourism campaign and a website, launched in November 2012. The website, translated into the languages of each country, as well as Korean, Japanese, and English, as well as training for the campaign, seemed to be well received by national governments and tourism agencies. For example, Thailand's Ministry of Tourism and Sport and the Chiang Mai University in Thailand has agreed to conduct child exploitation awareness training modeled on the Project's campaign. In addition, the Pillar has planted seeds with the Mekong Tourism Forum at the beginning of 2013 to promote the campaign. The Prevention Pillar has identified potential partners for handover (such as the Mekong tourism Forum or the Code), but has yet to engage partners to operate the website. Similarly, the Child Safe Tourism campaign is not yet operated and "owned" by a government entity or regional tourism group. Hence at mid-term the Project's Child Safe Tourism campaign is yet to be a transferable product that travel and tourism agencies, hotels, guest houses, and transport companies can readily identify with.

The Prevention Pillar's community training materials – three different sets of materials for duty bearers, parents, and children – were developed at the Pillar's regional level. The way the materials present and discuss CSETT prevention do not reflect the various cultural factors and core CSETT vulnerabilities that the Prevention Pillar identified through their baseline study and community research (for example, family stressors such as limited education or employment opportunities, family reliance on child labour, the normalisation of sexual relations between men and sex workers, normalisation of sex in exchange for gifts amongst teenagers, the value placed on girls' virginity, and the sense of duty or gratitude that children, particularly girls, owe their parents). It has been left to the Pillar's national coordinators and training partners to adapt and modify the materials. The Prevention Pillar indicated that they provided orientation/induction lessons to their training partners, as well as technical support, monitoring, and follow-up activities. However, stakeholders indicated that there was limited guidance on effective entry points (types of beneficiaries), practical examples, time-bound targets, and sustainability strategies.

The Prevention Pillar's visual materials were complex and text heavy, with limited suitability for communities. The presentation of the materials was low quality with small text, with few and small images. The lack of standardization of core messages, and a lack of quality assurance, resulted in wide ranges in materials and delivery. For example, the Pillar's facilitator's guide advises that boys and girls should receive separate training and that they should be separated by age: 5-8 years, 8-11 years, and 11-18 years. However, all Project staff in the four countries, and NGO partners visited by the evaluators, conducted training to boys and girls together (with some small same-sex group sessions) and to mixed age groups. This was due to the limited number of beneficiary participants, a focus on school grade levels, or residential groups, and reducing the significance of the instructions provided in the facilitator's guide. Therefore, currently the community training materials are not in a sufficiently 'marketable' stage – conceptualized to a high quality for effective handover to training partners – to ensure that their dissemination and delivery are sustainable as components within NGO or other organization's training programs.

The Protection Pillar has made significant progress on legal reform. The legal analysis reports are comprehensive and generally provide practical recommendations. They have been well received by government counterparts and several workshops have been held to share the reports and build support for reform. This has led to an increased understanding of CSETT and child sexual abuse issues amongst key counterparts, and has reportedly helped to raise the profile of CSETT within the justice agencies. Cambodia has introduced a new draft decree in response to one of the report's recommendations, and Viet Nam is planning to address many of its gaps as part of its ongoing Penal Code and Criminal Procedure Code reforms. Dialogue with Thailand and Laos PDR are ongoing, and the governments have yet to commit to concrete areas of reform that will be pursued.

Progress has also been made in police training, but this component is not on track to fully achieve the planned outcome. The Protection Pillar produced two comprehensive generic training manuals on sexual exploitation which have the potential to serve as a useful global resource. The manuals have been translated into all four languages, and work is on-going to contextualise them to each country, but they are not yet ready for in-country training. Training of trainers (TOT) was conducted using the generic manuals in July 2013 with participants from all four countries, but this was not predicated on clear plans for follow-up training, or for additional in-country TOT support. It is expected that at least one 'pilot' training activity will be conducted in each country, which will result in limited reach in each country.

The Protection Pillar's Operational Component has yet to progress to implementation, though information sharing and operational support has been provided by Interpol in relation to specific reported cases of child trafficking, sexual abuse and CSETT. Assessments on equipment needs were completed for hotspot locations in Cambodia, Thailand (one each) and Vietnam (two hotspots) in 2013. Operational plans for proactive investigations have not yet been developed.

Due to the delayed recruitment of country level staff, a protracted inception period, and delays in gaining government agreements, both Pillars are not on track to effectively implement all activities in the remaining one year Project period. These include: contextualized roll-out of the Child Safe Tourism campaign; a tangible Child Safe Tourism product to transfer/handover to appropriate stakeholders; ownership of Child Safe Tourism website; contextualized roll-out of Prevention community training curriculum; a tangible community training product to transfer/handover to appropriate stakeholders; a training plan for each country (Prevention and Protection Pillars); fully contextualised training manuals for the police and agreed plans for how CSETT will be incorporated into police training institutions; development of specialised CSETT training for judges and prosecutors; and most aspects of the Protection Pillar Operational Component.

Efficiency and Risk Management

The Prevention Pillar commenced with three Bangkok-based regional staff and in 2012 recruited four country level national coordinators. While external factors, such as government bureaucracy in each country, under-staffing of government counterpart agencies which limited the identification of CSETT designated officers, and harmonizing with government schedules, the Prevention Pillar underestimated the number of regional and national level staffing required to cope with work commitments and government shortfalls. As a risk management strategy, the Pillar proposed extra staff, which AusAID approved, and by the end of 2012 staffing increased to twelve officers. From 2013, with more staffing, the Pillar was in a better position to address national activities, government engagement, and partnerships for training.

The evaluators question the Protection Pillar's efficiency in developing a comprehensive, generic police training manual which will not be used as designed at the country level. The process of developing the generic manual was highly participatory, but as a result it took over one year to complete. The Operational Component has not made significant progress towards its planned outputs and activities. This is due in part to the under-estimation of the human resources that would be needed, and it is unlikely that one officer could provide the level of hands-on mentoring that their project design envisioned for each of the four project countries. The Protection Pillar's risk management strategy could have been to design CSETT training materials that could be easily integrated within Police Academies at the pre-service stage, and within in-service training programs related to child protection, CSEC, gender-based violence and trafficking. Instead, the approach was to design a multi-day, issue-specific in-service training manual that would require a significant commitment of police time and resources, and which is too long to incorporate into recruit training without substantial modification. In February 2013 the risk management strategy matrix didn't mention the training of trainers and the risk of not putting a training plan in place for sustainable handover. Police training is particularly high-risk due to the large numbers that require training in each country and the limited government budget to conduct in-service training.

Sustainability

MOUs and agreements with relevant government ministries and agency have yet to lead to committed adoption of Project activities as part of their planning cycles for Project sustainability after June 2014. National tourism authorities have been approached to sustain the Child Safe Tourism campaign, and CSETT training and awareness activities beyond the project period, but are not yet committed financially. In addition, Prevention Pillar government agencies and NGOs are hesitant to commit to the training curricula because the materials are not easy to incorporate into their existing training in their current state (content, package, and delivery). Law enforcement agencies in the four project countries lack the training resources to sustain training on the manuals as designed, though they do intend to modify, shorten, or re-package some aspects of the manual for use in their existing in-service and induction training programs. This adds time and budget to any agency that wishes to adopt the training curricula. The sustainability of multi-country coordination mechanisms supported by the Protection Pillar (for example the Regional Legal Research Group) is questionable. A more sustainable approach would be to explore opportunities for integrating CSETT into existing Mekong and ASEAN mechanisms.

Impacts

The evaluation is a mid-term performance assessment and not an end-of-project impact assessment. Therefore it is too early to adequately assess the impact of each Pillar's activities. The evaluators note that the Pillars have made slow progress towards their longer term objectives due to delays in the Inception Phase, recruitment of staff, and government timeframes. These delays may affect the achievement of all objectives by the end of the project. However, based on evaluation interviews and observations, it appears that the Project has resulted in increased understanding and awareness

of CSETT in all four project countries, particularly amongst justice sector stakeholders. There also appears to be a strong commitment on the part of governments to address CSETT, both from a preventative and law enforcement perspective.

Cross Pillar

AusAID intended that the Project would become nested within child protection and law enforcement through an integrated, sustainable two-project approach. However, a Cross Pillar approach was not explicitly part of the Project design. It developed as a need that arose. The evaluators note that the design of both Pillars does not automatically and easily facilitate integration of conceptual and operational joint activities. As the need arose, AusAID hired an external Cross Pillar facilitation team to achieve integration of the two Pillars in 2011 and 2012.

In 2012, the Cross Pillar facilitation team noted “many examples of successful cooperation between the Pillars at the national level” with increasingly shared information and activities. The Project’s significant achievement, and an example of AusAID’s intended holistic approach to CSETT, included their interlinking collaboration with the Royal Thai Police to establish community police teams across 40 targeted pilot locations to identify and investigate child sexual abuse cases.⁴ This collaboration led to the preparation of a joint submission in September 2012 to the United Nations Special Rapporteur on child exploitation that detailed the two-Pillar cooperation to respond to child sexual abuse in key travel and tourism hotspots in Thailand. In December 2012 the UN Special Rapporteur commended Project Childhood for being an innovative program for combatting the growing issue of CSETT.

Monitoring and Evaluation

AusAID required both Pillars to develop their own M&E frameworks. Their development took up to nine months, tailoring them to their overarching goals, programming objectives, and activities. The Prevention Pillar’s M&E Plan, formulated with specialist internal support from the Implementing Partner’s headquarters in Australia, outlines a relevant logframe for reporting, including indicators, some key annual performance targets, and beneficiary groups against outputs and outcomes. The Prevention Pillar aimed to provide age-appropriate training in three age categories: 5-7 years, 8-10 years, and 11-18 years. However, training is not reported against age categories, because the Prevention Pillar combines children of both genders and mixed ages into the training sessions. A planned 2013 external evaluation of the effectiveness of their Child Safe Tourism campaign was in progress during this evaluation, which will inform the Prevention Pillar of potential areas to address. Although the Prevention Pillar uses pre- and post-testing during its training sessions for children, parents, and duty bearers, currently there is no method for adequately monitoring or evaluating behaviour change.

The Protection Pillar hired an international M&E specialist to improve their M&E Plan formulated during the Inception Phase, and was subsequently retained to provide on-going M&E advice through a 100-day consultancy from February 2013 to the end of the Project. Although the Protection Pillar does not have clear targets against an annual plan, adequate and appropriate measurement and assessment tools are in place. Due to delays in conducting the train the trainer workshop and equipment rollout, the M&E Plan has not yet been fully implemented.

AusAID and the external Cross Pillar Facilitators encouraged the formulation of a joint Cross Pillar M&E mechanism. This has not occurred, and is not likely to occur, because both Pillars regard their conceptual approaches (the ‘soft’ approach of the Prevention Pillar and the ‘hard’ approach of the Protection Pillar) as parallel, rather than intersecting. However, the two Pillars cooperate to summarise Cross Pillar achievements in progress reports annexed to their individual reports.

⁴ Project Childhood Standing Brief (Jan 2013), pp2-3

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE PREVENTION PILLAR

Recommendation 1: World Vision to discontinue Community Training

To be a useful resource for replication and scale-up, the community training materials would need substantial revisions to make them more contextually appropriate and to reflect a greater focus on CSETT and a behaviour change approach – not just at the country contextualization stage, but also a revision of its original documents. It is highly unlikely that this could be done within the remaining Project period, and it is also questionable whether the Prevention Pillar has the expertise to make the necessary adjustments. Prevention Pillar staff and NGO partners would also need to re-orient their work with national and local child protection authorities, and develop a clear strategy for how the community-level work can be scaled up and integrated into on-going child protection system building initiatives. The Prevention Pillar has acknowledged that this is not something their officers have the capacity to do. It is therefore recommended that the community training activities and NGO contracts under Component 1 should be finalized by the end of 2013 (or earlier where possible), and resources re-allocated to Component 3.

Recommendation 2: World Vision to finalise the Child Safe Tourism campaign

It is recommended that the Prevention Pillar focus its remaining time and resources on strengthening and consolidating the Child Safe Tourism campaign at the regional and multi-country levels. This is because the campaign approach is appropriately harmonized with national tourism strategies in each target country. Opportunities should continue to be explored for sustaining tourism sector training and the Child Safe Tourism website through national and regional tourism authorities because they seem highly interested in the concept. Advocacy campaigning in South East Asia is already an area of competitive advantage for the Australian Government's aid program (such as their child trafficking mitigation campaign). The success and networking capacity of the aid program in child trafficking can be maximized to include an intense highly-focused specific Child Safe Tourism campaign.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE PROTECTION PILLAR

Recommendation 1: UNODC to finalise the Training Strategy

The draft training strategy should be completed as soon as possible, in collaboration with government partners. This should include a clear articulation of the process of how the training materials will be institutionalised in each country.

Recommendation 2: UNODC to focus on consolidating police training, rather than expanding to judges and prosecutors

It is recommended that the Protection Pillar use the remaining Project period to consolidate the work that has been done and contextualise the police training manual for each country, rather than moving to the next planned phase for prosecutor and judges. Focus should be on supporting national counterparts (with additional resource and external expertise as needed) to determine what aspects of the generic regional training manual can be adapted and incorporated into existing in-service training programs on related topics (e.g. training on child protection, CSEC, gender-based violence, trafficking, and community policing), and how the issue of CSETT can be effectively incorporated into the standard training programs for new recruits and for investigators/superintendents. Consideration should also be given to developing more user-friendly, practical resource materials on CSETT investigations, such as simple guidelines and checklists.

Recommendation 3: INTERPOL to discontinue the Operational Component

The Operational Component has not yet begun, and the level of mentoring and hands-on operational support envisioned in the Project design appears to be neither feasible with existing advisory resources, nor agreed by counterparts. Consideration should be given to whether there is value in continuing this component in the time frame remaining.

Recommendation 4: UNODC to work with counterparts to identify legislative reforms that can be progressed within the project period.

The legal analysis reports have been well received by governments, and many of the recommendations have been accepted by government counterparts for incorporation into on-going reforms that extend beyond June 2014 (e.g. penal law reform in Laos and Viet Nam). It is recommended that the Protection Pillar focus on working with government counterparts to identify specific areas of reform (if any) that can be progressed within the remaining time frame. Beyond that, continued advocacy and legislative review workshops are not likely to be an effective or efficient use of resources.

Recommendation 5: UNODC to promote integration of CSETT into existing ASEAN and Mekong mechanisms for bilateral and multi-lateral cooperation

The Regional Legal Research Group and multi-country law enforcement workshops enjoy strong support from the host governments, but sustaining them beyond 2014 may be a challenge. Opportunities should be explored to integrate this work with legislative reform initiatives of the ASEAN Commission for the Protection and Promotion of Women and Children's Rights, and with the MLAT and bilateral/multilateral MOU work being supported by the United Nations Inter-Agency on Human Trafficking and the Australia Asia Program to Combat Trafficking in Persons.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE CROSS PILLAR

The two Pillars have different conceptual approaches and have limited synergies between them. Although the Cross Pillar Community Policing initiative targets 40 areas, only two areas are known hotspots for child sexual abuse in travel and tourism. The evaluators note that although Cross Pillar functions improved from late 2012, they continue to primarily occur in a two Project approach. It is recommended that both Pillars focus their time, energies, and funding on their respective mandates for the remaining Project Period.

Evaluation Criteria Ratings

Evaluation Criteria Ratings for PROJECT CHILDHOOD		
Criteria	Rating	Explanation
Relevance	3	Both pillars have developed generic regional training materials that have not been contextualised to be relevant and appropriate for each country. The Prevention Pillar messaging and targeted locations are too broad to address specific CSETT vulnerabilities.
Effectiveness	3	Both pillars have experienced significant delays in implementation. The Prevention Pillar approach to community training limits its effectiveness as behaviour change communication because it hasn't effectively reflected their work identified in the community baseline study. The Protection Pillar strategy for police training (in-service training workshops) was not the most effective approach for building capacity on the narrow issue of CSETT. Limited progress has been made on the operational component.
Efficiency	3	The approach of both Pillars has been to support stand-alone CSETT-specific activities rather than identifying opportunities to build CSETT components into related initiatives at the national and regional levels. Some activities have unnecessarily duplicated or overlapped with the work of other development partners, or created new structures rather than work within those already in place.
Monitoring & Evaluation	4	The M&E Plans highlight the difference between internal development (Prevention Pillar) and an external consultancy (Protection Pillar). However, although the M&E Plans are in place, and are comprehensive, there is a mixed approach to their implementation. For both Pillars, there is yet to be an in-depth method of monitoring behaviour and attitudinal change.
Sustainability	3	While partners and government counterparts have been approached and discussions are in progress, neither Pillar has received commitment for adoption of Project activities or components.
Gender Equality	4	Both Pillars have adequate Gender Action Plans, and both Pillars have highlighted the issue of boys being sexually exploited. However, trainings have had limited specific focus on gender sensitization and gender stereotypes, or the different vulnerabilities faced by boys and girls.
Risk Management	4	AusAID made a concerted effort to enhance the Project's success by requesting each Pillar to provide a sustainability plan, gender action plan, and an M&E plan. AusAID also hired external facilitators to improve Cross Pillar coordination. AusAID's efforts were not matched by the Pillars' efforts. Given the sensitivities of the subject, the Pillars' risk management strategies are limited in adequately predicting potential risks to Project success, particularly in addressing delays and country-level challenges.
Impact	N/A	It is the opinion of the Evaluation Team that it is too early to assess the Project's impact. However, it appears that the Project has resulted in increased understanding and awareness of CSETT in all four project countries, particularly amongst justice sector stakeholders. There also appears to be a strong commitment on the part of governments to address CSETT, both from a preventative and law enforcement perspective.

Evaluation Criteria Ratings for PROJECT CHILDHOOD

Criteria	Rating	Explanation
Lessons/ Learning	4	Lessons learned are interconnected with risk management and the ability to shift programming from lessons learned. The time taken to undertake training manual and material development left limited time to review and revise their conceptual approaches, training delivery methods, training of trainers, and handover plans.

Evaluation Criteria Ratings for PREVENTION PILLAR ONLY

Criteria	Rating	Explanation
Relevance	2	The community training materials, developed at the regional level, have yet to be contextualized for the four countries. The materials are didactic, complex, text-driven, with low quality images and presentation. The materials over-emphasize child abuse in general, and have limited relevance to CSETT. Hotspot locations of operation are often outside the high-risk travel and tourism areas, and are limited in their target at identified categories of children vulnerable to CSETT. The Child Safe Tourism campaign seems to be the most relevant approach to CSETT prevention.
Effectiveness	2	Delivery of community training materials has not been conducted according to the Facilitator Guides which stipulate the training of boys and girls separately, and age groupings to be considered. The design document stated two hotspot locations of operation and the Project has expanded to other locations, which has limited the ability to focus in-depth in specific communities. The approach (one-off workshops in each community) limits the effectiveness to introduce and monitor behaviour change.
Efficiency	3	Designing the project implementation, and recruiting staff took longer than expected, which affected the ability of the Pillar to quickly engage government counterparts and partners. Hence the roll-out of community training has been slow, and the Child Safe Tourism campaign – which is a valuable instrument – has also been slow to promote.
Monitoring & Evaluation	3	The M&E Plan has some clearly stated targets and indicators, but some are underestimated and non-specific. There is yet to be an in-depth method of monitoring behaviour and attitudinal change. Reporting is unclear, not detailed or specific, with limited succinct summary charts and tables showing snap-shot statistics against disaggregated categories, such as gender, age, location, and country.
Sustainability	3	Government bureaucracy and extenuating circumstances have hampered counterpart commitment, although many are interested in the tourism campaign. However it has yet to achieve commitment and handover, of the website and the training. The campaign has the highest potential to be a sustainable component of the Project.
Gender Equality	4	The Gender Action Plan is adequate, and the Prevention Pillar has highlighted the issue of boys being sexually exploited. However, the trainings have had limited specific focus the different vulnerabilities faced by boys and girls. The use of mixed gender groups in working with children has likely impacted on the effectiveness of the training for both boys and girls.

Evaluation Criteria Ratings for PREVENTION PILLAR ONLY		
Criteria	Rating	Explanation
Risk Management	4	The Prevention Pillar identified the need for additional national staff and AusAID approved their request. Subsequently they recruited 3 extra staff per country by the end of 2012. More attention to strategies to offset delays in counterpart commitment is required.
Impact	N/A	It is the opinion of the Evaluation Team that it is too early to assess the Pillar's impact. However, the Pillar's community study and small-scale online survey, as well as additional research, have contributed to a body of CSETT information.
Lessons/ Learning	3	The Prevention Pillar's approach to community mobilization has not taken into account recent global lessons learned on the limited effectiveness and sustainability of NGO-driven, issue-specific child protection committees or task forces, or best practices in behavior change communication.

Evaluation Criteria Ratings for PROTECTION PILLAR ONLY		
Criteria	Rating	Explanation
Relevance	4	Law reform reports were relevant and comprehensive. The content of the generic police training manuals is appropriate, but they require further work to make them relevant and appropriate to each country.
Effectiveness	3	The regional police training manuals are of high quality, but the training strategy used (multi-day in-service workshops) was not the most effective approach for building capacity on the narrow issue of CSETT. CSETT training for judges and prosecutors and the operational component are not likely to progress.
Efficiency	3	The manual development process promoted a high degree of counterpart participation, but was not efficient. Some law reform and coordination activities have unnecessarily duplicated the work of other development partners or have created new mechanisms rather than capitalise on existing ones.
Monitoring & Evaluation	5	The M&E Plan and assessment tools are comprehensive and thorough, although yet to be used due to the limited or late roll-out of activities. Clearly specified targets and benchmarks would improve the effectiveness of the M&E system.
Sustainability	3	The police training manuals cannot be sustainably used by national counterparts as designed, and greater focus is needed on identifying appropriate ways to integrate content into existing recruit and other training programs. The sustainability of newly created structures and coordination mechanisms (Regional Legal Reference Group, Interpol working party, regional law enforcement cooperation workshops) has not been adequately addressed.

Evaluation Criteria Ratings for PROTECTION PILLAR ONLY		
Criteria	Rating	Explanation
Gender Equality	4	The Gender Action Plan is adequate, and the Protection Pillar has highlighted the issue of boys being sexually exploited in both training and legislative reform. Gender issues were incorporated into the TOT training and in capacity building work in Cambodia. However, the police training manuals have had limited specific focus on victim sensitization and gender stereotypes, or the different vulnerabilities faced by boys and girls.
Risk Management	3	The Protection Pillar has not used the risk management matrix as a dynamic document to correct delays to implementation, such as to Phase II roll-out. Risks in relation to training fatigue and sustainability of training were identified but not properly addressed in the Project design and implementation.
Impact		It is the opinion of the Evaluation Team that it is too early to fully assess the Pillar's impact. Project activities appear to have resulted in improved understanding of and commitment to address CSETT amongst key justice sector stakeholders in each of the project countries.
Lessons/ Learning	4	The Protection Pillar review of existing training materials (Thailand and Cambodia) highlighted many of the challenges that the Project countries have faced in sustaining in-service training on specialist topics such as CSEC and trafficking, yet this was not adequately reflected in their training strategy.

Rating scale

Satisfactory		Less than satisfactory	
6	Very high quality	3	Less than adequate quality
5	Good quality	2	Poor quality
4	Adequate quality	1	Very poor quality

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Project Childhood

Project Childhood is a four-year \$7.5 million Australian Government initiative (2011-14) to combat child sexual exploitation in travel and tourism (CSETT) in four target countries: Thailand, Viet Nam, Cambodia, and Lao People's Democratic Republic. Project Childhood's two Implementing Partners are World Vision Australia (WV) and the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) in partnership with INTERPOL. Table 1 presents each Implementing Partner's (IP) overall goal and their four corresponding components.

Table 1: Project Childhood Prevention and Protection Pillars

	PROJECT CHILDHOOD	
	PREVENTION PILLAR WORLD VISION	PROTECTION PILLAR UNODC/INTERPOL
Implementer	World Vision Australia in partnership with WV Cambodia, Lao PDR, Thailand, Viet Nam & World Vision East Asia Regional Office	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime in partnership with INTERPOL
Project Goal	To contribute to the prevention and protection of child sexual exploitation in travel and tourism in Cambodia, Lao PDR, Thailand and Viet Nam	
Pillar Goal	Improved action and responsiveness towards the prevention of sexual exploitation of girls and boys in travel and tourism in the 4 targeted countries	Enhanced law enforcement capacity for national and transnational action to identify and effectively act upon travelling child-sex offenders in the 4 targeted countries
Pillar Components / Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Build resilient vulnerable communities• Enhance national information, reporting & referral mechanisms• Support public & private sector response• Assist governments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Progress laws & regulations related to CSETT• Ensure informed & capable officers• Enhance cooperation & communication• Review scope & quality of operational outcomes
Main Stakeholders	Community (children, parents, public); National & provincial government; welfare agencies; travel & tourism sector	Police, prosecutors, judges; Criminal justice & law enforcement agencies
Budget	\$3 million	\$4 million

1.2 Evaluation Terms of Reference

This independent mid-term evaluation (IE), conducted by Evaluation Expert, Dr Martina Nicolls, and Context Specialist, Ms Shelley Casey, was undertaken in accordance with AusAID guidelines and the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) criteria for evaluating development assistance: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, gender equality, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems, and analysis and learning.⁵ The aim of the evaluation, according to the Terms of Reference (Annex 1), was to determine the following: (1) the progress within and between the Prevention and the Protection Pillars, (2) lessons learned in the first two years of Project Childhood's activity (2011-2012), and (3) the relevance of the Project in the context of AusAID's regional program priorities in South East Asia to inform management decisions beyond 2014.

1.3 Scope of the Evaluation

The scope of this evaluation covered an assessment of the Prevention Pillar and the Protection Pillar as two separate Pillars, and their connecting Cross Pillar coordination mechanism. The evaluation also covered the following phases of the Project from its concept:

(1) Concept Phase – the formulation of AusAID's Project Design Document (PDD);

⁵ AusAID (2012) Policy: Performance Management and Evaluation and <http://www.oecd.org>

- (2) Inception Phase – after contract negotiations each Implementing Partner prepared separate a Project Implementation Design Document (PIDD);
- (3) Implementation to date of the Mid-Term Evaluation – implementation to July 2013; and
- (4) Implementation to the end of the Project – implementation to June 2014.

1.4 Methodology

Desk Review

The evaluation, over 29 days from June to September 2013, commenced with a desk review of relevant Project background, planning, and implementation documentation provided by AusAID Bangkok. From the desk review, the evaluators prepared an Evaluation Plan as a guide to ensure a comprehensive coverage of the OECD DAC evaluation criteria (Annex 2). During the evaluation, the Implementing Partners provided further documentation, statistical data, and publications (Annex 4)

Site Visits

The evaluation included fieldwork in three of the four Project countries for 16 days from July 15 to August 1, 2013. The evaluators visited Thailand, Viet Nam, and Cambodia for five days each where they conducted individual and group interviews as well as focus group discussions with a range of Project stakeholders face-to-face and via Skype or telephone. In each of the three countries, the evaluators visited the capital city and one location designated by the Project as a CSETT ‘hotspot.’ Hence the evaluation was conducted in Bangkok and Chiang Mai in Thailand; Hanoi and Hai Phong in Viet Nam; and Phnom Penh and Siem Reap in Cambodia (Annex 3). AusAID Bangkok assisted with the provision of translators throughout the fieldwork. On completion of the fieldwork, the evaluators debriefed AusAID Bangkok on preliminary findings on August 2, 2013.

Limitations

The evaluation of a project with two distinct pillars across four countries within 16 fieldwork days necessitated the exclusion of a visit to Lao PDR. The concentration of implementation activities, by both pillars, determined the evaluators’ focus on visits to Thailand, Cambodia, and Viet Nam. Nevertheless, the evaluators interviewed Lao PDR Prevention Pillar stakeholders in Bangkok, Thailand, capitalizing on their regional staff meeting on July 20. Other Lao PDR stakeholders were contacted by telephone or during their visits to countries which coincided with the evaluators’ schedule. Within each country schedule of five days, a visit to the capital plus one site location (domestic flights in two countries) also limited the evaluator’s ability to widely sample project sites, activities and stakeholders. However, the rationale to include two cities within each country enabled a cross-section of Project ‘hotspot’ locations.

The evaluation occurred during the Cambodian general elections on July 28. Some stakeholders were not available as they were in their home location to vote. AusAID and Implementing Partners arranged the evaluators’ schedule to include the “First Regional Meeting to Establish the Legal Research Group” in Siem Reap, Cambodia, from August 1-2, to enable interviews with Cambodian and Laos PDR protection pillar stakeholders.

Further limitations included Project and stakeholder documentation with conflicting information, or conflicting with stakeholder experiences, timelines, and discussions. It was also difficult to disaggregate ‘planned’ activities from those in progress or completed. To counteract this, the evaluators triangulated information to include information that conformed to the majority of stakeholders and/or current documentation.

2. DESIGN AND INCEPTION PHASES

2.1 Australian Aid Programming in South East Asia

Australian aid regional programs targeting the prevention of exploitation, protection of victims, and prosecution of criminals include the Asia Regional Trafficking in Persons (ARTIP) Project and ARTIP Transition Project to strengthen criminal justice systems in South East Asia (2006-2013);⁶ the ILO TRIANGLE Project (2010-2015) which aims to prevent labour exploitation of migrant workers in the Greater Mekong Sub-region; and the MTV EXIT Project (on-going since 2003) that raises awareness on human trafficking among youths in South East Asia. ARTIP's successor (2013-2018) is the Australia Asia Program to Combat Trafficking in Persons (AAPTIP)⁷ which will operate regionally to provide support to ASEAN⁸ and individual partner countries to strengthen legislative frameworks for effective criminal justice responses to trafficking.

2.2 CSETT Project Design Document (PDD)

The Australian Government has supported programs to prevent child sexual exploitation in travel and tourism (CSETT) in ASEAN countries since 1999. In 2007, AusAID contracted the development of the Strategy Paper—*A Sustainable Regional Response to Preventing the Sexual Exploitation of Children in Tourism Destinations* to explore options for future programming. AusAID identified four areas requiring further work: (1) Prevention; (2) Protection; (3) Recovery and Reintegration of Victims; and (4) Regional Cooperation and Coordination. To complement AusAID's programming in the region and avoid duplication, AusAID initially considered Prevention, Protection and Recovery.

The Prevention Pillar was chosen to help prevent children becoming victims by increasing awareness within vulnerable communities, government and tourism companies, through public campaigns, training, and telephone reporting hotlines. The Protection Pillar was selected to protect at-risk children through training local law enforcement agencies, with the aim of increasing arrests and prosecutions. The Recovery Pillar was excluded after considering the complex systems to strengthen victim recovery and AusAID's resource limitations.⁹

The result of the Strategy Paper was therefore a Project Design Document (PDD) for Project Childhood to mitigate CSETT through a two-pronged strategy, combining the Prevention Pillar and the Protection Pillar under one Project over four years with a budget of \$7.5 million.

The 2010 AusAID's *Report on Quality at Entry and Next Steps to Complete Design for Project Childhood* (QAE)—an internal peer and independent appraiser review process—expressed concerns about the project design, such as: (1) attitudinal and behavioural change, and child participation, were not adequately addressed in the Prevention Pillar; and (2) there was confusion on the difference between child trafficking and child sex exploitation (CST) in the Protection Pillar because the two are not necessarily linked. For both Pillars, AusAID's report identified the necessity to have the following documentations: a Sustainability Strategy, a Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) Framework, and a Gender Action Plan. All documents were expected to be developed during the Inception Phase by each Implementing Partner as part of the refinement of the project design: "A Project Implementation Design Document (PIDDD) was to be developed for the Prevention and Protection Pillars by the Implementing Partners ... during a 6 month Inception Phase" elaborating

⁶ ARTIP ended in August 2011 and was followed by the ARTIP Transition Project which ended in March 2013

⁷ <http://www.artipproject.org/> (Accessed on August 5 2013)

⁸ ASEAN = Association of South East Asian Nations, formed in 1967, which includes: Brunei, Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Myanmar, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, and Viet Nam.

⁹ AusAID, Report on Quality at Entry and Next Steps to Complete Project Design for Project Childhood, 7 October 2009, p2

how each Pillar will be operationalized.¹⁰

AusAID approved their Project Design Document on 12 February 2010 with the proviso that each Implementing Partner's Project Implementation Design Document should be finalized incorporating the QAE comments in the Inception Phase before proceeding to implementation.¹¹ The QAE stated that a stop-go review point would be in place at the end of the Inception Phase for both Pillars.¹²

2.3 Inception Phase - Project Implementation Design Document (PIDD)

AusAID signed a cooperation agreement with UNODC for the Protection Pillar on 10 August 2010 and, after a competitive process, with World Vision Australia for the Prevention Pillar on 23 December 2010. Both Pillars were expected to produce separate Project Implementation Design Documents (PIDD) during a six-month Inception Phase to address the AusAID's requirements.

2.3.1 Inception Timeline

The Prevention Pillar commenced its Inception Phase in February 2011 and submitted their PIDD in September. AusAID approved the PIDD in December pending revisions. Revisions were submitted and approved in January 2012,¹³ taking the Inception Phase 11 months to finalize. The strategic changes from PDD to PIDD included: a shift to a multi-pronged systems strengthening approach to child protection adapted from UNICEF's 2008 Child Protection Strategy; a holistic approach to prevention with children at its core; a shift from strengthening reporting hotlines to working with general advice helplines; and an expanded focus on parents.¹⁴

The Protection Pillar commenced its Inception Phase in November 2010, submitting the PIDD in May 2011. AusAID requested further amendments to improve gender issues, capacity building, institutional strengthening, and a legal analysis. The PIDD was re-submitted in September 2011, and approved in December, with further revisions in February 2012, thus taking over a year to finalize.

Table 2: Project Childhood Design and Inception Timeline

		Prevention Pillar	Protection Pillar
AusAID Concept PDD		2009 to February 2010	
Cooperation Agreement		Signed December 2010	Signed August 2010
Implementation Phase			
	PLANNED	ACTUAL	
Inception Phase PIDD	4 months for Prevention Pillar and 6 months for Protection Pillar ¹⁵	Feb to Sept 2011 (7m)	Nov 10 to Sept 11 (10m)
	Approved with revisions	Dec 2011 (10m)	Dec 2011 (13m)
	Final approval	Jan 2012 (11m)	Feb 2012 (14m)
Full Implementation		From September 2011	From January 2012
Reporting Phase		From September 2011	From September 2011
End of Project		June 2014	

Notes: PDD: Project Design Document; PIDD: Project Implementation Design Document

¹⁰ AusAID, 2010 QAE Report, p3

¹¹ AusAID, 2010 QAE Report, p8

¹² AusAID, 2010 QAE Report, p8

¹³ World Vision (April 2012), Six Monthly Report, 1 September 2011 – 31 March 2012, p1

¹⁴ World Vision (September 2011) Prevention Pillar PIDD, p10

¹⁵ Funding Order between AusAID and WVA, and Funding Agreement between AusAID and UNODC

2.4 Design Concerns

AusAID managers explicitly detailed major concerns for the implementation of Project Childhood in the design phase, from 2009, and in the 2010 QAE Report.¹⁶ The concerns included: (1) the Project is inherently subject-specific contained under the canopy of child protection, and under the umbrella of child trafficking, while conflating the two; (2) although there are regional elements in the Protection Pillar, the Project is not a regional program, but is a multi-country Project that focuses only on some of the Mekong sub-region countries; (3) the design over-emphasizes cross-border approaches for the Protection Pillar rather than an emphasis on an in-country focus; (4) the design is actually two stand-alone projects with limited conceptual links between the two; (5) one organization cannot implement the two Pillars (because advocacy in the Prevention Pillar is considered to be a 'soft' approach to child protection while law enforcement in the Protection Pillar is considered to be a 'hard' approach, and hence two organizations are implementing the Project; (6) there are two discrete performance assessment logframes with no collective performance criteria; and (7) there is limited focus on the travel and tourism sector, focusing primarily on the child in the Prevention Pillar and the law in the Protection Pillar.

Although AusAID's 2010 QAE Report identified major concerns and the lack of specific strategies for sustainability, gender, and monitoring, it was approved for implementation with the expectation that the two Implementing Partners would address the issues during the Inception Phase.

The Inception Phase for both Pillars was protracted. To final approval of each Pillar's PIDD, the intended 6-month Inception Phase extended to 11 months for the Prevention Pillar and 14 months for the Protection Pillar. The prolonged phase provides an indication that Project Childhood is sensitive and complex, demanding specific attention to strategies, approaches, and conceptual understandings of both prevention and protection within CSETT.

2.5 Cross Pillar Coordination

One of the major design implications was Cross Pillar coordination. AusAID intended that the Project would become "nested as a whole" within child protection and law enforcement through an integrated, sustainable two-project approach, resulting in a holistic and wide-reaching response to CSETT.¹⁷ However, a Cross Pillar approach was not explicitly part of the Project design. This was because AusAID assumed that Cross Pillar cooperation, communication, and joint activities would organically occur between the Pillars.

During the Inception Phase AusAID realized that the assumption was not the reality. Hence, AusAID contracted an external facilitation team to enhance Cross Pillar functions through a one-day Cross Pillar workshop in October 2011 – before final approval of the Pillars' PIDDs. The Cross Pillar facilitation team noted that operational and conceptual differences to program delivery, and differing interpretations of definitions and terminology, impacted effective cooperation between Pillars at the activity level. Whereas the Protection Pillar was ready to discuss joint activities and partnerships in 2011, the Prevention Pillar preferred to have more substantive discussions and consultations. While it was discussed that operational cooperation could occur, Cross Pillar cooperation was relatively inactive in 2011 during the Inception Phase because the Prevention Pillar was yet to recruit and mobilize their national staff.

¹⁶ Adapted from AusAID's Strategy Paper (Sept 2009) and 2010 Quality at Entry Report (2010)

¹⁷ AusAID (Feb 2012) 2011 Quality at Implementation Report, p7

The evaluators noted that while AusAID was aware of the importance of Cross Pillar functionality, it was not fully cognizant of the implications that Cross Pillar ideals do not automatically, nor easily, facilitate integration of conceptual and operational joint activities.

2.6 Stop-Go Review Point

The QAE stated that a stop-go review point would be in place at the end of the Inception Phase for both Pillars.¹⁸ The Prevention Pillar submitted their final PIDD on 18 January 2012 and AusAID approved it in the same month. The Protection Pillar submitted their final PIDD in February 2012 and AusAID approved it in the same month.¹⁹

Despite not receiving final approval until early 2012, both Pillars had interim approval pending revisions of their PIDDs. Consequently, the Prevention Pillar's first six-monthly report covered the period September 2011 to March 2012, at AusAID's request.²⁰ The Protection Pillar's first six-monthly report covered the period from September 2011 to May 2012.²¹ Hence, AusAID regarded that both Pillars commenced implementation from September 2011.

AusAID produced a *Quality at Implementation Report* (QAI) on 23 February 2012 for the year 2011, within a month of signing final approval of the Inception Phase in January/February 2012, noting that Project Childhood "was exempt from QAI reporting in 2010 as it was still in its Inception Phase. The Project has now begun implementation. Accordingly, this is the Project's first QAI."²² Although the report noted effective gains from the Pillars contributing significantly to the knowledge base of CSETT, identifying known hotspots, producing sound gender strategies, and beginning to build relationships with host governments, it expressed ongoing concerns. These included: (1) limited quantitative analysis or retrieval of national statistics on CSETT, (2) incomplete baseline, (3) limited in-depth national work plans, (4) relationships with government not yet formalized with a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), (5) a year to recruit staff, and (6) budgets for implementation diverted to the Inception Phase.²³

The report highlighted the critical interlinking component, Cross Pillar coordination, required for the Project's success. However, the report documented the two different approaches to implementation in operational locations: "this approach means that even in locations where the two projects overlap, the activities may not be sufficiently coordinated to be mutually supporting."²⁴ The 2011 QAI Report was cleared on March 1, 2011 with the statement: "this QAI report raises some serious issues ..."²⁵ Yet the PIDDs were approved a month before the release of the QAI report.

Although AusAID made every effort to prolong the Inception Phase to enable both Implementing Partners (through guidance and review) to develop and document their own conceptual approaches, and a coordination strategy for Cross Pillar linkages, AusAID missed the opportunity to categorically resolve these concerns during the Inception Phase, or to permanently or temporarily halt the Project at the stop-go review decision point.

¹⁸ AusAID, 2010 QAE Report, p8

¹⁹ The evaluators did not cite AusAID's approval document, but the month of approval was confirmed by IPs and AusAID personnel; the dates of submission are provided in the IPs first quarterly reports

²⁰ World Vision (April 2012), Six Monthly Report, 1 September 2011 – 31 March 2012, p1

²¹ UNODC (May 2012), Project Implementation Semi Annual Progress Report

²² AusAID, 2011 QAI Report, p1

²³ AusAID, 2011 QAI Report, p3-5

²⁴ AusAID, 2011 QAI Report, p4

²⁵ AusAID, 2011 QAI Report, p1

2.7 Challenges for Project Implementation

The evaluators noted that the Project Childhood design melded and confused the following conceptual approaches which prolonged the Inception Phase: (1) regional with multi-country; and (2) issues-based with systems-based. These approaches, and AusAID's concerns, continue into the implementation of the Project. These will be outlined in the implementation findings.

The evaluators have documented the development of the design and inception phases in detail to highlight the Project's complications and complexities. The design concerns occurred before full implementation of a four-country Project in which each country has its own political, economic, social, legal, and geographic challenges in mitigating child sexual exploitation. The Project aimed to address and mitigate an exceptionally precise and narrow issue, such as child sexual exploitation in travel and tourism, in which people's understanding of terminology, concepts, strategies, laws and regulations are critical to its success. The Project is more than a commitment to ensuring the fundamental rights of the child and combating transnational crime in South East Asia. It is AusAID's obligation to act as a steward to ensure the most effective, far-reaching and sustainable outcomes for Project Childhood. Therefore in this evaluation the evaluators place an intensely critical focus on the Implementing Partners' inputs, outputs, outcomes, and progress during the first half of the Project as they move into the latter phase of implementation.

2.8 Mobilization and Transition from Inception to Implementation

2.8.1 Staffing Timeline

The Prevention Pillar regional headquarters staff commenced in February 2011. National Coordinators were recruited in Thailand in January 2012, in Cambodia and Viet Nam in February 2012, and in Lao PDR in April 2012, a year after commencement of the Inception Phase.²⁶ The Protection Pillar regional staff commenced in November 2010 (June 2011 for INTERPOL). National Project Officers were in place in all four countries by August 2011, nine months after commencement of the Inception Phase.²⁷

Table 3: Project Childhood Staffing Timeline

	Prevention Pillar	Protection Pillar
Implementation Phase		
Inception Phase*	Feb 2011 to Jan 2012	Nov 2010 to Feb 2012
Full Implementation	From September 2011	From January 2012 (reporting from Sept. 2011)
Staffing Finalized	Regional HQ: Feb 2011	Regional HQ: Dec 2010
	Thailand: Jan 2012	Thailand: Dec 2010
	Cambodia: Feb 2012	Cambodia: Feb 2011
	Viet Nam: Feb 2012	Viet Nam: August 2011
	Lao PDR: April 2012	Lao PDR: August 2011

Note: *The Inception Phase covers the period to the final approval of the Project Implementation Design Document (PIDD)

During the Inception Phase, each Pillar was expected to mobilize key staff to a regional headquarters office in Bangkok, write the PIDD, recruit staff, and commence host government agreements to implement the Project. While the Protection Pillar had staffing in place at country level from the start of the reporting period (September 2011) and indeed by approval of the Inception Phase (February 2012), the Prevention Pillar did not. It was not explicitly clear to the Prevention Pillar that they should commence activities in the Inception Phase in preparation for full implementation. Instead, they waited until approval of the Inception Phase before commencing the recruitment of

²⁶ World Vision (July 2013), Project Childhood Prevention Pillar Staff Outline, requested by evaluators

²⁷ UNODC, 2012 Protection Pillar Annual Report, p1

key staff in each country. As such, with minimal staffing from September 2011, the Prevention Pillar was exceptionally constrained in documenting their PIDD and in putting structures in place for full implementation. This blurring between the end of the Inception Phase and the start of implementation severely hampered the Prevention Pillar, causing delays to host government partnerships in each country and the establishment of partner NGOs to implement specific activities.

3. EVALUATION FINDINGS: OUTCOMES, ACHIEVEMENTS AND IMPACTS

3.1 Outcomes and Achievements

The following chart presents the major outcomes and achievements of both the Prevention Pillar and the Protection Pillar reported to July 2013:²⁸

Table 4: Project Outcomes and Achievements

Prevention Pillar²⁹	
OUTCOME 1: Selected vulnerable communities are more resilient against child sexual exploitation in travel and tourism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support to 6 CSOs working to prevent CSETT;³⁰ • Education initiatives to 410 children (246 F, 164 M) and 122 parents and carers (90 F, 32 M) in tourism hotspots;³¹ • Training to 525 community representatives (233 F, 283 M), including local government officials, social workers and teachers on how to prevent children from sexual exploitation in tourism hotspots³²
OUTCOME 2: Selected national information and communication mechanisms for vulnerable girls and boys are improved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extending the existing Cambodia Child Helpline to 2 tourism CSETT hotspots resulting in 14,625 total helpline beneficiaries
OUTCOME 3: Tourism sector and traveling public participate in the development of a protective environment for children in travel and tourism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development of Child Safe Tourism (CST) campaign concepts with endorsement from National Tourism Organisations; • Trainings for CST campaign to 490 private tourism personnel (220 F, 223 M) on keeping children safe from abuse in travel and tourism;³³ • Market research surveying over 300 international travellers to the region resulting in a publication on their perspectives of CST; • The launch of a regional Child Safe Tourism campaign to promote child safe travel for people coming to South East Asia; • Training to 15 media members (7 F, 8 M) on child protection in tourism.
OUTCOME 4: Key government ministries and agencies take increased action to strengthen the protective environment to prevent the sexual exploitation of girls and boys sustainably	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training to 494 public servants (232 F, 259 M); • Support to ministerial staff to increase their knowledge and capacity; • Technical assistance on the implementation of national action plan; • Child Safe Tourism Committee meeting conducted in Cambodia with Ministry of Tourism; • Delivery of a presentation at the World Vision Asia Pacific Urban Forum in Bangkok, March 2013.
Protection Pillar	
OUTCOME 1: Legislative frameworks meet International standards and obligations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legal Analysis Reports completed in all countries (Feb. 2012) & formally approved in Cambodia & Laos; • Increased understanding of sexual abuse and CSETT issues amongst key justice sector stakeholders;

²⁸ Project Childhood Standing Brief (Jan 2013), pp2-3, World Vision (2012) 2012 Annual Report 1, p2, WV 2013 Six-Monthly Report, p4, UNODC Project Childhood Annual Report 2012 and Semi-Annual Progress Report June-July 2013

²⁹ Targets are not specified in the Prevention Pillar's M&E Plan for most activities, except some for Outcome 1 and Outcome 3 (shown below), and reporting amalgamates achievements from all countries

³⁰ AusAID Program Target: Support to two CSOs that are working to prevent CSETT tourism in each country (end-of-program target: 8)

³¹ Target Outcome 1: At least 40 girls and boys and 30 parents/carers per country in Year 1, and from Year 2, 100 girls and boys and 90 parents/carers in two locations per country per year to participate in training initiatives (mid-way target: at least 560 children, 840 parents & carers). Hotspot locations are according to Implementing Partner designated locations.

³² Target Outcome 1: At least 20 community members/ duty bearers per country participate in training initiatives in Year 1 and from Year 2, at least 40 community members/duty-bearers in two locations per country per year participate in training initiatives (mid-way target: at least 400 community members/duty bearers)

³³ Target Outcome 3: At least 20 tourism sector stakeholders per country have increased knowledge and capacity in Year 1 & from Year 2 at least 40 tourism sector training participants per country have increased knowledge and capacity (mid-way target: at least 320)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Prakas (decree) on inter-agency coordination in Cambodia. • Viet Nam agreed to incorporate report's recommendations in its on-going Penal Code & Penal Procedure Code reform process; • Establishment of Lao Legal Responsible Committee to follow up on legal report finding. Will conduct further surveys and introduce a new CSETT Decree, or incorporate CSETT reforms into the planned Penal Law review in 2015; • Regional Legal Research Group established and first meeting held (with 62 participants), 1-2 Aug. 2013.
OUTCOME 2: Informed and capable front-line law enforcement officers, prosecutors and judges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment of Police Training Technical Working Groups in Thailand, Viet Nam & Cambodia in 2012, and in Laos in 2013; • Regional generic training manuals for front-line police officers & specialist investigators finalized in Jan. 2013, translated into 4 languages (editing and country contextualisation ongoing); • Strong sense of counterpart ownership over the process, and improved understanding on CSETT issues amongst Working Group members. • Regional Training of Trainers delivered to 45 trainers in June 2013; • Training for Cambodian police gender focal point-people on sexual exploitation of children and gender-based violence; • Regional training for 6 police officers in March 2013 on use of INTERPOL's Victim Identification Laboratory; • Training of 32 police (Sept 2012) and 32 prosecutors and judges (July 2013) on computer-facilitated crimes against children in collaboration with ICMEC; • Equipment needs assessments completed Feb. 2013 in Thailand, Cambodia & Viet Nam (one hotspot location each & two in Viet Nam).
OUTCOME 3: Mechanisms established to enhance cooperation between criminal justice agencies within and across borders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bilateral police cooperation meeting conducted in Thailand/Cambodia in Aug 2012 and Regional Law Enforcement Cooperation Workshops in Oct. 2012; • Establishment of INTERPOL Specialists Group on Crimes against Children in South East Asia, & first regional meeting in March 2013.
OUTCOME 4: Joint Investigation Teams (JITs) established and operational	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designated focal point police agencies agreed in Thailand, Vietnam and Cambodia (Laos still pending); • Ad hoc information sharing and operational support from Interpol in relation to cases of child trafficking, sexual abuse and CSETT.
Cross Pillar Coordination	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The preparation of a joint submission in Sept. 2012 to UN Special Rapporteur on Sale of Children, Child Prostitution and Child Pornography, on request for inputs on 'sex tourism involving children' to contribute to Human Rights Council report in March 2013, regarding their collaboration on Community Policing and other activities to respond to child sexual abuse in key hotspots in Thailand (based on Cross Pillar cooperation with Royal Thai Police to establish community police teams across 40 targeted pilot areas across Thailand to strengthen cooperation between police and community to identify and investigate child sexual abuse cases.³⁴ • The Prevention Pillar delivered training on <i>Keeping Children Safe from Sexual Abuse</i> to 77 community police and 41 duty bearers (20 F, 89 M) during a Community Policing Seminar hosted by the Protection Pillar on November 13-14, 2012, for police of Cambodia, Lao PDR, Viet Nam and Thailand.³⁵ 	

In terms of the project goal to “contribute to the prevention and protection of child sexual exploitation in travel and tourism” in the four targeted countries, as a broader development goal, the evaluators noted that while initial Cross Pillar coordination was limited in 2011 due to staffing recruitment delays, the two Pillars increased their collaborative efforts by September 2012. An AusAID-contracted external facilitation team presented two workshops, one in October 2011 and

³⁴ Project Childhood Standing Brief (Jan 2013), pp2-3

³⁵ World Vision (2013) Six-Monthly Report, 1 October 2012-31 March 2013, p13

another in September 2012, to enhance coordination and communication.³⁶ In 2012, the Cross Pillar facilitation team noted “many examples of successful cooperation between the Pillars at the national level” with increasingly shared information and staff taking part in each other’s activities. The two Pillars also cooperated to summarise Cross Pillar achievements in progress reports annexed to their individual six-monthly reports to AusAID.³⁷

The national-level cooperation included collaboration in training to community police of Cambodia, Lao PDR, Viet Nam, and Thailand at a regional workshop in November 2012. However, the Project’s significant achievement, and an example of AusAID’s intended holistic approach to CSETT, included their first major Cross Pillar interlinking collaboration. It involved joint activities with the Royal Thai Police to establish community police teams across 40 targeted pilot locations to identify and investigate child sexual abuse cases.³⁸ This collaboration included the preparation of a joint submission in September 2012 to the United Nations Special Rapporteur on child exploitation that detailed the two-Pillar cooperation to respond to child sexual abuse in key travel and tourism hotspots in Thailand. In December 2012 the UN Special Rapporteur commended Project Childhood for being an innovative program for combatting the growing issue of CSETT.³⁹

3.2 Impacts

The evaluation is a mid-term performance assessment and not an end-of-project impact assessment. Therefore it is too early to adequately assess the impact of each Pillar’s activities. The evaluators noted that the Pillars have made slow progress towards their longer term objectives due to delays in the Inception Phase, recruitment of staff, and government timeframes. These delays may impact the achievement of all objectives by the end of the project. However, based on the evaluation interviews and observations, it appears that the Project has resulted in increased understanding and awareness of CSETT in all four project countries, particularly amongst justice sector stakeholders. There also appears to be a strong commitment on the part of governments to address CSETT, both from a preventative and law enforcement perspective.

³⁶ Milner (2012) Project Childhood’s Facilitators’ Report: (Second Cross Pillar Facilitation Report for Project Childhood), p2

³⁷ For example, Annex 6 Cross Pillar Achievements, in World Vision (June 2013) Six-monthly Report

³⁸ Project Childhood Standing Brief (Jan 2013), pp2-3

³⁹ World Vision (2012) Annual Report 1, p6 and Annex 6

4. EVALUATION FINDINGS: RELEVANCE

The concept of national and sub-Mekong regional collaboration for the prevention of child sexual exploitation in travel and tourism is relevant as an inter-governmental, inter-agency, and country-wide intervention. Foreign police liaison officers and international police organisations, such as INTERPOL, already shared information on criminal activity and legal reforms in CSETT across the region. In addition, private hotel corporations, NGOs, taskforces, and government tourism commissions are exploring means of coordination to address the issue, through Codes of Conduct, advocacy, staff training, and messaging for travellers. In terms of the four countries, Cambodia, Lao PDR, Thailand and Viet Nam collaborate against trafficking as part of the Coordinated Mekong Ministerial Initiative, including in the tourism industry.

Nevertheless, there are significant gaps and/or ambiguities in protocols, policies, legal regulations, and enforcement for child sexual exploitation, particularly in relation to travel and tourism-related offences, at both the country-level and across the region. It is also relevant for the Australian aid program's regional priorities to extend its positive reputation in trafficking in persons interventions to the related issue of CSETT, and to close the gaps to ensure the protection of CSETT. It is timely and relevant to address CSETT in a comprehensive, holistic manner. With AAPTIP and its predecessor programs to combat trafficking in persons, the Australian Government is a leading donor in TIP in the region. To match this reputation, the CSETT Project requires high quality programming.

The design of Project Childhood recognised that addressing CSETT in the sub-Mekong region required a multifaceted effort spanning communities, governments, travel and tourism businesses, and law enforcement. The immediate step for the Implementation Phase was the establishment of Memoranda of Understanding, or equivalent, with relevant government or national travel organization to build a strong foundation for formal collaboration. The Protection Pillar signed its first government agreement with Cambodia in November 2011. All other government partnerships were signed in 2012, with the exception of Lao PDR. The Protection Pillar signed a Letter of Agreement with the relevant Lao PDR government ministry in 2013, but the Prevention Pillar is yet to establish an agreement with their counterpart agency (Table 5).

Table 5: Host Government Agreements and MOUs Timeline by Country

	Prevention Pillar
Thailand	Ministry of Social Development & Human Security: Letter of Endorsement 2012
Cambodia	Ministry of Tourism: MOU August 2012
Viet Nam	Viet Nam National Administration for Tourism: MOU June 2012; Ministry of Labour, Invalids & Social Affairs: MOU Sept 2012
Lao PDR	No MOU signed to date with the Ministry of Labour & Social Welfare
	Protection Pillar
Thailand	Royal Thai Police: Cooperation Agreement 2012
Cambodia	Ministry of Interior: Letter of Agreement November 2011
Viet Nam	Ministry of Public Security: Letter of Agreement 2012
Lao PDR	Ministry of Public Security on behalf of MPS & Ministry of Justice: Letter of Agreement 2013

Sources: WV and UNODC Annual and Quarterly Reports

All host government ministries expressed the view that the Project was relevant to the needs of their countries, and were aligned with their national child protection strategies. For example, the Project aligns with the Lao PDR's National Strategic Plan on Tourism (2011-2020) with a focus on the National Action Plan (NAP) on Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children (CSEC) and the Viet Nam NAP on the Care and Protection of Children (2011-2015).

4.1 Prevention Pillar

The Prevention PIDD identified four outcomes (components) which represented stakeholder levels: (1) communities, (2) national level, (3) public and private partnerships, and (4) governments. For components 2 and 4 (C2 and C4), the Pillar worked at the national government level and hence their main stakeholders were government agencies and national level travel and tourism organizations.

Locations

For component 1 and component 2, two hotspot locations were identified per country during the Inception Stage so that they could operate at the community level: Thailand – Pattaya and Chiang Mai; Viet Nam – Hai Phong and Ho Chi Minh City; Cambodia – Mondulkiri and Siem Reap; and Lao PDR – Vientiane and Luang Prabang.⁴⁰ By the mid-term evaluation in 2013, the Prevention Pillar was working with communities in other locations (Table 6).

Table 6: Prevention Pillar Hotspot Locations by Country

	Component 1 (Communities)	Component 2 (National)	Component 3 (Public, Private)	Component 4 (Governments)
Cambodia	<u>Planned</u> Mondulkiri Siem Reap <u>Other</u> Battambang Preah Sihanouk	Phnom Penh Preah Sihanouk Siem Reap	<u>Planned</u> Mondulkiri <u>Other</u> Phnom Penh; Kampong Cham Kampong Thom; Preah Sihanouk	Phnom Penh
Lao PDR	<u>Planned</u> Vientiane province Luang Prabang province <u>Other</u> Khammouane province Sayaboury province	Vientiane	<u>Planned</u> Vientiane capital Luang Prabang province <u>Other</u> Khammouane province Sayaboury province	Luang Prabang province Vientiane capital
Thailand	<u>Planned</u> Chiang Mai Chonburi (Pattaya)* <u>Other</u> Bangkok Prayao* Mae Hong Sorn* Rayong* Bangkok* Krabi* Phuket*	Bangkok*	<u>Planned</u> Chiang Mai <u>Other</u> Koh Samui (Suratthani) Koh Chang (Trad)*	Chiang Mai* Bangkok* Chonburi (Pattaya)* Phuket*
Viet Nam	<u>Planned</u> Ho Chi Minh Hai Phong <u>Other</u> Quang Binh* Da Nang*	Hanoi	<u>Planned</u> Hai Phong <u>Other</u> Hoa Binh Lao Cai Quang Ninh	Hanoi

Source: World Vision, July 31, 2013, as requested by the evaluators (* denotes locations commencing activities after the last reporting period, i.e. March 31 to July 31, 2013)

The original two locations identified for community support for C1 and C3 were appropriately identified through baseline and review information, and also through the needs of host governments. For example, Mondulkiri in Cambodia is an emerging eco-tourist site which the government targeted for Prevention Pillar support because there are currently no existing child protection services in the location.

The Prevention Pillar planned to focus C1 and C3 on two sites per country, but by mid-way into the Project, the Pillar is extending its reach to other locations. Given the delays to implementation, expanding the Pillar's reach limits its ability to undertake in-depth community engagement solely in the planned locations in sites directly related to CSETT. Hence, the two locations planned for each

⁴⁰ World Vision (Sept 2011), Project Implementation Design Document, p6

country, identified in their PIDD, are appropriate, but within the location the exact hotspot that the Pillar has chosen to operate lies on the periphery of travel and tourist sites, for local and/or international tourists.

The Pillar was more opportunistic than strategic in its initial choice of entry locations. Four of its eight main locations in which community-based (C1) activities are implemented (Pattaya, Chang Mai, Hai Phong and HCMC) occur within their existing area-based development programs (ADP). The reasons were twofold: (1) its ADPs had existing permission to operate, thus the Prevention Pillar did not need to undertake a time-consuming MOU process because the Project could be covered under an extension to the ADP MOU; and (2) local NGOs could be easily identified through ADP partnerships and a contractual agreement could be established quickly. ADPs locations generally used a poverty reduction and child protection approach to support, thus they were not explicitly relevant to a CSETT prevention program.

Therefore the Pillar's work in hotspot locations has not consistently and specifically targeted appropriate districts or high risk children and families. In Pattaya, the Project operates alongside an existing project with street children and on HIV/AIDS mitigation, thus appropriately targeting categories of children identified in the baseline as being at high risk of CSETT. However, in Hai Phong, Chiang Mai, and Mondulkiri, the Prevention Pillar targeted eco-tourist areas, backpackers, high-end five-star hotels, and areas peripheral to high risk children. In Chiang Mai in late 2013 the Pillar intends to operate in a remote northern district that is five hours from the main tourist hub. Part of the reason is due to the choice of NGO and their base for activities, and/or influence from the government partner regarding the choice of location.

Community, NGO and Government Partners

The Pillar's identification of key government agencies, and gaining their commitment to the Project, through the formulation of MOUs were finalized from June 2012 and into 2013 (Table 5). These agencies could have been identified at the Inception Phase while the Pillar was determining its project design, but the regional managers had not yet recruited national staff to initiate government relationships at an earlier stage. In most cases, the Pillar targeted host governments' child protection and child trafficking agencies, using existing committees, agencies, organizations, and activities. While this was an appropriate entry point, spring-boarding from existing policies to the discussion and development of specific CSETT policies was delayed. The Pillar focused on general child protection for too long, and in some cases, was still focused on child protection issues at the mid-way point, and had not yet focused on CSETT.

Other partnerships were also delayed or only initiated in 2013. For example, the Child Helpline in Thailand, under the Ministry of Social Development and Human Security, was approached in March 2013. The Child Helpline already receives substantial government funding and has moved into prominent, newly established facilities with advanced technology. Initial Project discussions for relevant engagement, according to Child Helpline, centred on awareness-raising for children in select Bangkok schools in the latter half of 2013. However, the stakeholder indicated that advocacy would be related to the prevention of child sexual abuse in general and not CSETT in particular.

Conceptual Approach to CSETT and CSETT Messages

In its conceptual approach to community training, the Prevention Pillar debated the 'child sex tourism' terminology of the Project design, moving the paradigm from the child as a victim to the child as a survivor, which represents a relevant dialogue. The Prevention Pillar indicated that its approach is to build resilience against CSETT in particular through filling gaps in understanding and knowledge, and that these gaps have been identified through evidence-based research about child sex abuse from travelling child sex offenders. The Prevention Pillar considers that the Project would

not be working in the best interests of children, nor within the mechanisms of child protection, sustainability, effectiveness and current evidence if it were limiting the recognition of offenders to 'only foreigners' where the key vulnerability gap identified is the lack of basic awareness of child sexual abuse per se.

The Prevention Pillar chose to take a broad approach to its community-based prevention messaging, focusing on prevention of all forms of violence, abuse and exploitation of children, rather than CSETT more specifically. The rationale given for doing so was that it would not be in the best interests of the child to focus on only one aspect of abuse to the exclusion of other, inter-related vulnerabilities. In most interviews with stakeholders, they did not explicitly state the aim of the Project as prevention of CSETT. In many instances, the evaluators found it difficult to extract the key CSETT messages from partner NGOs and government agencies.

This lack of a specific focus on CSETT is not solely but also apparent from the English version of the training curriculum. CSETT is marked as an optional component in the training for duty bearers and parents, and not addressed at all in the training materials for children. This is a missed opportunity to produce high-quality, targeted interventions specifically relevant to families and their children at high risk of exploitation in travel and tourism. Consistently, the Pillar addressed the peripheral issues and not the core. Alternatively, if Prevention Pillar coordinators are addressing issues of CSETT, the messages do not appear to be penetrating to high effect at the NGO partner and beneficiary levels.

4.2 Protection Pillar

The Protection Pillar identified the following hotspot locations (in Table 7) for its Operational Component, in collaboration with government counterparts. General locations were selected during the PIDD phase, but the precise districts and police units were not identified until early 2013, and have yet to be confirmed in Laos PDR. The hotspots appear to be relevant and appropriate, but this is difficult to assess since the Operational Component has not really begun. Eight of the Protection Pillar locations (italicised) overlap with the Prevention Pillar.

Table 7: Protection Pillar Hotspot Locations by Country

	PIDD Hotspot Location	Operational partners agreed 2013
Cambodia	Phnom Penh <i>Siem Reap</i> <i>Sihanoukville</i>	Phnom Penh Anti Human Trafficking and Juvenile Protection Unit
Lao PDR	<i>Vientiane Capital</i> <i>Luang Prabang</i> Savannakhet	Not yet agreed
Thailand	Bangkok <i>Chiang Mai</i> <i>Pattaya</i>	Pattaya Children Women and Family Protection and Anti-Human Trafficking Centre
Viet Nam	<i>Hai Phong</i> Thanh Hoa Vung Tau	Vung Tau Criminal Police Department

Source: Protection Pillar PIDD and Semi-Annual Progress Report January-June 2013.

Locations

The Protection Pillar has appropriately identified government ministries for partnerships, working primarily with national ministries of justice (for law reform), national police forces, specialist police units responsible for crimes against children, and police training schools. There also appears to be close cooperation with foreign liaison officers (including the Australian Federal Police) and Asia Regional Trafficking in Persons Project (ARTIP) technical advisors. However, the process of building

relationships and establishing agreements with government counterparts took a significant amount of time, and was still not complete at the end of the extended Inception Phase. Due to challenges with the government approval process, finalisation of the MOU with police counterparts in Laos PDR was not complete until May 2013.

Legal Reform

The PIDD appropriately identified a strong legal framework as essential to enhancing law enforcement capacity to address CSETT, and one of the earliest activities undertaken by the Protection Pillar was to engage a consultant to conduct a desk review of existing laws in each country. The reports review and analyse all standard offences relevant to CSETT, including rape and sexual abuse, child prostitution, child pornography, and issues of extra-territoriality, extradition and mutual legal assistance. Recommendations are tailored to each individual country, though the proposed “action plans” drafted externally by the consultant without government participation are generic and did not take into account the different nature of the legislative reform process in each country, or identify existing entry points to integrate CSETT-related amendments into on-going legislative reform plans. However, this has been addressed through the subsequent discussion and planning process with government counterparts, and where possible the reports’ recommendations are being integrated into on-going or planned law reform (e.g. Penal Code reforms in Vietnam, and planned Penal Code reforms in Laos PDR). The overall relevance and importance of focusing on legislative reform does not appear to have been re-assessed on a country-by-country basis based on the results of the analysis and levels of gaps identified.

Most of the legal reform recommendations are relevant and appropriate, though there is no reference in any of the reports to examples of CSETT-specific crimes (for example, in New Zealand it is an offence to organise or promote child sex tourism, which covers activities such as knowingly making travel arrangements or providing transport to facilitate sexual exploitation of a child, and printing or publishing information to promote child sex tours).⁴¹ Recommendations also promote some reforms that are not necessary or appropriate, such as new CSETT-specific MOUs, mutual legal assistance treaties (MLATs) and extradition agreements, which would not normally be pursued for such a narrow topic and would unnecessarily duplicate existing instruments such as the ASEAN MLAT.⁴² Some areas selected for follow-up support (for example, child rights/child protection law reform in Viet Nam) are only tangentially related to criminalisation of CSETT.⁴³

Law Enforcement Training

Generic regional police training manuals on sexual exploitation of children have been developed for front-line officers (FLOs) and specialist investigators. The training manuals were developed through a highly participative process, which has resulted in a high level of government engagement. Content was informed by a training needs assessment (Thailand and Cambodia only) as well as consultations at the national level through Police Training Working Groups. The manuals address sexual exploitation of children in general, but with a specific focus on investigative issues related to CSETT. They cover all aspects of a CSETT investigation, including child-sensitive interview techniques, securing a crime scene and digital evidence, and issues of international cooperation. The latter emphasizes issues of extradition, but does not sufficiently address extra-territoriality (which allows

⁴¹ Crimes Act, s. 144C

⁴² Ratified by Cambodia, Laos, and Viet Nam, and signed but not yet ratified by Thailand. The same standard mutual legal assistance and extradition processes and procedures apply regardless of the type of offence, and ARTIP/APTIP is working with all participating countries to strengthen their capacity to effectively use existing instruments.

⁴³ The law is a general child rights law with a detailed chapter on child protection. Child victims of CSETT would be considered as “children in special circumstances” under the law, but the intention of the drafters as per the National Child Protection Strategy is to move away from an issue-specific approaches and to define prevention and response services in broad terms, rather than by categories of children. The drafting process is being financially and technically supported by UNICEF.

travelling perpetrators to be prosecuted in their home countries). Depending on the individual case, once a CSETT perpetrator has left the jurisdiction, it may be easier to pursue prosecution in his or her home country, rather than seeking extradition back to the country where the offence occurred. Many countries of origin of CSETT perpetrators (including Australia, New Zealand, Canada and most European countries) now have laws specifically addressing this in the context of CSETT. The training manual does not provide guidance on this option, or outline clearly which countries prosecute their own nationals for CSETT offences committed in other countries, and how this option can be pursued with the assistance of foreign liaison officers working in the region.

The training manuals have been translated and are in the process of being adapted to the local country context. Work is on-going to make them relevant and appropriate by incorporating national laws, adjusting procedures to reflect national investigative processes and standard operating procedures (SOPs), and using country-specific case studies. Police counterparts in Thailand and Vietnam noted that the manuals will also need to be modified to reflect the national division of roles and functions between front-line officers (FLOs) and investigative police, which differs from how they are presented in the two manuals.

In collaboration with the International Centre for Missing and Exploited Children (ICMEC), training has also been provided to police (September 2012) and prosecutors and judges (July 2013) on online exploitation and computer-facilitated crimes against children. This has been well received by counterparts and addresses a potentially emerging issue in the region. The emphasis placed on internet-related crimes and online grooming by counterparts who were interviewed suggests that they have invested these emerging issues with undue prominence over the more immediate and apparent *modus operandi* for CSETT. As the baseline study notes, the majority of CSETT perpetrators use intermediaries and/or access children in pre-defined locations such as hotels, brothels and other tourist hotspots, which are more obvious and immediate targets for proactive police investigations. Language barriers also limit the extent to which law enforcement agencies can monitor online chatter to identify perpetrators.

Operational Component

The hotspots, police partners and proposed targets appear to be relevant and appropriate, but this is difficult to assess since the operational component has not really begun.

5. EVALUATION FINDINGS: EFFECTIVENESS

By promoting gender-sensitive and child-sensitive approaches to the prevention of and protection from CSETT, the Project contributes to the Australian aid program's overarching gender equality and child protection policies.⁴⁴ In addition, AusAID requested that each Pillar produce comprehensive Gender Action Plans which were formulated during the Inception Phase.

In assessing the effectiveness of Project implementation, the evaluators examined whether activities were on track to achieve their stated outcomes. This included the speed of implementation, the likelihood that the outcomes would be achieved within the original timeline, and the approaches used to advance gender action and child-sensitive approaches.

5.1 Prevention Pillar

Child Safe Tourism Campaign

From May to June 2012 the Prevention Pillar conducted a small-scale online survey⁴⁵ through various social media networks, email and internet forums, targeted at international travelers to Asia, on their attitudes to and interactions with children during their travels. The survey was conducted for one month for English-speaking tourists who encountered the invitation and chose to participate. Consequently, from 533 interested responses, 316 were valid for analysis.

From the survey findings, the Prevention Pillar developed a Child Safe Tourism campaign and launched a website in November 2012. The Child Safe Tourism website was translated into the languages of each country, as well as Korean, Japanese, and English.⁴⁶ The Child Safe Tourism training and campaign seemed to be well received by national governments and tourism agencies, and the Laos government has launched the materials. Thailand's Ministry of Tourism and Sport and the Chiang Mai University in Thailand has agreed to conduct child exploitation awareness training modeled on the Project's campaign. In addition, the Pillar has planted seeds with the Mekong Tourism Forum at the beginning of 2013 to promote the campaign.

Although the Child Safe Tourism campaign launched a website in 2012 it is not yet operated and "owned" by a government entity or regional group, and currently remains under the operation of the Prevention Pillar's Implementing Partner (World Vision). The Prevention Pillar has identified some potential partners for handover (Mekong tourism Forum or the Code), but has yet to engage partners on this.

The campaign materials were produced at the regional Prevention Pillar headquarters in Bangkok, and are yet to be contextualized for each country so that they can adopt the campaign. The reason for the delay in campaign adoption and commitment, as stated by the Prevention Pillar, is due to the time take to receive specifications from national government partners, and to receive approval for campaign artwork that is customized and contextualized to each country's needs. The campaigns for each country and national body are being developed organically as stakeholders express interest in delivering the CSETT message.

Hence at mid-term the Project's Child Safe Tourism campaign is more of an idea, or ideal, rather than a tangible and transferable packaged product that travel and tourism agencies, hotels, guest houses, and transport companies can readily identify with. If stakeholders can view a 'dummy' example of a package of information – such as a 'campaign in a suitcase' or a brochure similar to

⁴⁴ AusAID's QAI, June 2011, p2

⁴⁵ World Vision (2012), Child Safe Tourism: The Tourist Perspective; childsafetourism@wvi.org

⁴⁶ Child Safe Tourism campaign www.childsafetourism.org

travel brochures – with the proviso that they are adapted to each country - they may be more likely to be converted to the campaign ideal and its realization. As a product for evaluation, it is premature to assess the campaign's effectiveness – i.e. the messaging approach. However, the messaging appears similar to the Friends International Child Safe campaign which has received a positive response from stakeholders. Once the campaign messages are developed for each country, tourism organizations can be trained on how to deliver the message to their industry.

Community Training Materials

To the end of 2012, the Project trained 1,148 individuals on child protection, accessing Helplines, and awareness-raising to build resilience in vulnerable communities. The community training materials – three different sets of materials for duty bearers, parents, and children – were developed at the Pillar's regional level. Prevention Pillar national coordinators, NGO and organizational partners use the materials for community training to deliver grassroots advocacy. This approach complements the higher-level government and tourism organizational awareness and training. Because the training is focused on communities, including schools and clubs, the training approach is the use of cards that contain messages and images. It is expected that national Prevention Pillar coordinators and training partners will contextualize the material – both the cards and the messages – themselves, adapting them to their country's situational needs.

The evaluators have concerns about the effectiveness of community training materials in relation to their quality, standardization, and delivery. Each set of community training materials was developed at the regional level using an existing 'Westernized' approach and messages, and they are yet to be contextualized to the national context of each country.⁴⁷ The way the training materials present and discuss CSETT prevention does not reflect the various cultural factors and core CSETT vulnerabilities that the Prevention Pillar identified through its baseline study and community research (for example, family stressors such as limited education or employment opportunities, family reliance on child labour, the normalisation of sexual relations between men and sex workers, normalisation of sex in exchange for gifts amongst teenagers, the value placed on girls' virginity, and the sense of duty or gratitude that children, particularly girls, owe to their parents). It has been left to the Pillar's national coordinators and training partners to adapt and modify the materials. The Prevention Pillar indicated that they provided orientation/induction lessons to their training partners, as well as technical support, monitoring, and follow-up activities. However, stakeholders indicated that there was limited guidance on effective entry points (types of beneficiaries), practical examples, time-bound targets, and sustainability strategies.

The Prevention Pillar indicated that the materials had been adapted for varied audiences, including for those with low literacy. The evaluators viewed the Pillar's English language versions of the training materials, as well as the partner's adaptations of the training materials. The materials for duty bearers begin with complex, legal definitions of the various forms of abuse drawn from the WHO global definitions. The Pillar's visual materials were complex and text-laden, and low quality with small text, few and small images, and on one-ring A-4 card that was difficult to turn over. One partner, experienced in training, adapted the materials themselves for their beneficiaries, as part of their own initiative. That NGO partner changed the training material to larger text, fewer words per page, more images, and a larger flip-chart so that participants could easily view the messages.

The evaluators interviewed a range of NGOs who had used the materials. They all adapted the materials for their beneficiaries in accordance with their own organization's training style. They also changed the delivery from lecture-style with an emphasis on conveying information to an activity-

⁴⁷ The acknowledgments section of the children's toolkit notes that it includes materials adapted from New South Wales Department of School Education, Student Welfare Directorate (1997) *Child Protection Education: Curriculum Materials to support teaching and learning in Personal Development, Health and Physical Education*.

based approach with practical examples, and community-driven dialogue. The lack of standardization of core messages, and a lack of quality assurance, resulted in wide ranges in materials and delivery. Key guiding instructions designed to ensure effectiveness of the training with children are not being consistently followed by either Prevention Pillar staff or NGO partners delivering the training. For example, the Pillar's facilitator's guide advises that boys and girls should receive separate training and that they should be separated by age: 5-8 years, 8-11 years, and 11-18 years. However, Project staff in the four countries, and NGO partners visited by the evaluators, conducted training to boys and girls together (with some small same-sex group sessions) and to mixed age groups. This was due to the limited number of beneficiary participants, a focus on school grade levels, or residential groups, and reducing the significance of the instructions provided in the facilitator's guide.

Therefore, currently the community training materials are not in a sufficiently 'marketable' stage – conceptualized to a high quality for effective handover to training partners – to ensure that their dissemination and delivery are sustainable as components within NGO or other organization's training programs.

CSETT Community Messages

The Pillar's community training tended to be delivered on a one-off basis with limited or no follow-up, entering a community and leaving with limited continued engagement. While the Prevention Pillar indicated that follow-up had occurred, the evaluators interviewed staff from a training partner organization that had only seen Prevention officers once.

The tendency (particularly in Cambodia and Thailand) has been to expand to non-target areas and spread the message thinly, rather than concentrating on the original targeted hotspot sites to reinforce messaging and build local capacity to promote behavior change. Prevention Pillar staff indicated that they capitalized on opportunities when organizations expressed interest in delivering training. However, this approach tends to spread the message widely, but not in-depth to ensure effectiveness. Two of the experienced NGO partners who had been engaged to conduct community training expressed the concern that one-off community workshops would not be effective, and that the process of promoting attitude and behavior change requires more concerted approach to community engagement and community dialogue. There is also no evidence that behavior change was monitored and measured, which could have been possible within planned and targeted sites and communities engaged with over a period of time.

The evaluators noted, particularly in Cambodia, that trainers informing the community of helpline services had not fully imparted the purpose, process, and procedures of helplines. For example, one community group was unsure what happened when children called the helpline, what information would be provided, and what the follow-up would be. While this issue – possibly a misunderstanding and not an institutional reflection of the helpline services – was addressed at the time of the evaluation, information transferred to children and duty bearers needs to be consistent, useful and accurate.

Enhancing Reporting and Referral Structures

The Prevention Pillar also aimed to enhance information, reporting and referral mechanisms for children (girls and boys) at risk of sexual abuse, primarily through financial and technical support to existing government or private helplines to extend their services to additional locations or to undertake community participation, communication or advocacy activities. Helpline support

commenced in Cambodia and expanded to other countries in 2013. The effectiveness of helplines is that they are the Project's "closest activity to CSETT reporting."⁴⁸

Gender Equity

In the evaluators' observed activities and in discussions with the Pillar's training partners, it was noted that activities and training under the Prevention Pillar were not currently separate for boys and girls. Strengthened gender sensitization, information on gender stereotypes, and/or the different vulnerabilities faced by both boys and girls require further emphasis.

Private Sector

There has been limited progress in promoting private sector engagement, with the exception of training for the Child Safe Tourism campaign in which 490 private tourism personnel have been trained to date (exceeding the mid-way target of 320). One example of their engagement with a private travel agent in which discussions and cooperation had occurred was that of Kiri Travel. The Prevention Pillar was engaged in discussions with Kiri Travel in Thailand, which was seeking a way to expand its humanitarian arm by linking small-scale community-based production with local tourism businesses and their hotels in regional areas. Simultaneously, the Pillar was working with government child protection authorities in Chiang Mai where school girls were selling garlands of flowers to tourists. The Project trained the students and community on their risks and child protection, and provided pocket money to children as an incentive to stop selling flowers. Prevention Pillar managers indicated that they had presented to the evaluators a concept for linking the community and travel agent so that children could sell garlands directly to hotels and guest houses, thus creating a sustainable approach to the prevention of CSETT, in cooperation with the Thailand Department of Social Development and Human Security. There was conflicting evidence on the generation of the idea – whether it was Project-based or generated by the private travel agent. Nevertheless, it was at the concept stage and there was no schedule in place for its implementation.

5.2 Protection Pillar

Legal Reform

The Protection Pillar has made significant progress on legal reform, though both the PIDD outcome statement (legislative frameworks meet international standards and obligations) and performance indicators from the M&E framework (recommendations for legislative improvement are acted on by the competent national authorities, new/improved legislation or regulations are drafted and enacted) were likely overly ambitious considering the short Project period and the length of time generally required for legislative reform.

The legal analysis reports are comprehensive and generally provide clear and practical recommendations that each country can take into account in its existing or future legislative reform plans. However, as noted above, some of the report recommendations are not realistic or appropriate, and both the reports and follow-up activities have placed undue emphasis on cross-border collaboration and harmonisation of laws between the four Project countries. Whilst perpetrators may cross borders, CSETT is a crime that takes place within national boundaries, and harmonisation of laws between neighbouring countries is not necessary to effectively address it.

The reports have been well received by government counterparts and several workshops (3 in Cambodia, 4 in Laos, 11 in Viet Nam, and 2 in Thailand) have been held to share the reports and build support for reform. This has led to an increased understanding of CSETT and child sexual abuse

⁴⁸ World Vision Interview, July, 2013

issues amongst key counterparts, and has reportedly helped to raise the profile of CSETT within the justice agencies. Cambodia has already acted on one of the report's recommendations by drafting a Prakas (decree) on inter-agency coordination in responding to CSETT cases, and Viet Nam will be incorporating the recommendations into its on-going reforms of the Penal Code and Penal Procedure Code (to be finalised in 2014). Laos PDR has established a committee to conduct further research and decide on how best to take the recommendations forward, either by drafting a new decree on CSETT, or incorporating the report's recommendations into its planned review of penal laws starting in 2014. Thailand has requested further information on the offence of grooming, but has yet to commit to specific legislative reforms.

Some of the legal recommendations are quite clear and easily actionable, but others are more technical and present complex drafting challenges (for example, the new concept of 'grooming'; defining child pornography and penalising possession without over-reaching and criminalising legitimate family photos of children; extending protections against sexual abuse to all children under the age of 18, but without rendering consensual teenage sex a crime). Advancing these more complex recommendations would likely require additional technical support beyond the capacity of the Protection Pillar's regional and national staff. However no additional legal advisory support is planned. The Regional Legal Research Group (proposed by the Vietnamese government) is intended to provide opportunities for technical collaboration amongst legal experts in the four countries, but the fact that they have different legal systems, very different legal drafting styles, and similar gaps in their laws and expertise (in relation to grooming and child pornography) limits the potential effectiveness of cross-sharing.

Law Enforcement Training

The Protection Pillar's strategy for police capacity building has been to develop generic training manuals (a 3-day front-line officer course and a 5-day specialist investigator course), which will then be contextualized to each country. Both manuals are of high quality, have the potential to serve as a useful global resource, and have generally been well received by government counterparts in all four countries.

A TOT was conducted on the generic regional manual in July 2013 with participants from all four countries. Counterparts were highly supportive of this approach, since it promoted a common understanding of CSETT across all four countries, provided an opportunity for experience sharing between the different law enforcement agencies, and allowed countries with less experience in CSETT to learn from those who have had greater expertise in these types of investigations. It is expected that at least one 'pilot' training activity will be conducted in each country within the remaining Project period, likely reaching approximately 40 more participants per country.

A draft Training Strategy (prepared after the evaluation, and not yet finalised) outlines plans to contextualize and pilot the generic manuals for each country under the leadership of the national working groups. It also references (but has not yet articulated) the process for institutionalizing the training. This strategy comes fairly late in the process, and should have been documented at the outset, together with detailed training plans for each country. Several law enforcement counterparts expressed concerns about the lack of clarity about the Project's plans for follow-up training in each country, and the funds that would be made available for training.

The draft Training Strategy states that the manuals reflect a "blended training" approach as they can be used for short instructor-led classroom training, seminars, e-learning and one-on-one instruction. However, the manuals do not readily lend themselves to this approach – they are long (over 200 pages in English), relatively dense, are not easily divided into short, discrete modules, and have not been designed for self-directed or e-learning (other than being usable as a text-book) or with easy

checklists, hand-outs and quick reference guides. Counterparts raised concerns about the length of the manuals, the number of days required for training, and the use of complex and academic language which is not appropriately tailored to the target audience, particularly FLOs. The content also overlaps with existing training materials already in use, for example on commercial sexual exploitation of children (CSEC) and child-friendly interviewing techniques.⁴⁹ Existing materials were reviewed as part of the assessment of training materials, but a decision was made to create a new comprehensive manual, rather than to strengthen and expand on what was already in place.

As the UNODC regional representative noted during the evaluation interview, multi-day specialist courses are an expensive approach to police capacity building. Based on the evaluators' discussions with counterparts, it is unlikely that any of the Project countries will be using the manuals as designed beyond the Project-supported "pilot" training, since resources for in-service training are limited and the police have many competing priorities. Instead, each country will be selecting parts of the manual that can be incorporated into existing training programs. For example, three hours on CSETT was added to the Thai superintendents' course and a short module may be added to the Police Academy and Education Bureau trainings. Cambodia has added a one-day session on violence against women and children (including CSETT) to its training for gender focal points and will likely pick up some parts of the manual for inclusion in the Police Academy recruit training. Viet Nam plans to include some portion of the manual in its Police Academy training program (which already covers CSEC and child-friendly investigations). Given the ultimate use of the manual content, a more effective and efficient approach would have been to design, from the beginning, a flexible CSETT training package that could more easily be incorporated into relevant in-service and recruit training programs, and to work with counterparts to identify entry points and gaps in their existing training.

As noted above, a small group of judges and prosecutors from each project country have been supported to participate in ICMEC training. However, the development of CSETT training materials for prosecutors and judges has not yet commenced. A training needs assessment is planned for 2013, but given how long it took to initiate and develop the police training modules, it is unlikely that much progress can be made in the remaining Project period. A generic regional approach to prosecutorial and judicial training would be even more problematic given the very different legal systems in the four countries.

Operational Component

Limited progress has been made on the Operational Component. The INTERPOL advisor has provided support to national law enforcement agencies in response to intelligence received by INTERPOL, in accordance with the standard role played by INTERPOL and foreign liaison officers in the region. Many of the reported cases relate to trafficking in children rather than CSETT. Apart from this ad hoc intelligence sharing and advice, there has yet to be support for building CSETT investigative capacity in the designated hotspot locations.

The PIDD called for law enforcement counterparts to be mentored and supported through a process of proactive CSETT investigations in selected hotspots. This was to be undertaken in two phases: (1) a focus on disruption of base/'street' level offenders (closely mentored); and (2) travelling child-sex offenders based on information from Operation INFRASEA (International Fugitives Round-up and Arrest - Southeast Asia) to be less heavily mentored. The process involved risk and threat

⁴⁹ The Vietnam MPS already has detailed training modules on Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children and on Child Friendly Investigations. The Cambodian police, through the World Vision / UNICEF supported LEASETC and LEAP initiatives, have developed training manuals on child-friendly interview techniques and sexual exploitation of children (including CSETT). The Thailand police counterparts advised that both the police academy and police education bureau training curricula already include components on child friendly interviewing and child sexual abuse.

assessments, the development of detailed operational plans, and both technical and equipment needs support.

In early 2013, equipment needs assessments were completed for one hotspot each in Cambodia and Thailand, and two in Vietnam. However, operational plans for proactive investigations have not yet been developed, and there are no clear agreements as to the nature and type of support that the INTERPOL officer will be providing to the selected police units. Support appears to have been reduced from heavily mentoring the planning and implementation of proactive investigations to training police on the use of supplied equipment and ‘observing’ investigations.⁵⁰ The equipment (\$20,000 per hotspot) is not linked to any clear operational plan. It is doubtful that much progress can be made in the remaining Project period, or that one INTERPOL advisor could provide the degree of support envisioned in the PIDD to four participating countries simultaneously.

Gender Equity

The Protection Pillar has a Gender Action Plan that acknowledges the importance of gender equity. Where appropriate and possible, the Protection Pillar has provided training for women, and training data has been routinely disaggregated by gender. The limited number of women in law enforcement in all four project countries remains a key challenge, and is beyond the scope of the Project.

In Cambodia, the Protection Pillar has worked closely with the police gender unit to develop and deliver training on gender sensitization and child sexual abuse for police gender focal points. However, the generic training manuals have limited focus on gender, victim sensitization, the different vulnerabilities faced by boys and girls, and attitude and behavior change. These issues were identified in the baseline research as key barriers to successful law enforcement action in CSETT cases. A session on gender was reportedly added to the multi-country TOT, but these materials are not reflected in the generic manuals themselves. There are no specific exercises designed to challenge and address police attitudes towards CSETT victims.⁵¹

5.3 Project Activities Remaining

The evaluators’ main concern is the limited period remaining to conduct key activities and to ensure marketable and sustainable products (campaigns, manuals, training materials, and capacity building) as a package or as components for longer term development and behaviour change for CSETT. The Prevention Pillar has already requested a no-cost extension since May 2012, four months after approval of their Inception Phase PIDD. The Protection Pillar indicated that national officers have a better understanding of organisational structures and policies at the country level and that the context cannot be captured over short periods of exposure in each location. This compounds the evaluators’ concerns – the Project is intended to be effective at the country levels as well as across the region, and therefore contextualization of materials, laws, and training is essential.

By strengthening the capacity of government and civil societies to protect and promote the human rights of and justice for children at risk, Project Childhood fits within AusAID’s strategic goal of effective governance. However, the Project is yet to conduct comprehensive, in-depth capacity building at government and stakeholder levels to strengthen their ability to conduct their own advocacy, Child Safe Tourism campaigns, and community training (Prevention Pillar) or police training (Protection Pillar). Additionally, the evaluators question the effectiveness of the content, presentation, implementation, and/or delivery of each Pillar’s training materials that are yet to be customized and contextualized at the country level within the current timeframe.

⁵⁰ Interview with INTERPOL advisor

⁵¹ For a discuss of effective exercises and approaches for promoting police attitudes and behavior towards children, see Consortium for Street Children (2005) Police Training on Child Rights & Child Protection: Lessons Learned and Manual

Both Pillars are unlikely to implement some activities in the remaining period of the Project. The following table (Table 8) presents activities not yet on track for completion by June 2014.

Table 8: Activities Remaining

ACTIVITIES NOT YET UNDERTAKEN	PRIORITY ACTIVITIES THAT SHOULD BE FINISHED BY JUNE 2014
PREVENTION PILLAR	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contextualized roll-out of Prevention community training curriculum; A tangible community training product to transfer/handover to appropriate stakeholders; Capacity building of government, NGO, and private partners to sustain training. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prevention Pillar MOU with the relevant Lao PDR government ministry; Contextualized roll-out of the Child Safe Tourism campaign; A tangible Child Safe Tourism product to transfer/handover to appropriate stakeholders; Ownership of Child Safe Tourism website; A training plan for each country.
PROTECTION PILLAR	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Finalisation and institutionalisation of country-specific police training manuals; Training needs assessment for prosecutors and judges; Development of CSETT training materials for judges and prosecutors; Most aspects of the Protection Pillar Operational Component, including: identification of a counterpart in Laos; agreements with other governments counterparts on the scope and nature of operational support; risk and threat assessments; development of operational plans; and mentoring of counterparts through two-phased proactive investigations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Finalised training strategy for each country, including agreed plans for how CSETT will be incorporated into police academy and other existing training institutions; Contextualised training manuals for the police.

6. EVALUATION FINDINGS: EFFICIENCY AND RISK MANAGEMENT

Delays in full mobilization of staff to enable the formalisation of agreements and MOUs with government counterparts have significantly affected Project implementation (by up to 2 years): most activities did not fully commence until early to mid-2012. The delayed start and slow implementation of planned activities has impacted expenditure rates in both Pillars.

The Project updates its risk management matrix six-monthly and annually in line with each Pillar's reporting cycle. These Pillar-by-Pillar matrices, while not standardized, are comprehensive, outlining categories such as implementation and management risks.

6.1 Prevention Pillar

At the end of 2012 the Prevention Pillar had underspent by 40%, although expenditure rates increased in the first half of 2013. However, from May 2012 the Prevention Pillar submitted a request for a no-cost extension, which is uncommon for projects in their first year of implementation. The no-cost extension request was also mentioned in June 2013 in which the Pillar suggested an extension up to five months to December 31, 2014.⁵² Although the Inception Phase commenced in February 2011, implementation commenced in September and their implementation design was approved in January 2012.

Staffing

The Prevention Pillar commenced with three Bangkok-based regional staff and in 2012 recruited four country level national coordinators: one in each country. While external factors, such as government bureaucracy in each country, under-staffing of government counterpart agencies which limited the identification of CSETT designated officers, and harmonizing with government schedules, the Prevention Pillar under-estimated the number of regional and national level staffing to cope with work commitments and government shortfalls.

National coordinators were mobilized for each country from January to April 2012. The national coordinator for Thailand was initially filled from January to July 2012, but has been formally vacant since July 2012 following the dismissal. For the past year to the time of the evaluation, the Prevention Pillar has attempted to recruit a replacement. Temporary personnel have substituted during the year, but the position remains unfilled on a permanent basis. Currently, the Thailand national coordinator position has been filled on 50%-80% capacity since April 2013. This has placed further challenges on the Prevention Pillar's capacity to complete tasks in a timely, efficient manner.

Risk Management

As a risk management strategy, the Pillar proposed extra staff, which AusAID approved, and by the end of 2012 staffing increased to three officers per country (therefore increasing in total across all countries from 4 to 12). From 2013, with more staffing, the Pillar was in a better position to address national activities, government engagement, and partnerships for training.

The Prevention Pillar risk management matrix, presenting in its six-monthly and annual reports, includes the following matrix categories: Development Risks, Implementation Risks, and Management Risks. While comprehensive, the matrix appears limited in its efficiency as a decision-making document for corrective management. For example, the Prevention Pillar documents the case where "Government fails to develop capacity to independently implement prevention strategies" as a development risk. Its mitigation treatment is to "ensure appointment of appropriate

⁵² World Vision (June 2013), Six-Monthly Report, p17

counterparts from program outset.” However, it was updated on April 2013, with 15 months of the Project remaining.⁵³ At this point, the risk management strategy could have been used to critically analyze the counterpart appointments and their commitment to a phased handover.

6.2 Protection Pillar

At the end of 2012 the Protection Pillar had spent 66% of its projected expenditure. As discussed above, the evaluators question the efficiency of developing a comprehensive, generic police training manual which will not be used as designed at the country level. The process of developing the generic manual was highly participatory, but as a result it took over one year to complete. The manual is comprehensive, but took significant investment of time and resources for a product that will not likely be used as designed beyond the initial pilot trainings in each country.

The Protection Pillar activities have also unnecessarily duplicated or overlapped with the work of other development partners. For example, in Viet Nam the Project is supporting criminal and child protection law reform, which are already heavily supported by other UN agencies.⁵⁴ As of the date of the evaluation, the country-level IP staff member had not yet met with the other UN agencies to coordinate their support to these legislative reform process, but was nevertheless planning to hire a technical consultant. Given the technical and other support already being provided to government counterparts to support the drafting process, this is not an efficient use of project resources.

Creating new regional and sub-regional mechanisms was less effective than taking advantage of existing mechanisms. For example, the Pillar supported the establishment of a four-country ‘regional’ Legal Research Group rather than working through an existing ASEAN Committee on child protection legislative reform (including crimes against children); funded bilateral and multilateral law enforcement cooperation meetings on CSETT rather than exploring opportunities to engage with the regional trafficking Heads of Specialist Units (HSU) and the United Nations Inter-Agency on Human Trafficking (UNIAP) processes as a means of promoting cross-border police collaboration on CSETT; and promoted issue-specific Mutual Legal Assistance Treaties (MLATS) and MOUs which duplicate existing ASEAN and Mekong agreements. While it is important not to conflate CSETT with trafficking, there is significant overlap in terms of the nature of cross-border collaboration being promoted (law enforcement information sharing channels, mutual legal assistance), and often the same specialist police units designated for both CSETT and trafficking.

The Operational Component has not made significant progress towards its planned outputs and activities. This is due in part to the under-estimation of the human resources that would be needed, and it is unlikely that one officer could provide the level of hands-on mentoring the PIDD envisioned for each of the four project countries. It also appeared that the INTERPOL officer invested significant time in providing advisory support to other component activities, at the expense of progressing the key outputs under the Operational Component.

Risk Management

The annual Protection Pillar risk management matrix, presenting in its annual report, includes the following matrix categories: Political Commitment, Partner/Operational/Capacity, Management, Implementation, and Donor Support.

⁵³ World Vision (June 2013), Six-Monthly Report, Annex 5, p1

⁵⁴ UNICEF is providing technical support to the reform of the child protection law, as well as Penal Code reform relating to crimes against children (including all forms of sexual abuse and exploitation) and child-friendly investigative procedures. UNDP is providing support with respect to gender based violence.

However the matrix does not appear to address issues in terms of immediate needs. For example, the Protection Pillar documents ‘training fatigue by police officers’ as an implementation risk with the risk management strategy being ‘an assessment of training delivered to police officers to be undertaken to identify gaps in training and inform the design of targeted training’ (status as ‘completed in 2011’⁵⁵). Identifying a training gap does not necessarily address the issues of training fatigue, competing demands on police officers’ time, or limited capacity of counterparts to absorb and sustainably deliver another detailed, issue-specific training program. The risk management strategy could have been to design CSETT training materials that could be easily integrated within Police Academies at the pre-service stage, and within in-service training programs related to child protection, CSEC, gender-based violence and trafficking. Instead, the approach was to design a multi-day, issue-specific in-service training manual that would require a significant commitment of police time and resources, and which is too long to incorporate into recruit training without substantial modification. In February 2013 the matrix didn’t mention the training of trainers and the risk of not putting a training plan in place for sustainable handover. Police training is particularly high-risk due to the large numbers that require training in each country and the limited government budget to conduct in-service training.

6.3 Cross Pillar

A Cross Pillar approach was not explicitly part of the Project design, and hence it developed as “a need that arose.”⁵⁶ Opportunities for integration of Cross Pillar activities presented in AusAID’s PDD were not fully realised in the Inception Phase.

As a risk management strategy, AusAID contracted an external facilitation team to enhance Cross Pillar functions through a one-day Cross Pillar workshop in October 2011 during the Inception Phase. The Cross Pillar facilitation team noted operational and conceptual differences to program delivery, and differing interpretations of definitions and terminology. Whereas the Protection Pillar was ready to discuss joint activities and partnerships in 2011, the Prevention Pillar preferred to have more substantive discussions and consultations.⁵⁷ Mobilization of national level staffing occurred later than expected – after the Inception Phase. Hence collaborative activities could not begin to occur until after April 2012 when both Pillars had a full contingent of staff at regional and national levels.

AusAID deployed a second risk management strategy and contracted the external facilitation team to support the annual meeting of the Project Childhood Coordinating Committee in July 2012, Cross Pillar monitoring and evaluation (M&E), a workshop in September 2012, as well as coordination and communication.⁵⁸

In 2012, the Cross Pillar facilitation team noted examples of successful cooperation at the national level and the staff of both Pillars taking part in each other’s activities. However, the facilitation team concluded that the Protection Pillar “prefer to take a more experiential or iterative approach to working” and “the basic divide between a more conceptual approach and a more experiential approach ... had not really changed much.”⁵⁹ The team concluded that “the two Pillars are operating in separate silos, but with an increasing number of crossovers and groundwork being laid for joint activities especially at the national level.”

⁵⁵ UNODC (Feb 2013), 2012 Annual Report, Annex 4, p57

⁵⁶ Interview with AusAID Bangkok on 15 July 2013

⁵⁷ IBA Development (July 2012), First Annual Project Childhood Coordinating Committee Meeting: Minutes Report

⁵⁸ Milner (2012) Project Childhood’s Facilitators’ Report: (Second Cross Pillar Facilitation Report for Project Childhood), p2

⁵⁹ Milner (2012) Project Childhood’s Facilitators’ Report: (Second Cross Pillar Facilitation Report for Project Childhood), p4

Both Pillars addressed Cross Pillar cooperation in their six-monthly risk management plans. For example, they addressed the need to “promote regular formal and informal dialogue and program planning/evaluation amongst the Implementers responsible for each pillar; explore feasibility of joint activities in recognition of the need to collaborate across pillars; and work closely with AusAID contracted Program Facilitators to support cross pillar communication and communication.”⁶⁰ Although the Prevention Pillar planned to “devise and implement a Prevention Pillar Cross Pillar Collaboration Strategy,”⁶¹ it has not yet been undertaken.

⁶⁰ World Vision (2012) Annual Report 1, p28

⁶¹ World Vision (2012) Annual Report 1, p28

7. EVALUATION FINDINGS: MONITORING AND EVALUATION

Both Pillars established an M&E framework over a long period of time – up to nine months – using different methods and techniques, relevant to their overarching goals, programming objectives, and activities.

7.1 Prevention Pillar

The Prevention Pillar's M&E Plan, developed during the Inception Phase and approved by AusAID in November 2011, and updated in September 2012, outlines a relevant logframe for reporting, including indicators, some key annual performance targets, and beneficiary groups against outputs and outcomes. Their headquarters in Australia provided specialist internal M&E support to operationalize the Plan and hence the budget was minimized.

The Prevention Pillar has clear targets for some of its activities, for both the regional and national level activities. Each national coordinator collects their relevant statistics and information on standardized templates (which were prepared during the Inception Phase by regional staff) according to their internal training in March 2012. This was the first regional meeting of all staff on completion of the recruitment stage. These forms are continually updated and revised. National coordinators regularly submit the forms to the regional office in Bangkok for collation and reporting. Although activity targets are provided in the Prevention Pillar M&E Plan many are under-estimated and non-specific. For example, over the life of the Project the objective is to 'train a target of 50 public servants'.⁶² Furthermore, it is an AusAID Headline Indicator which indicates its importance, yet it does not detail the type public servant, the type of training, and when it is to occur.

A planned 2013 external evaluation of the effectiveness of the Child Safe Tourism campaign was in progress during this evaluation. The market research is currently being drafted and will be disseminated for information that will inform the Prevention Pillar managers of potential areas to address.

Annual and six-monthly reports to AusAID provide limited consolidated tables of progress against annual targets against country, location, gender, or age. With a summary table that clearly shows the actual number against the planned figure, for each category, would therefore provide a quick snap-shot of progress. Currently, there are many tables that show training figures, but they are not summarized concisely into one table. It is also currently unclear whether statistics are semi-annual, annual, or cumulative (i.e. from start to current period).

The age categories are blurred during reporting. The Prevention Pillar aimed to provide age-appropriate training in three age categories: 5-7 years, 8-10 years, and 11-18 years. However, training is not reported against age categories, and often training occurs at 'residential level' or school grade level – thus combining children of both genders and mixed ages into the training sessions. Disaggregation by stated age categories would show progress, or otherwise, and as a decision-making tool could guide improvements – or a rationale that outlines the strategic shift in policy and/or regional/national approach.

Currently there is no method for adequately monitoring or evaluating behaviour change. In training sessions, the Project uses pre- and post-testing. This is a useful tool, but only on an immediate basis to determine whether the concepts and/or messages have been understood. It may capture an intent to change attitudes or behaviour, but it does not capture actual or perceived behavioural

⁶² World Vision (2012) Annual Report 1, Annex 4, Operational M&E Plan, Updated 27 April 2012, p1 & Six-monthly Report (June 2013), p5 and p21 & Annex 9, Operational M&E Plan, Updated 30 September 2012, p1

change, or longer term change (such as after a month or three months). Follow-up with structured assessment would provide the Project with more information on attitudinal or behavioural change, and whether training approaches need to be revised. The regional team purchased NVivo software at the end of Year 1 for the analysis of qualitative data, particularly for use in the analysis of behaviour and attitudinal change, as well as trending or emerging issues. However, this is yet to be used. External M&E advice may be an option for the Prevention Pillar to ensure optimal implementation of its M&E Plan.

7.2 Protection Pillar

The Protection Pillar hired an international M&E specialist for 17 days from February to July 2012 to improve an M&E Plan formulated during the Inception Phase (November 2010 to September 2011). This was approved and operationalized in July 2012, almost two years after inception. Subsequently the international consultant was retained to provide on-going M&E advice through a 100-day consultancy from February 2013 to the end of the Project. Although the Protection Pillar does not have clear targets against an annual plan, adequate and appropriate measurement and assessment tools are in place. Due to the delay in finalising an appropriate M&E mechanism, and the delays in conducting train the trainer workshop and equipment rollout, implementation is yet to produce tangible evidence of performance outputs and outcomes.

7.3 Cross Pillar

AusAID and the external Cross Pillar Facilitators encouraged the formulation of joint Cross Pillar M&E mechanism⁶³ and joint training in M&E for national Project coordinators of both Pillars by early 2013. This has not occurred and is not likely to occur. Both Pillars regard their conceptual approaches (the 'soft' approach of the Prevention Pillar and the 'hard' approach of the Protection Pillar) as parallel, rather than intersecting. However, the two Pillars cooperate to summarise Cross Pillar achievements in progress reports annexed to their individual six-monthly reports to AusAID.⁶⁴

⁶³ AusAID Bangkok (6 February 2013) 2012 Project Childhood Quality at Implementation Report, p8; and IBA Development (2012), Final Report Project Childhood Cross Pillar Workshop (October 2011), p5 onwards

⁶⁴ For example, Annex 6 Cross Pillar Achievements, in World Vision (June 2013) Six-monthly Report

8. EVALUATION FINDINGS: SUSTAINABILITY

Sustainability was one of the Australian Government's main concerns for Project Childhood. Accordingly, as part of the Inception Phase, both Pillars were required to formulate a comprehensive Sustainability Plan. AusAID's emphasis included: (1) linking prevention and protection to a broader child protection agenda in each country, and (2) that both Pillars take into account the needs and existing mechanisms of government partners.⁶⁵ Therefore the key to sustainability, within a limited timeframe, is the commitment – both financial and institutional – to infuse CSETT policies and activities into existing mechanisms and structures, building upon existing developments, such as national plans of action (NPA), campaigns, laws, and regulations.

8.1 Prevention Pillar

The Prevention Pillar has adopted several approaches to sustainability, documented in their Sustainability Plan and reports, such as: (1) building community resilience, (2) working through partners, (3) building partner capacity, and (4) leveraging training through a Train the Trainer (TOT) approach. In the Inception Phase, AusAID also discussed approaches with the Prevention Pillar, such as the establishment of a central coordinating mechanism, maintenance of a relationship with ASEAN Secretariat (ASEC), train the trainer (especially in the tourism industry), and strengthening existing government and non-government mechanisms.⁶⁶ The Prevention Pillar's best mechanism, to date, to ensure sustainability is the Child Safe Tourism campaign for each country as a systems-wide intervention. This is because the campaign approach is appropriately harmonized with national tourism strategies in each target country.

The Prevention Pillar has identified a number of pathways to sustainability, but there is yet to be, at the regional or national levels, any firm commitments to adopt a component, campaign, or activity at the government level. Discussions are in place, and the governments are interested, but they are still reluctant to commit financially. For example, the Helplines in Thailand and Viet Nam have not indicated a budget for continued training of staff in CSETT, and support for child helpline expansion in Cambodia has consisted predominately of funding staff salaries with no effective model of sustainability. High-level discussions with ASEC are yet to bear results, and there is no central coordination mechanism in place. Essentially the Prevention Pillar is taking too long to build relationships with governments to ensure their commitment to CSETT interventions.

Train the Trainer

The training materials are not ready in their current format to be handed over to organizations. Organizations, such as the NGO training partners, are adapting the materials themselves, but without donor funding, this is not a sustainable approach. Some have indicated that they would like to include CSETT material in their existing training programs, but the CSETT messages are not yet clearly understood (by the NGO) because the messages are too similar to their existing child protection messages and not distinct enough as separate, clear, concise, precise messages for families or children.

In addition, the Prevention Pillar's Sustainability Plan includes TOT on CSETT messages and lessons for duty bearers, parents and children, but there is no training plan or schedule for TOT. Training NGO partners individually, when they indicate interest in the CSETT program, does not constitute a TOT plan. Their best approach, similar to TOT, is with the tourism industry through the Child Safe Tourism campaign, although this is yet to occur in a scheduled plan of TOT training. It requires a step-by-step clearly articulated training plan, which has yet to be documented. Furthermore, the

⁶⁵ AusAID, Report on Quality at Entry and Next Steps to Complete Project Design for Project Childhood, 7 October 2009, p6

⁶⁶ AusAID (2010) QAE, p5

Child Safe Tourism campaign, while discussions have occurred, has not yet secured commitment by a regional or national agency. The evaluators note that this campaign, if packaged in a marketable way, has a good chance for sustainability. Community training, on the other hand, is not in a suitable format and delivery approach for sustainability, and the time left in the Project is not considered to be enough to ensure its successful adoption.

Monitoring and Evaluation of CSETT

The Prevention Pillar indicated that it would also support its partners “to ensure that their M&E systems are sustainable and ensure that information needs beyond the life of the program continue to be tracked.”⁶⁷ The proposed approach to M&E includes training and coaching of program partners to help them to strengthen their own M&E systems so that they will be effective both during the program life and sustainable after the program ends. For this to occur, the sustainability of the community training needs to be secured, and this is yet to occur.

The Prevention Pillar indicated that it could not achieve handover by June 2014.⁶⁸ This was in reference to the completion of activities under its four components, and therefore the Prevention Pillar has sought a no-cost extension.

8.2 Protection Pillar

The sustainability strategy for law enforcement training was to ensure that the training curriculum is embedded within existing training structures in each country. A draft training strategy was prepared after the evaluation, but does not yet articulate the process for institutionalizing CSETT training in each project country. Representatives from the police academies and other training institutions have been involved in the manual development process from the beginning, which is an effective way to promote institutionalization. However, there was no clear agreement from the beginning as to how CSETT could best be incorporated into existing recruit and in-service police training programs. The manuals have not been designed in a way that would allow easy incorporation into the existing curricula. For example, dedicating three days to such a narrow topic in a basic recruit training program is not realistic when the total training period is only three months (Thailand and Cambodia), or when the curriculum already covers many of the topics included in the manual (Cambodia, Thailand, and Viet Nam). A more effective and sustainable strategy would have been to design a training course to fit within the time-frame that could realistically be devoted to the narrow topic of CSETT.

The counterpart law enforcement agencies do not have sufficient training budgets to organise multi-day in-service training as envisioned in the manual design. The large number of front-line officers and frequent rotation of specialists make it difficult to sustainably build expertise through in-service workshops. A more sustainable approach would have been to design a short CSETT module that could have been incorporated into existing in-service training programs on related topics (e.g. CSEC, child-friendly policing, community policing, gender, gender-based violence and trafficking), or offered as part of advancement training for superintendents, inspectors and investigators. Other options such as the use of self-directed or e-learning, or the development of on-the-job reference materials (short user-friendly handbook, or checklists) could also have been explored.

The Protection Pillar has also supported the creation of new multi-country structures, including the Regional Legal Research Group (four countries only), and the INTERPOL Specialists Group on Crimes against Children in Southeast Asia (ASEAN-wide). However, it is unclear how the INTERPOL Specialist Group will be funded in the long term; INTERPOL generally expects each country to fund its own

⁶⁷ World Vision (September 2011) Project Implementation Design Document, p229

⁶⁸ Interview, 16 July 2013

participation. Similarly, the Regional Legal Research Group, proposed by Vietnam, enjoys strong government support but sustainability beyond June 2014 may also be a challenge. Cross-country experience sharing on CSETT legislative reform could be more sustainably promoted through the ASEAN Commission for the Protection and Promotion of Women and Children's Rights which has an on-going initiative (with broader scope and participation) on child protection legislative reform.

9. EVALUATION FINDINGS: LESSONS/LEARNING

The evaluators assessed the Project's approach to continuous learning and its response to emerging issues in the Mekong sub-region.

9.1 Prevention Pillar

The Prevention Pillar conducted a baseline assessment in four countries as well as community field research that provided input into their community training activities. The Prevention Pillar has also produced a 2012 colour booklet on *Child Safe Tourism: The Tourists' Perspective*. It was a result of findings from an online survey, conducted in English, and subsequently published in English. It has also been translated and edited in Cambodia, Lao PDR, Thailand and Viet Nam and is currently in approval process for distribution and also availability through their Child Safe Tourism website. With only 316 responses, the conclusion cannot be regarded as definitive. Nevertheless it provided a springboard for the Prevention Pillar's Child Safe Tourism campaign to the travel and tourism sector in each country. In progress is a publication on *Sex, Childhood and Abuse*. The final versions of the country-specific reports in English have been edited and are currently being internally reviewed. The Cambodia, Lao, Thai, and Vietnamese versions are being translated and are due for publication and dissemination before the end of the Project. A third research document on testing market effectiveness with more in-depth views and perspectives from tourists is in progress in partnership with the University of Western Sydney in Australia. The report is currently being written with an expected publication date in September 2013.

9.2 Protection Pillar

The Protection Pillar produced an initial baseline situational analysis report during the Inception Phase. Legal Analysis Reports have been drafted for each country, and are in the process of being finalized and approved for publication by national governments. The police training activities have been informed by assessment reports on training delivered in Thailand and Cambodia, and a report on police responses to child sex tourism covering the four Project countries, all completed in November 2011. However, there is limited documentation on strategy shifts as a result of this research. For example, the Protection Pillar review of existing training materials (Thailand and Cambodia) highlighted many of the challenges that the Project countries have faced in sustaining in-service training on specialist topics such as CSEC and trafficking, yet this has not been reflected in the training strategy used.

9.3 Lessons/Learning

The main lessons from both Pillars highlight the importance of the following:

- A sound design phase – in which a clear conceptual approach is defined. The Project did this in narrowing its focus to CSETT.
- An effective Inception Phase – in which the implementation is refined. The Project lengthened the Inception Phase to enable all elements of the implementation design to be formulated, such as a sustainability plan, M&E plan, and a gender action plan. Staff recruitment needs to occur during the Inception Phase in order to test concepts, partner and government readiness, and appropriate entry points, within each country to inform the Project Implementation Design Document.
- A refined and comprehensive implementation plan – from which activities lead to their intended outcomes. The Project did this through a protracted Inception Phase, closely monitored by AusAID. However, the Prevention Pillar's approaches to training materials and delivery were

developed in the regional office with the conceptualization process yet to occur in each of the four countries due to delayed recruitment of staff, government MOUs and agreements, and identification of partner organizations.

- Strategic, risk-managed, implementation – in which the guiding factors and concepts are followed through in a timely manner. The M&E frameworks did not build in the capacity for in-depth monitoring of behaviour and attitudinal change and the risk management matrix was not used as a dynamic instrument for corrective action. For all the comprehensive plans, the delay in implementation put activities at risk of effectiveness, relevance, completion, and sustainability.

10. EVALUATION CRITERIA RATINGS

10.1 Project Childhood

Evaluation Criteria Ratings for PROJECT CHILDHOOD		
Criteria	Rating	Explanation
Relevance	3	Both pillars have developed generic regional training materials that have not been contextualised to be relevant and appropriate for each country. The Prevention Pillar messaging and targeted locations are too broad to address specific CSETT vulnerabilities.
Effectiveness	3	Both pillars have experienced significant delays in implementation. The Prevention Pillar approach to community training limits its effectiveness as behaviour change communication because it hasn't effectively reflected their work identified in the community baseline study. The Protection Pillar strategy for police training (in-service training workshops) was not the most effective approach for building capacity on the narrow issue of CSETT. Limited progress has been made on the operational component.
Efficiency	3	The approach of both Pillars has been to support stand-alone CSETT-specific activities rather than identifying opportunities to build CSETT components into related initiatives at the national and regional levels. Some activities have unnecessarily duplicated or overlapped with the work of other development partners, or created new structures rather than work within those already in place.
Monitoring & Evaluation	4	The M&E Plans highlight the difference between internal development (Prevention Pillar) and an external consultancy (Protection Pillar). However, although the M&E Plans are in place, and are comprehensive, there is a mixed approach to their implementation. For both Pillars, there is yet to be an in-depth method of monitoring behaviour and attitudinal change.
Sustainability	3	While partners and government counterparts have been approached and discussions are in progress, neither Pillar has received commitment for adoption of Project activities or components.
Gender Equality	4	Both Pillars have adequate Gender Action Plans, and both Pillars have highlighted the issue of boys being sexually exploited. However, trainings have had limited specific focus on gender sensitization and gender stereotypes, or the different vulnerabilities faced by boys and girls.
Risk Management	4	AusAID made a concerted effort to enhance the Project's success by requesting each Pillar to provide a sustainability plan, gender action plan, and an M&E plan. AusAID also hired external facilitators to improve Cross Pillar coordination. AusAID's efforts were not matched by the Pillars' efforts. Given the sensitivities of the subject, the Pillars' risk management strategies are limited in adequately predicting potential risks to Project success, particularly in addressing delays and country-level challenges.

Evaluation Criteria Ratings for PROJECT CHILDHOOD

Criteria	Rating	Explanation
Impact	N/A	It is the opinion of the Evaluation Team that it is too early to assess the Project's impact. However, it appears that the Project has resulted in increased understanding and awareness of CSETT in all four project countries, particularly amongst justice sector stakeholders. There also appears to be a strong commitment on the part of governments to address CSETT, both from a preventative and law enforcement perspective.
Lessons/ Learning	4	Lessons learned are interconnected with risk management and the ability to shift programming from lessons learned. The time taken to undertake training manual and material development left limited time to review and revise their conceptual approaches, training delivery methods, training of trainers, and handover plans.

10.2 Prevention Pillar

Evaluation Criteria Ratings for PREVENTION PILLAR ONLY

Criteria	Rating	Explanation
Relevance	2	The community training materials, developed at the regional level, have yet to be contextualized for the four countries. The materials are didactic, complex, text-driven, with low quality images and presentation. The materials over-emphasize child abuse in general, and have limited relevance to CSETT. Hotspot locations of operation are often outside the high-risk travel and tourism areas, and are limited in their target at identified categories of children vulnerable to CSETT. The Child Safe Tourism campaign seems to be the most relevant approach to CSETT prevention.
Effectiveness	2	Delivery of community training materials has not been conducted according to the Facilitator Guides which stipulate the training of boys and girls separately, and age groupings to be considered. The design document stated two hotspot locations of operation and the Project has expanded to other locations, which has limited the ability to focus in-depth in specific communities. The approach (one-off workshops in each community) limits the effectiveness to introduce and monitor behaviour change.
Efficiency	3	Designing the project implementation, and recruiting staff took longer than expected, which affected the ability of the Pillar to quickly engage government counterparts and partners. Hence the roll-out of community training has been slow, and the Child Safe Tourism campaign – which is a valuable instrument – has also been slow to promote.
Monitoring & Evaluation	3	The M&E Plan has some clearly stated targets and indicators, but some are underestimated and non-specific. There is yet to be an in-depth method of monitoring behaviour and attitudinal change. Reporting is unclear, not detailed or specific, with limited succinct summary charts and tables showing snap-shot statistics against disaggregated categories, such as gender, age, location, and country.

Evaluation Criteria Ratings for PREVENTION PILLAR ONLY		
Criteria	Rating	Explanation
Sustainability	3	Government bureaucracy and extenuating circumstances have hampered counterpart commitment, although many are interested in the tourism campaign. However it has yet to achieve commitment and handover, of the website and the training. The campaign has the highest potential to be a sustainable component of the Project.
Gender Equality	4	The Gender Action Plan is adequate, and the Prevention Pillar has highlighted the issue of boys being sexually exploited. However, the trainings have had limited specific focus the different vulnerabilities faced by boys and girls. The use of mixed gender groups in working with children has likely impacted on the effectiveness of the training for both boys and girls.
Risk Management	4	The Prevention Pillar identified the need for additional national staff and AusAID approved their request. Subsequently they recruited 3 extra staff per country by the end of 2012. More attention to strategies to offset delays in counterpart commitment is required.
Impact	N/A	It is the opinion of the Evaluation Team that it is too early to assess the Pillar's impact. However, the Pillar's community study and small-scale online survey, as well as additional research, have contributed to a body of CSETT information.
Lessons/ Learning	3	The Prevention Pillar's approach to community mobilization has not taken into account recent global lessons learned on the limited effectiveness and sustainability of NGO-driven, issue-specific child protection committees or task forces, or best practices in behavior change communication.

10.3 Protection Pillar

Evaluation Criteria Ratings for PROTECTION PILLAR ONLY		
Criteria	Rating	Explanation
Relevance	4	Law reform reports were relevant and comprehensive. The content of the generic police training manuals is appropriate, but they require further work to make them relevant and appropriate to each country.
Effectiveness	3	The regional police training manuals are of high quality, but the training strategy used (multi-day in-service workshops) was not the most effective approach for building capacity on the narrow issue of CSETT. CSETT training for judges and prosecutors and the operational component are not likely to progress.
Efficiency	3	The manual development process promoted a high degree of counterpart participation, but was not efficient. Some law reform and coordination activities have unnecessarily duplicated the work of other development partners or have created new mechanisms rather than capitalise on existing ones.

Evaluation Criteria Ratings for PROTECTION PILLAR ONLY		
Criteria	Rating	Explanation
Monitoring & Evaluation	5	The M&E Plan and assessment tools are comprehensive and thorough, although yet to be used due to the limited or late roll-out of activities. Clearly specified targets and benchmarks would improve the effectiveness of the M&E system.
Sustainability	3	The police training manuals cannot be sustainably used by national counterparts as designed, and greater focus is needed on identifying appropriate ways to integrate content into existing recruit and other training programs. The sustainability of newly created structures and coordination mechanisms (Regional Legal Reference Group, Interpol working party, regional law enforcement cooperation workshops) has not been adequately addressed.
Gender Equality	4	The Gender Action Plan is adequate, and the Protection Pillar has highlighted the issue of boys being sexually exploited in both training and legislative reform. Gender issues were incorporated into the TOT training and in capacity building work in Cambodia. However, the police training manuals have had limited specific focus on victim sensitization and gender stereotypes, or the different vulnerabilities faced by boys and girls.
Risk Management	3	The Protection Pillar has not used the risk management matrix as a dynamic document to correct delays to implementation, such as to Phase II roll-out. Risks in relation to training fatigue and sustainability of training were identified but not properly addressed in the Project design and implementation.
Impact		It is the opinion of the Evaluation Team that it is too early to fully assess the Pillar's impact. Project activities appear to have resulted in improved understanding of and commitment to address CSETT amongst key justice sector stakeholders in each of the project countries.
Lessons/Learning	4	The Protection Pillar review of existing training materials (Thailand and Cambodia) highlighted many of the challenges that the Project countries have faced in sustaining in-service training on specialist topics such as CSEC and trafficking, yet this was not adequately reflected in their training strategy.

Rating scale

Satisfactory		Less than satisfactory	
6	Very high quality	3	Less than adequate quality
5	Good quality	2	Poor quality
4	Adequate quality	1	Very poor quality

11. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

11.1 Prevention Pillar

Recommendation 1: World Vision to discontinue Community Training

Whilst the Prevention Pillar is meeting its numerical training targets, both the content of the materials and the target audience are missing the mark. The current approach to community awareness raising and tourism sector training will reach a relatively small percentage of people in each country, with no clear plan for how these activities will be scaled up and sustained beyond June 2014. The four countries are yet to work constructively to build the capacity of national and local child protection authorities to integrate activities into their child protection systems.

To be a useful resource for replication and scale-up, the community training materials would need substantial revisions to make them more contextually appropriate and to reflect a greater focus on CSETT and a behaviour change approach – not just at the country contextualization stage, but also a revision of its original documents. It is highly unlikely that this could be done within the remaining Project period, and it is also questionable whether the Prevention Pillar has the expertise to make the necessary adjustments. Prevention Pillar staff and NGO partners would also need to re-orient their work with national and local child protection authorities, and develop a clear strategy for how the community-level work can be scaled up and integrated into on-going child protection system building initiatives. The Prevention Pillar has acknowledged that this is not something their officers have the capacity to do. It is therefore recommended that the community training activities and NGO contracts under Component 1 should be finalized by the end of 2013 (or earlier where possible), and resources re-allocated to Component 3.

The Prevention Pillar's approach to community mobilization has not taken into account recent global lessons learned on the limited effectiveness and sustainability of NGO-driven, issue-specific child protection committees or task forces,⁶⁹ or best practices in behaviour change communication. The Prevention Pillar indicates that it works on a systems-wide approach, but this is only evident in the Child Safe Tourism campaign, and not community training.

Recommendation 2: World Vision to finalise the Child Safe Tourism campaign

It is recommended that the Prevention Pillar focus its remaining time and resources on strengthening and consolidating the Child Safe Tourism campaign at the regional and multi-country levels. Opportunities should be explored for sustaining tourism sector training and the Child Safe Tourism website through national and regional tourism authorities. Advocacy campaigning in South East Asia is already an area of competitive advantage for the Australian Government's aid program (such as their child trafficking mitigation campaign). DFAT's success and networking capacity in child trafficking can be maximized to include an intense highly-focused specific Child Safe Tourism campaign.

11.2 Protection Pillar

Recommendation 1: UNODC to finalise the Training Strategy

With the completion of the generic police manuals and TOT, UNODC is now turning its attention to country-level contextualisation and institutionalisation of the training manuals. A draft training strategy has been developed, but has not been finalised.

⁶⁹ What are we Learning about Protecting Children in the Community? An Inter-agency Review of Evidence on Community-based Child Protection Mechanisms, Save the Children, UNICEF and World Vision (2009)

Recommendation 2: UNODC to focus on consolidating police training, rather than expanding to judges and prosecutors

It is recommended that the Protection Pillar use the remaining Project period to consolidate the work that has been done and contextualise the police training manual for each country, rather than moving to the next planned phase for prosecutor and judges. Focus should be on supporting national counterparts (with additional resource and external expertise as needed) to determine what aspects of the generic regional training manual can be adapted and incorporated into existing in-service training programs on related topics (e.g. training on child protection, CSEC, gender-based violence, trafficking, and community policing), and how the issue of CSETT can be effectively incorporated into the standard training programs for new recruits and for investigators/superintendents. Consideration should also be given to developing more user-friendly, practical resource materials on CSETT investigations, such as simple guidelines and checklists.

Recommendation 3: INTERPOL to discontinue the Operational Component

The Operational Component has not yet begun, and the level of mentoring and hands-on operational support envisioned in the Project design appears to be neither feasible with existing advisory resources, nor agreed by counterparts. Consideration should be given to whether there is value in continuing this component in the time frame remaining.

Recommendation 4: UNODC to work with counterparts to identify legislative reforms that can be progressed within the project period.

The legal analysis reports have been well received by governments, and many of its recommendations have been accepted by government counterparts for incorporation into on-going reforms that extend beyond June 2014 (e.g. penal law reform in Laos and Viet Nam). Given the limited time remaining, the Protection Pillar should focus on working with government counterparts to identify specific areas of reform (if any) that can be progressed within the remaining time frame. Beyond that, continued advocacy and legislative review workshops are not likely to be an effective or efficient use of resources. The Regional Legal Research Group and multi-country law enforcement workshops enjoy strong support from the participating governments, but sustaining them beyond the Project period may be a challenge. They are not truly “regional”, and are centred on a four-country grouping that is relevant only to this particular project.

Recommendation 5: UNODC to promote integration of CSETT into existing ASEAN and Mekong mechanisms for bilateral and multi-lateral cooperation

Opportunities should be explored to integrate this work with legislative reform initiatives of the ASEAN Commission for the Protection and Promotion of Women and Children’s Rights, and with the MLAT and bilateral/multilateral MOU work being supported by UNIAP and APTIP.

11.3 Cross Pillar**Recommendation 1: World Vision and UNODC to focus their time, energies, and funding on their respective mandates for the remaining Project period**

The evaluators note the UN Special Rapporteur’s commendation in 2012 for Project Childhood as an innovative program for combatting the growing issue of CSETT.⁷⁰ This was in relation to the joint efforts of both Pillars which, when working as intended, provides a holistic approach to the prevention of CSETT.

However, cross-pillar integration remains a challenge since the Pillars have different conceptual approaches and have limited synergies between them. For example, the Prevention Pillar’s decision to shift from strengthening reporting hotlines to advice helplines lessened opportunities to link

⁷⁰ World Vision (2012) Annual Report 1, p6 and Annex 6

increased community awareness with improved reporting to, and response by, police and child protection authorities. Furthermore, both Pillars' implementation schedules have not enabled consistent synergies to be built between the law enforcement and community-level duty bearer training.

The evaluators noted that Cross Pillar functions improved from late 2012. However, they continued to primarily occur in a two Project approach and joint Cross Pillar M&E mechanism has not occurred and is not likely to occur.

11.4 DFAT Programming Beyond 2014

Recommendation 1: If a multi-component approach to CSETT is maintained, all components should be implemented through one IP, with a clear plan for aligning project activities to create synergies.

AusAID's holistic approach to combatting child sexual exploitation in travel and tourism (CSETT) through a combined focus on prevention and protection was laudable. However the two pillar project design was fraught with challenges. An integrated approach would have required greater alignment in the hotspot locations, as well as coordinated timing of activities to ensure that increased community awareness and reporting coincided with improved law enforcement capacity to respond. This could not easily be achieved with two different implementing partners, working across four countries with multiple government and non-government partners and varying timeframes for the development and implementation of capacity building materials.

Recommendation 2: DFAT's future support to CSETT should focus on the development of high-quality Child Safe Tourism communications materials, rather than community-based awareness-raising

Through its investment in the region over previous project support, the Australian Government has built a strong reputation for supporting targeted CSETT awareness-raising. The shift to Child Safe Tourism messaging appears to be well-received by government and regional counterparts, but likely requires more time and investment for it to be fully developed and institutionalised within regional tourism fora. The Child Safe Tourism campaign has the potential to reach a much greater audience than community-based behaviour change, and is more closely aligned with DFAT's comparative advantage in this field.

Recommendation 3: DFAT's support to regional coordination on CSETT should focus on existing regional bodies, such as ASEAN and the Mekong Tourism Forum.

Project Childhood also tended to conflate "multi-country" with "regional." The four countries participating in the project are part of broader Mekong sub-region and ASEAN coordination mechanisms. Rather than building on these regional mechanisms, the Project has tended to promote a separate four-country "regional" identity.

ANNEX 1: Terms of Reference

Independent Evaluation of Project Childhood

Overview

These Terms of Reference (TOR) have been developed to specify the requirements for conducting an Independent Evaluation of Project Childhood – a \$7.5 million program (2010-14) to combat child sexual exploitation in travel and tourism in target locations across the Mekong sub-region. Presenting the findings of the evaluation and providing an assessment of the current situation, the Independent Evaluation report will be used to inform AusAID's management decisions to the end of, and beyond, the projects end date in 2014.

Purpose

The Independent Evaluation will provide recommendations to implementing partners on how to strengthen the management arrangements to ensure efficiency and effectiveness in the administration and implementation of Project Childhood and to guide AusAID's management decisions beyond 2014. The evaluation will assess:

- a. Progress within and between both Pillars (Prevention and Protection)
- b. Lessons learned in the first two years of the Projects activity (2011-2012)
- c. The relevance of the Project in the context of AusAID's regional program priorities in South East Asia

Background

The problem of child sexual exploitation in travel and tourism (CSETT) remains a significant and growing threat in South East Asia. Across ASEAN, tourism is expected to increase by 25% by 2015. While local demand contributes to the sex industry, there are indications that growth in global tourism has facilitated access to the region by travelling child-sex offenders from around the world. Tourism is emerging as a key sector in fostering ASEAN's economic growth and development, however rapid increases in tourist flows from within the region and from outside, also poses critical risks to vulnerable children who fall outside national safety-nets and social protection systems. Simultaneously, dramatic technological advances such as the pervasiveness of the internet have increased access to children for the purpose of sexual exploitation.

Across the region, many programs exist to address children's rights in both general and specific areas. However, comparatively little attention has been directed toward protecting children from travelling child-sex offenders.

Since 1999, the Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID) has supported programs to prevent CSETT in South East Asia. These programs have focused on raising awareness and providing training for tourism sector workers on how to identify and respond to instances or suspicions of child sexual exploitation. This work has been well-received by stakeholders, but reviews have indicated that the scale has been insufficient to curb the prevalence of child sexual exploitation in tourism.

In 2007, AusAID contracted the development of the Strategy Paper '*A Sustainable Regional Response to Preventing the Sexual Exploitation of Children in Tourism Destinations*' to explore options for future programming. This Strategy Paper was endorsed by tourism ministries of ASEAN member states and by the ASEAN Secretariat (ASEC). It identified four areas requiring further work; Prevention; Protection; Recovery and reintegration of victims; and Regional Cooperation and Coordination. AusAID identified a capacity to make a difference in focusing a response on two of the four areas of need; Prevention and Protection. This decision considered AusAID's experience of

working within the law and justice sector, strong approach to child protection and a gap in donor response to prevention and protection activities. The result was the design and implementation of Project Childhood.

All design and implementation decisions need to be considered in the context of AusAID's regional program priorities and approach and will be a point of enquiry for this evaluation.

Project Childhood

The design of Project Childhood recognised that addressing CSETT in the Mekong region required a multifaceted effort spanning communities, governments, businesses, and law enforcement.

Two distinct but inter-linked pillars of work were designed: Prevention and Protection. The following is outlined in detail in each relevant project design document and subsequent project implementation design document (PIDD).

The Prevention Pillar aims to improve action and responsiveness towards the prevention of sexual exploitation of girls and boys in travel and tourism in the targeted countries. The Prevention Pillar will achieve this objective by:

1. Building community resilience by equipping selected communities with knowledge, skills and capacity to prevent CSETT;
2. Improving national information and communication mechanism, such as helplines, for vulnerable girls and boys;
3. Increasing tourism sector's, including travellers', awareness of and participation in developing a protective environment for children in travel and tourism;
4. Providing tourism authorities and welfare ministries with the knowledge, skills and capacity to prevent CSETT.

The Prevention Pillar is implemented by World Vision Australia (WVA). Work under the Prevention Pillar commenced in February 2011 with an inception phase. The implementation phase started in September 2011.

The Protection Pillar aims to strengthen and enhance the capacity of law enforcement officials (police, prosecutors and judges) in identifying, arresting and prosecuting travelling child sex offenders. The work of the Protection Pillar leads to:

1. The development of legal frameworks which meet international standards and obligations;
2. A cadre of informed and capable front-line, law enforcement officers, prosecutors and judges;
3. Established mechanisms to promote cooperation between criminal justice agencies within and across borders;
4. Expert investigations that effectively identify, investigate, arrest and prosecute travelling child sex offenders.

The Protection Pillar is implemented by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) in partnership with INTERPOL. The Protection Pillar commenced its inception phase in November 2010, followed by the implementation phase in January 2012. Project Childhood's dual-pillar approach aims to increase the impact of the project by fostering linkages across stakeholders in welfare, tourism, law enforcement, business and community sectors to maximise project outcomes. This approach also strengthens the visibility of Project Childhood to governments and beneficiaries.

Scope of services

The independent evaluation will follow AusAID's quality standards and procedures. The evaluation will assess progress within and between each pillar using the following key evaluation criteria; relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and incorporation of learning. Project Childhood as a whole will receive an overall number rating against each of these evaluation criteria. Each pillar will also be

rated individually against the same set of criterion. The independent evaluation should, where possible and most relevant, consider the following criteria: sustainability, M&E, impact, risk and gender equality.

The outline and expected contents of the aide memoire (to be submitted at the end of the evaluation mission) and the final evaluation report are given in Attachment A and Attachment B respectively. The review will address, but not be limited to, the following questions:

1. **Relevance:** how relevant/appropriate is the Project as a response to CSETT in the region?
Considering:
 - i. Relevance to Australian Aid objectives.
 - a. Are the Project's objectives and design an appropriate fit under AusAID's (draft) East Asia regional strategy objectives?
 - ii. Priorities of partner countries and regional bodies (ASEAN).
2. **Effectiveness:** is the Project 'on track' to achieve its stated outcomes under each pillar?
Considering:
 - i. Rate of implementation to date.
 - a. factors influencing progress against milestones/outcomes to date.
 - ii. Likelihood of achieving intended outcomes under each Pillar against the original Project timeline.
3. **Efficiency:** how efficiently are AusAID and the implementing partners managing the project to obtain value for money from AusAID inputs (e.g. funds, staff and other resources) and to continually manage risks?
Considering:
 - i. Is the budget under each pillar expended as expected?
 - ii. The adequacy of inputs (human resources, funding and time) provided by AusAID and partners to achieve each pillar's objectives.
 - iii. Extent to which the different parts of the management system and implementation arrangements are harmonized and working well, including:
 - a. Reporting cycles/requirements.
 - b. Regional cooperation/coordination under each Pillar.
 - c. Cross pillar coordination.
 - d. Project management of AusAID.
4. **Lessons/learning:** has the project been based on sound technical analysis and continuous learning and how is each pillar responding to emerging developments in the regional context?
Considering:
 - i. Was AusAID's capacity to make a difference in the area of CSETT accurately identified?
 - ii. Lessons that will influence AusAID's decision to continue/discontinue the Project after its formal end date.

The independent evaluation should, where possible and most relevant, consider the following criteria:

5. **Sustainability:** how is the project addressing sustainability and national ownership under each pillar and across the region so that the benefits will continue after funding has ceased?
Considering:

- i. Activities are designed and implemented by partners to align with existing systems, with a clear phase-out strategy for each country.
 - ii. Extent to which specific constraints to sustainability of the project have been identified and strategies to address these constraints under each pillar are being implemented by partners.
6. Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E): how well has each M&E framework under Pillar 1 and Pillar 2 been implemented and how effectively do they measure progress?
Considering:
 - i. The appropriateness and effectiveness of monitoring, review, evaluation and reporting frameworks and procedures of partners.
 - ii. How cross pillar coordination may be measured and evaluated.
 - iii. The appropriateness and effectiveness of AusAID's mechanisms to collate and best use the data/reports.
7. Impact: are there indications that the project (and/or AusAID's previous CSETT programming) has produced positive or negative changes (directly or indirectly, intended or unintended)?
Considering:
 - i. The type of intended or unintended changes produced in the lives of beneficiaries /their environment (directly or indirectly) by the activities.
 - ii. The extent to which there has been positive or negative impacts from external factors beyond the control of the project.
8. Risk management: are the risk identification and management strategies in place being used effectively?
Considering:
 - i. The identification of any emerging or current risks that need management attention
 - ii. Fiduciary, environmental and social impacts, child protection, corruption and fraud or political risks related to activities under each Pillar of the Project.
9. Gender Equality: how is the Project adequately identifying and effectively addressing, monitoring and reporting on gender equality issues under each Pillar?
Considering:
 - i. The four dimensions of gender equality, namely access, decision-making, women's rights and capacity building.
 - ii. Extent to which gender equality objectives have been articulated and sustainable progress achieved under each pillar.

Evaluation Process: Duration and Timing

The Independent Evaluation will be conducted for a period of 24 working days commencing on 20 May 2013. The final report will be submitted in August 2013.

5 input days will be allocated for pre-mission documentation review, consultations and briefing's as required, up to 10 input days for the regional evaluation mission including; travel (Viet Nam, Cambodia, Laos and/or Thailand); meeting with implementing partners and AusAID; and field work. 1 day will be allocated for the preparation and presentation of the Aid Memoire to AusAID Bangkok on the final day in country and 5 input days to draft the final report. After comments have been provided by AusAID an additional 3 input days will be allocated to finalize and submit the Independent Evaluation report and present findings to AusAID and partners.

Table 1: Schedule of Activities

TASK	LOCATION	INPUT (days)	
		Team Leader	Context Specialist
Document review	Home Office	3	3
Evaluation Plan	Home Office	1	1
AusAID briefing and/or presentation of methodology	Thailand, Bangkok Office	1	-
Evaluation mission (Including observation of the 2nd PCCC meeting, Bangkok, July 2013).	Viet Nam, Cambodia, Laos and Thailand	10	10
Preparation and presentation of aide memoire (during mission)	Thailand, Bangkok Office	1	1
Draft Evaluation Report	Home Office	5	3
Redrafting after feedback from AusAID and other stakeholders	Home Office	2	2
Presentation of findings by Evaluation Team to all stakeholders	Thailand, Bangkok Office	1	1
TOTAL # Days		24	21

Methodology

The evaluation team leader will be responsible for the development of a detailed evaluation plan based on these TOR. The outline of methodology will be submitted as part of the 'Request for Quote' proposal. The TOR should be discussed with AusAID before the drafting of the evaluation plan. The evaluation plan will be submitted to AusAID Bangkok for approval after the contracting arrangements have been agreed. The plan will be finalized at least 5 working days prior to the in-country mission. The evaluation plan will include the evaluation questions, the evaluation design and the report structure. The approach should include a document review, field visits and stakeholder consultations: to be determined in consultation between AusAID management and the evaluation team. Factors to be considered include:

1. Review of key documents and strategies
Desk review will include wider analysis of current research on crime of CSETT in the region.
2. Regional field mission (2-3 countries)
3. Partner/stakeholder consultation
4. Project Childhood Coordination Committee (PCCC) meeting in July, 2013

Implementing partners under each pillar provide a 6-monthly progress reports and an annual report. This Independent Evaluation should, where possible, incorporate findings from the Prevention Pillar's internal mid-term review and the Protection Pillar's participatory review anticipated for 2013. All reports, including internal AusAID assessments will be made available to the evaluation team.

Roles and Responsibilities: AusAID and implementing partners

The consultancy contract will be managed by AusAID Bangkok post. AusAID Bangkok will be available for specific meetings/briefings with the evaluation team and, where appropriate, will be able to provide documents/resources on request. AusAID Bangkok will monitor outputs against the evaluation timeline and provide feedback, comments and direction where appropriate. AusAID Bangkok Post, with support from implementing partners under both pillars, will facilitate the work in-country, including sourcing translation services where relevant. Implementing partners will be available for specific meetings with the evaluation team both in-country and at the regional office in Bangkok. AusAID Bangkok will provide a written management response against the recommendations and share with the evaluation team and implementing partners within 30 days of

approving the final report. This response will be implemented and monitored by AusAID management at post.

Outputs:

- a. *Evaluation Plan / Draft Methodology* - for agreement with AusAID prior to mission.
- b. *Evaluation Mission Aide Memoire* - to be presented to AusAID Bangkok Post at the completion of the in-country mission. The format for the aide memoire will follow AusAID's template.
- c. *Draft Independent Evaluation Report* – to be provided to AusAID Bangkok within 15 working days of completion of the field study in the region. Feedback from AusAID and other stakeholders will be provided within 10 working days of receiving the draft report.
- d. *Independent Evaluation Report* - final document within 10 working days of receiving the feedback. The report will be no more than 25 pages (plus annexes).

The final report should be a brief and clear summary of the evaluation outcomes, focusing on a balanced analysis of the Project; within and between Pillars. It should recommend ways to overcome any problems identified and give a clear indication of the best way forward to the formal end date and beyond.

The report will:

1. Provide a brief summary of the major findings and an overall assessment of the quality and success of Project Childhood.
2. Discuss any issues or problems which are adversely affecting pillar outcomes and any particular strengths of the project, its organisation and management arrangements.
3. Discuss the implications of the findings and lessons learned for future program development and support.
4. Make recommendations to AusAID on;
 - a. options for Project Childhood beyond 2014.
 - b. ways it may position any future support to CSETT in the region.

Annexes should be limited to those that are essential for understanding the text.

Evaluation team

The evaluation team will consist of two members: an evaluation consultant, who will act as team leader, and a specialist with expertise in child protection and/or the justice sector.

The team will have an appreciation of:

1. The regional social, political and policy context as well as specific country context;
2. Tourism and travel trends in the region;
3. Australia's regional program in south East Asia, particularly programming under Human Security;
4. Relevant AusAID policies, including gender, and child protection; and
5. AusAID's reporting and accountability requirements.

The team members will have experience in participatory research methods and have appropriate analytical, research and report writing skills.

Role of Team Leader:

The team leader will have strong evaluation qualifications and expertise and will have substantial experience conducting project/ program evaluations and in a team leader role.

- i. The Team Leader will be responsible for the overall effective leadership, management and coordination of the evaluation, including delivery of outputs in a timely manner.
- ii. The Team Leader will direct the field review in accordance with the agreed evaluation methodology and work plan, as well as allocation of responsibilities and timeline.
- iii. The Team Leader will, in consultation with the Specialist, analyse data and draft sections of the report during the evaluation, delegating tasks to the Specialist, according to agreed responsibilities.
- iv. Towards the end of the field mission the Team Leader will prepare an aide memoire (up to five pages) covering the major findings, preliminary recommendations, lessons learned, and a clear summary of the review process.
- v. The Team Leader will be responsible for submitting the draft and final reports, meeting the deadlines as stated in the contract.

Role of Specialist:

The Specialist will have extensive knowledge and experience in, child rights and protection and ideally experience working in the police and justice sector. S/he will have a wide knowledge of migration and trafficking policies and child exploitation policies in the region.

- i. The main responsibility of the Context Specialist expert is to examine the program achievements in the appropriate context.
- ii. The Context Specialist will support the Team Leader to collect and process the data and information in specified areas and with report writing.

ANNEX 2: Evaluation Plan

TASK	DAYS		TIMING
	TL	CS	
Desk/Document Review	3	3	18-24 June
Evaluation Plan	1	1	28 June
In-country AusAID Bangkok brief	1	0	15 July
Evaluation Mission	15	15	16-31 July
Aide Memoire Presentation	1	1	1 August
Draft Evaluation Report	5	3	2-23 August
Finalize Report	2	2	10-20 September
Stakeholder Meeting – Presentation of Findings	1	1	TBA
TOTAL DAYS	29	26	

ANNEX 3: People Contacted

DATE	PERSON	POSITION
THAILAND - BANGKOK		
Mon 15 July	Ms Vi Than	Senior Regional Program Manager, DFAT Bangkok
	Ms Nuch Supavanich	Senior Program Officer, DFAT Bangkok
	Ms Trisha Gray	Human Security, East Asia Regional Section, DFAT
Tues 16 July	Ms Aarti Kapoor	Regional Program Manager, World Vision Australia
	Ms Afrooz Kaviani	Technical Director, World Vision Australia
	Mr Sasrawut Rachasrimuang	Director of Operations, World Vision Thailand
	Mr Trevor Holbrook	Acting National Coordinator Project Childhood, World Vision Thailand
	Ms Annethe Ahlenius	INTERPOL Coordinator
	Mr Eric Francelet	Representative French Police
	Mr Jeremy Douglas	Regional Representative, UNODC
Wed 17 July	7 Representatives	Royal Thai Police
	Ms Margaret Akullo	Project Childhood Coordinator, UNODC
	Ms Snow White Smelser	National Project Officer – Protection Pillar, UNODC
	Ms Kobkhun Pitarachart & 2 staff	Chief of Bureau of Tourism Service Development, Department of Tourism, Ministry of Tourism & Sports (MOTS)
Fri 19 July	Mr. Chansamone Bouakhamvongsa	Project Coordinator, Project Childhood, World Vision Lao PDR
	Ms Vathrana Thongphanmaha	Project Childhood, World Vision Lao PDR
	Ms Thipphairone Phothichack	Project Assistant, Project Childhood, World Vision Lao PDR
	Mr Pongpat Riengkruar	Ministerial Public Law Specialist, Chief Knowledge Officer, Ministry of Justice
	Mr. Willem Niemeijer	Co-founder & CEO, Khiri Travel, Bangkok
	Ms Raemroong Subansaenee	Director 1300 Helpline, Ministry of Social Development & Human Security (MSDHS)
	Mr Chaknarin Tikkana	1300 Helpline Officer, One Stop Crisis Centre, MSDHS
THAILAND – CHIANG MAI		
Thu 18 July	Police Lieutenant Colonel Apichart Hattasin	Inspector, Royal Thai Police – Region 5
	Ms Mayupee Yoktree	Provincial Social Development & Human Security, Department of Child Protection & Care, Ministry of Social Development & Human Security (MSDHS)
	Ms Rossukhon Tariya	Head of Social Welfare & Protection Division, MSDHS
	Ms Usanee Jintanaprawasri	Teacher, Nong Kong School, Chiang Mai
	Mr Kreangkrai Chaimuangdee & 5 staff	Executive Director, The Life Skills Development Foundation
VIET NAM – HANOI		
Mon 22 July	Ms Van Do	National Project Officer, Project Childhood, UNODC Viet Nam
	Ms Minh Nguyen	Program Specialist, UNODC Viet Nam
	Board members, Project	Representatives from Ministry of Public Security; Ministry of

	Management Board (Protection Pillar)	Justice (Criminal Police Department); National Police Academy Lecturer, National Police Academy Research Faculty, INTERPOL
Tues 23 July	Dr Than Thi Ha	Director Operations, World Vision Viet Nam
	Mr Nguyen Khanh Hoi	National Coordinator, Project Childhood, World Vision Viet Nam
	Mr Nguyen Xuan Hoa	Project Officer, Project Childhood, World Vision Viet Nam
	Mr Nguyen Quoc Phong	Project Officer, Project Childhood, World Vision Viet Nam
	Mr Nguyen Manh Cuong	Vice Chair, Viet Nam National Administration of Tourism (NVAT)
	Mr Vu Van Thanh	Vice Director of Hotel Department, VNAT
	Ms Nguyen Thanh Xuan	Official of International Relations Department, VNAT
	Mr Le Thanh Anh	Official of Hotel Department, VNAT
Wed 24 July	Ms Sommany Sihathap	National Project Officer, Project Childhood, UNODC Lao PDR (Telephone Call)
	Mr Jonathon Hampshire	UNODC (Regional) Monitoring & Evaluation Specialist/International Consultant (Skype Call)
Fri 26 July	Mr Dang Hoa Nam	Deputy Director, Department of Child Protection & Care (DCPC), Ministry of Labour, Invalids & Social Affairs (MOLISA)
	Ms Do Thuy Hang	Chief of General Planning Division, DCPC, MOLISA
	Mr Nguyen Cong Hieu	Vice Director Child Helpline, DCPC, MOLISA
	Mr Nguyen Hoai Duc	Official of General Planning Division, DCPC, MOLISA
	Ms Emma Tiaree	Counsellor (Mekong), DFAT Hanoi
VIET NAM – HAI PHONG		
Thu 25 July	Ms Hoang Thi Tuyet Lan	Vice Chair, Commune Level, Lac Vien People's Committee, Hai Phong (Ngo Quyen District)
	Staff & 6 Students (Child Club)	Trang Minh Ward, Hai Phong (Kien An District)
CAMBODIA – PHNOM PENH		
Mon 29 July	Ms Chan Kanha	National Project Officer, Project Childhood, UNODC Cambodia
	Mr Chanda Phang	National Program Coordinator, World Vision Cambodia
	Mr Jojo Pastores	Senior Program Manager, World Vision Cambodia
	Mr Sean Sok Phay & Staff	Executive Director, Child Helpline Cambodia (CHC)
Tues 30 July	Dr Suon Bophea	Youth Health Program Manager, Reproductive Health Association of Cambodia (RHAC)
	Mr Kong Chhan	Deputy Director General, Ministry of Social Affairs, Veterans & Youth (MOSAVY)
	Police Lieutenant General Youk Sokha & Staff	Gender Focal Person, General Commissariat of National Police, National Police Cambodia
	His Excellency Hor Sarun	Under Secretary of State, Ministry of Tourism
CAMBODIA – SIEM REAP		
Wed 31 July	Angkor Thom Trained Group – 2 Police (males); 2 Commune Leaders (1 female, 1 male); 2 Teachers (1 female, 1 male)	Angkor Thom District, Siem Reap, World Vision Cambodia
	Ms Bou Vannary	Counsellor Supervisor Child Helpline Cambodia
	Mr Sourn William	Outreach Program Manager, Kalyan Mith Trang Village, Siem Reap, Friends International

	His Excellency Professor Ket Kiettisak	Vice Minister, Ministry of Justice, Lao PDR
	Mr Bounta S. Phabmixay	Director General Judicial Administration System Dept, MOJ
	Ms Lothchana Khemthong	Director of Nationality Division, Ministry of Justice
	Mr Khamphou Thirakul	Director of Criminal Division, Law Department, MOJ
Thu 1 Aug	OBSERVATION:	
	First Regional Meeting to Establish Legal Research Group, Angkor Century Resort, Siem Reap	
	Police Colonel Sok Reaksmey	Deputy Director, Anti-Human Trafficking & Juvenile Protection, General Commissariat of National Police, National Police Cambodia
	Brigadier General Verak	Deputy Director, Anti-Human Trafficking & Juvenile Protection, General Commissariat of National Police, National Police Cambodia
	Police Major Duong Thavry	Anti-Human Trafficking & Juvenile Protection, General Commissariat of National Police, Siem Reap
	His Excellency Ity Rady	Under Secretary of State, Ministry of Justice
THAILAND – BANGKOK		
Fri 2 Aug	DFATstaff	Presentation of Aide Memoire

ANNEX 4: List of References and Reading

AusAID (6 February 2013), 2012 Project Childhood QAI, Quality at Implementation Report for Project Childhood

AusAID (September 2012), Project Childhood Coordinating Committee (PCCC) Terms of Reference

AusAID (23 February 2012), 2011 Project Childhood QAI, Quality at Implementation Report for Project Childhood

AusAID (2012), Policy: Performance Management and Evaluation.

AusAID (23 December 2010), Project Childhood Prevention Pillar Head Agreement No. 37923

AusAID (December 2010), Australia's Aid Strategy for East Asia Regional Organisations and Programs 2011-2015

AusAID (10 June 2010), Project Childhood Protection Pillar Head Agreement No. 55835

AusAID (9 October 2009), 2010 Project Childhood QAE, Report on Quality at Entry & Next Steps to Complete Design for Project Childhood

Child Wise (July 2010) Community Attitudes on Sex Trafficking of Children and Young People

Child Wise (14 April 2009), Annex J, Strategy Paper: The South-East Asian Plan – A Sustainable Regional Response to Preventing the Sexual Exploitation of Children in Tourism Destinations (2009-2013)

IBA Development (September 2012), Project Childhood Facilitator's Report: Second Cross Pillar Facilitation Report for Project Childhood, (Author: Michael Milner), www.iba.com

IBA Development (10 July 2012), First Annual Project Childhood Coordinating Committee Meeting: Minutes Report, Bangkok, Thailand, (Authors: Michael Milner & Melinda MacDonald), www.iba.com

IBA Development (2012), Final Report Project Childhood Cross Pillar Workshop (October 2011), (Authors: Melinda MacDonald & Michael Milner), www.iba.com

MOLISA (5 November 2012), Some Strategic Documents on Child Care, Education and Protection in the New Context, Ministry of Labour, Invalids and Social Affairs Department of Child Protection and Care, Hanoi, Viet Nam

UNODC (26 June 2013), Project Childhood – Protection Pillar, Cambodia: Combating Child Sexual Abuse in Travel and Tourism, Legal Analysis and Implementation Report

UNODC (26 June 2013), Project Childhood – Protection Pillar, Lao PDR: Combating Child Sexual Abuse in Travel and Tourism, Legal Analysis and Implementation Report

UNODC (7 June 2013), Project Childhood – Protection Pillar, Discussion Paper: Establishing a Legal Research Group (Drafted by Ministry of Justice, Viet Nam)

UNODC (29 May 2013), Project Childhood – Protection Pillar, Curriculum Modules

UNODC (6 May 2013), Project Childhood – Protection Pillar, Viet Nam: Combating Child Sexual Abuse in Travel and Tourism, Legal Analysis and Implementation Report

UNODC (4 May 2013), Project Childhood – Protection Pillar, Trainers Guide: Curriculum on Investigating Sexual Exploitation of Children (ISEC) for Specialist Investigators

UNODC (January & May 2013), Project Childhood – Protection Pillar, Questionnaire to Thai Police in Region 3: Responses to Pre-Training Questionnaire by Local Police Volunteering to be Community Policing Officers

UNODC (22 April 2013), Project Childhood – Protection Pillar, Trainers Guide: Curriculum on Investigating Sexual Exploitation of Children (ISEC) for Front Line Officials

UNODC (9-10 April 2013), Project Childhood – Protection Pillar, Cambodia: Summary Report, Cambodia Joint Prakas (Regulation) on Competency between Tourism Police and Tourism Inspectors, Kampot

UNODC (2 March 2013), Project Childhood – Protection Pillar, Thailand: Combating Child Sexual Abuse in Travel and Tourism, Legal Analysis and Implementation Report [The report is currently being reviewed by the Ministry of Justice Thailand]

UNODC (28 February 2013), Project Childhood – Protection Pillar, Annual Progress Report 2

UNODC (28 February 2013), Project Childhood – Protection Pillar, 2013 Detailed Annual Costed Work Plan

UNODC (October 2012), Project Childhood – Protection Pillar, Viet Nam: Field Survey Report, Implementation of Provisions of the 1999 Penal Code on Child Sex Tourism [Unofficial Translation]

UNODC (7 February 2012), Project Childhood – Protection Pillar, Revised Monitoring and Evaluation System

UNODC (9 July 2012), Project Childhood – Protection Pillar, Monitoring and Evaluation System

UNODC (9 November 2012), Project Childhood – Protection Pillar, Gender Strategy

UNODC (30 October 2012), Project Childhood – Protection Pillar, Regional Law Enforcement Cooperation Workshop to Combat Sexual Exploitation in Travel and Tourism, Meeting Minutes

UNODC (12 August 2012), Project Childhood – Protection Pillar, Coordinating Committee Meeting, Bangkok, Report on the Meeting (Author: Margaret Akullo)

UNODC (May 2012), Project Implementation: Project Childhood – Protection Pillar, Semi Annual Progress Report, XSP T 33

UNODC (February 2012), Project Implementation Design Document: Project Childhood – Protection Pillar, Year 1: September 2011 – August 2012 [PIDD]

UNODC (November 2011), Assessment of Training Delivered to Police Officers in Cambodia on Travelling Child Sex Offenders (Author: Dr Geeta Sekhon)

UNODC (November 2011), Assessment of Training Delivered to Police Officers in Thailand on Travelling Child Sex Offenders (Author: Dr Geeta Sekhon)

World Vision (July 2013), Project Childhood Prevention Pillar Staff Outline

World Vision Australia (June 2013), Project Childhood (Prevention Pillar) Six Monthly Report, 1 October 2012 – 31 March 2013

World Vision Australia (2012), Child Safe Tourism: The Tourist Perspective

World Vision Australia (2012), Project Childhood (Prevention Pillar) Annual Report 1, Year 1: 1 September 2011 – 30 September 2012

World Vision Australia (September 2012), Keeping Our Children Safe from Sexual Abuse: Prevention Toolkit for Community Representatives

World Vision Australia (September 2012), Keeping Our Children Safe from Sexual Abuse: Prevention Toolkit for Parents and Carers

World Vision Australia (10 September 2012), Child Safe Tourism Campaign

World Vision Australia (10 September 2012), Update about Child Safe Tourism Campaign

World Vision Australia (June 2012) How Can Government Make Tourism Child Safe: Prevention Pillar Facilitators' Guide

World Vision Australia (April 2012), Project Childhood (Prevention Pillar) Six Monthly Report, 1 September 2011 – 31 March 2012

World Vision Australia (15 September 2011), Project Implementation Design Document: Project Childhood – Prevention Pillar, Project Number EAS-195373 [PIDD]

World Vision Australia (), Project Childhood (Prevention Pillar): Project Design Document - Guidelines

----- (29 October 2012), Comments on Project Childhood Facilitator's Report – Sept 2012, Project Childhood (Prevention and Protection Pillars)

----- (September 2009), Project Childhood Strategy Note