## Review of DFAT-supported UNICEF Pacific Multi-Country Child Protection Programme

**MANAGEMENT RESPONSE**

## Investment Summary

| **Investment Name** | **Pacific Multi-Country Child Protection Programme: *Protecting Children from Violence, Abuse and Exploitation in the Pacific***  |
| --- | --- |
| DFAT Arrangement Number | 70538 |
| UNICEF Grant Number | SC140450 |
| Commencement date | 13 June 2014 | Completion date | 31 December 2017No Cost Extension to 30 June 2018 |
| Total Australian $ | AUD 7,000,000 Balance as of 31 December 2017: USD 1,033,552 |
| Delivery organisation(s) | UNICEF Pacific |
| Implementing partner(s) | 14 Pacific Island Country and Territory governments and NGO’s |
| Country/Region | Pacific Regional  |
| Primary sector | Child Protection |
| Investment description | Australia has been UNICEF Pacific’s primary donor for the Multi-Country Child Protection Programme since 2005.  The total allocation to the Pacific Multi-Country Child Protection Programme between 2005 and 2018 is A$20,460,000.  The overall goal of the programme is to protect children in the Pacific from violence, abuse and exploitation, through strengthening child protection systems and promoting social behaviour change. **Outcome 1:** Child Protection systems (including justice and police, child and family social services, health and education and communities) provide improved quality of and access to services for the prevention and response to violence, abuse and exploitation of children at all times. ***Output 1:*** Children are better protected by strengthened legal, regulatory and policy frameworks at national level, including in emergencies. ***Output 2:*** Governments and civil society have strengthened capacity to provide children and families with improved access to child and family welfare and child justice services to prevent and respond to violence, abuse and exploitation, including in emergencies. **Outcome 2:** Parents, caregivers, and children demonstrate skills, knowledge and behaviour enabling children to grow up in caring homes and communities, including schools that are free from violence, abuse and exploitation. ***Output 3****:* Parents, families and communities demonstrate strengthened knowledge, attitudes and practices (KAP) creating an enabling environment that protect children from violence, abuse and exploitation.The Programme is implemented in 14 PICs with work plans in 9 countries including Kiribati, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu, Fiji, Samoa, Tuvalu, Nauru, RMI, Tonga. UNICEF provides direct assistance to Government and NGO Partners, technical assistance by UNICEF staff and specialized consultant services when needed, travel, programme supplies and equipment. |

**Review Objectives and Methodology**

The purpose of the Review was to provide an overall assessment of the programme, and its role in strengthening Pacific national child protection systems for the prevention of and response to violence, abuse, neglect and exploitation of children. The Review was conducted between August and December 2017 and appraised programme implementation from June 2014 to September 2017 in Kiribati, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu, with some consideration of Fiji’s progress, and selected findings from other countries. The Review specifically aimed to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the programme, as well as to identify lessons learnt and make recommendations. The methodology included a desk review of programme documents, in depth semi-structured individual and small group interviews with regional and national stakeholders including government, non governmental organisations and communities, as well as other donors, and site observations. The final report was submitted on 26 December 2017.

**Review Consultants and Reference Group**

The Review Team consisted oftwo international consultants, Margot Szamier, Evaluation Specialist, Team Leader, and Juliet Attenborough, Child Protection Specialist, Team Member.

The Review Reference Group (RRG) consisted of:

-DFAT: Suzanne Bent, First Secretary, Gender; Nilesh Goundar, Programme Manager.

-UNICEF: Vathinee Jitjaturunt, Deputy Representative; Brigitte Sonnois, Chief Child Protection; Stanley Gwavuya, Social Policy Specialist as Monitoring and Evaluation Officer a.i.; Amy Delneuville, Child Protection Specialist; Salote Kaimacuata, Child Protection Specialist.

-Pacific Women Shaping Pacific Development: Emily Miller, Monitoring and Evaluation Advisor.

**Review Summary**

*Programme Relevance*

UNICEF’s Child Protection programme is aligned with Pacific country commitments to upholding children’s rights, and its approaches largely target regional priorities, structures and gaps. Child protection system strengthening is an appropriate strategy to advance the prevention of and response to violence, abuse, and exploitation of children in the Pacific. However, better data, and analysis of existing evidence, including on the intersections of violence against children and gender based violence, are needed to convey urgency to policy makers, and to underpin future programming. There is a need to better contextualise child protection system strengthening approaches to national and local circumstances, and to sharpen messages so that the goals are explicitly communicated and the intended impact is more in focus. Investment in coordination mechanisms and improved sequencing of support is needed to ensure alignment with stakeholder readiness and political will.

Strengthening relationships and collaborating with national and regional actors working to end violence against women and improve Pacific justice systems could help to strengthen child protection systems. Better harmonization of work, pathways and resources in the justice, health, education and gender based violence prevention and response systems, such as initiatives that build referral networks, support standard setting, and assist with service development, represents a significant benefit to the programme and its partners.

A tailored national framework to track child protection system strengthening progress, and other relevant tools, would improve child protection coordination.

***Programme Effectiveness***

The programme made strong gains in strengthening the child protection legal framework in Pacific Island Countries. However, it has been less effective in leveraging opportunities arising from legislative reform to support partners in defining priorities, roles and responsibilities for strengthening child protection systems, and building the capacities needed for implementation. There is a need for a more rigorous process to establish country-specific priorities and strategies, including support for the development of national multi-sectoral plans to strengthen child protection systems. The programme was less effective in generating evidence about approaches that work in particular circumstances to build child protection services capacity. A more strategic approach to capacity building, grounded in robust monitoring and learning systems, is needed for any future programme phases. There is limited evidence that the programme’s community mobilisation and behaviour change approaches and tools strengthened skills, knowledge and behaviours, or was effective in developing child protection systems. A specific community mobilisation and behaviour change theory is needed to inform further programme investment. Advocacy for child protection systems building has been less influential in raising the visibility and gravity of all forms of violence against children, and in highlighting the link between child protection system building and prevention of and response to violence, abuse and exploitation of children. Collaboration on child protection work has been uneven, and increased coordination and learning with multi-stakeholder partners, including those working to end violence against women, is needed. Data collection and analysis has been limited and of variable quality. Annual progress reports do not report on core indicators consistently, and Annual Work Plans are not fully aligned to indicator targets. Monitoring of the implementation of the community facilitation package is almost completely absent.

Birth registration coverage improved in three of UNICEF’s priority countries, and the programme accelerated progress in birth registration system strengthening. It also supported good work on child protection in emergencies, but it was less effective in ensuring this advanced child protection system strengthening overall.

***Programme Efficiency***

UNICEF’s capacity to deliver the programme was overstretched due to gaps in team leadership during the period, disasters in Fiji and the region and weak capacity and coordination in countries, which impacted on the programme’s efficiency. The limited number of national child protection policies or plans contributed to a fragmented, project-oriented programme in most countries. Mapping and assessment in each context, and identification of explicit causal pathways - beyond the Annual Work Plans – is needed to ensure changes, strategies, risks, assumptions envisioned, and measures of change, are clearly outlined and documented. Funds and expertise could have been better used to achieve results through assessing and prioritising partners’ readiness for funding support, and by identifying more realistic technical and institutional requirements. Increased support to collaborative child protection mechanisms, including help in tracking and measuring results beyond activity updates, is also a priority. The results of the scale-out of the community facilitation package and scale up of the community child protection pilots were not well linked to the programme logic, and should be revisited before further investment.

***Programme Sustainability***

The child protection systems building approach is conducive to achieving sustainable outcomes, but increased attention to appropriate institutional arrangements, planning and budgeting processes is needed to help strengthen and protect programme investments.

Mainstreaming child protection in various national and community based protection system interventions and referral pathways, and deepening alliances with other networks, such as those working on eliminating violence against women and girls, has been limited, but are important strategies for sustainability in the Pacific context.

In most countries, child protection system strengthening is highly dependent on UNICEF funding. Increased advocacy, including working with leaders to take up evidence-based recommendations (i.e., the Baseline Reports), and making efforts to collaborate and draw other development partners into supporting child protection system strengthening is another important sustainability measure, but has not been a strength of the programme in this cycle.

**Joint appraisal of the review report**

* The evaluation report provides useful information to guide future programme directions.
* A brief summary of the methods employed is provided and key limitations of the methods are described.
* The evaluation report addresses the questions in the Terms of Reference, and there is a balance between operational and strategic issues.
* There is adequate exploration of the factors that have influenced the issues identified and the conclusions and recommendations logically flow from the presentation of findings and any associated analyses.
* The recommendations are feasible.
* The report makes a number of references to Violence against Women/Gender Based Violence (VAW/GBV) programming in terms of partnerships, lessons learnt, collaboration, synergies, convergence, leveraging, embedding, mainstreaming, etc. supposed to be developed as a result of the intersection between Violence against Children and Violence against Women. However, the report does not take into account the major differences which exist between child protection systems and response to gender-based violence against adults, in terms of state statutory obligations, approaches and procedures. Both DFAT and UNICEF have a joint understanding of the intersections and distinctions between EVAW and EVAC and of the implications for programmatic interventions, which will be taken into account by both sectors.

In the spirit of the UNICEF and DFAT partnership, and given the fact that the review was undertaken as a joint process, this Management Response has been jointly drafted and agreed upon by the UNICEF / DFAT Review Reference Group members.

**JOINT MANAGEMENT RESPONSE TO THE REVIEW REPORT**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Response** | **Actions** | **Responsibility** | **Time frame** |
| **Recommendation 1.** UNICEF’s Child Protection programme is continued to ensure that gains in prevention and response to Pacific children’s protection-related risks are sustained. Any future development partner funding for the programme should be based upon: |
| a. (i) A revised overall programme theory grounded in (ii) available national and regional research and an up-to-date analysis that articulates underlying assumptions and determines an appropriate level of ambition for the expected results.  |
| a. Agree | (i) Theory of Change developed as the basis for the2018-2022 Pacific CP Multi-Country Programme. (ii) Situation analysis conducted for 14 PICT’s, including latest data on prevalence of CP issues, causal analysis, and assessment of status of all components of child protection systems. | UNICEF | (i) Completed December 2017(ii) Final Draft completed December2017. |
| b. A clearly defined (i) programme pathway in each country that outlines intervention sequencing, realistic timeframes, (ii) robust indicators linked to outcomes, and (iii) describes UNICEF’s comparative advantage for the selected areas of intervention. |
| b. Agree | (i) Child Protection (CP) Legislation and Policy Expert assisting UNICEF team to define programme pathway in each country outlining intervention sequencing and timeframes. 2018 sequencing and timeline for 10 countries defined during CP team meeting in March.(ii) Indicators at outcome and output level already defined for 2018-2022 Multi-Country Programme. Indicator baseline and annual target values for each of the 14 PICT’s for the next five years drafted, to be finalised with implementing partners in 10 countries during the first semester of 2018 as part of the finalisation of the 2018-2019 rolling work plans.(iii) Description of UNICEF’s comparative advantage for selected areas of intervention will be described in new Investment Design. | UNICEF | (i) Done for 10 countries for 2018. Five-year sequencing/time frame for 14 countries to be included in Investment Design (ID).(ii) Finalised for 10 countries by June 2018; others in ID.(iii) ID. |
| c. An agreed value for money rubric that establishes explicit, shared understanding of and accountability for UNICEF’s programme resources, including for coordination among partners, and consideration of the sustainability of results. |
| c. Agree | UNICEF will define criteria and prepare a draft analysis against these criteria for DFAT review. UNICEF and DFAT will jointly finalise this analysis.  | UNICEF and DFAT | By the end of 2018 (after approval of ID) |
| **Recommendation 2.** UNICEF (i) reassesses its required mix of skills in management, administration and technical functions for new phases, and (ii) develops a strategy for drawing on quality short-term technical assistance effectively ensuring that all roles are properly defined, resourced and supported, and (iii) contingencies built in to the programme in the event of staff turnover. |
| Agree | (i) UNICEF will reassess the mix of skills required for the new phase. (ii) Regarding short-term technical assistance, UNICEF is in the process of drafting Terms of Reference for high quality technical expertise in various areas. The CP Legislation and Policy expert is already under contract. (iii) In the event of staff turnover, UNICEF will bring qualified staff holding similar positions in other UNICEF offices for “stretch assignments”. | UNICEF | (i) Will be included in ID(ii) Throughout next 5-year cycle. (iii) Throughout next 5-year cycle. |
| **Recommendation 3.** UNICEF advocates for and supports (i) stronger national and regional coordination of child protection system strengthening, including through investment in child protection governance bodies and multi-sectoral coordination platforms; (ii) targeted support to the development of national child protection policy frameworks; and (iii) support to the development and monitoring of context-specific indicators to track progress. (iv) The work on national priority setting, sequencing and synchronization should draw on regional experience, whilst maintaining national specificity needs including VAWG, to inform approaches and the process. |
| Agree | (i) Multi-sectoral coordination platformsCP Legislation and Policy Expert has developed a Guidance Note, Sample TOR and a Sample Agenda for a Workshop to establish a national child protection strategic multi-sectoral mechanism, in charge of coordinating the elaboration and implementation of CP policy, law and costed plan, advocating for resources and monitoring implementation. To be implemented by CP staff in every country.(ii) National child protection policy frameworksCP Legislation and Policy Expert has developed a Guidance Note on CP Policy and System Design, a Sample Outline for a CP Policy and a Sample Agenda for a Policy/System Development Workshop. To be implemented by Expert in every country.Expert also developed a Guidance Note on the Legal Framework for Child Protection and will develop one on the elaboration of CP Costed Implementation Plans. To be implemented by Expert in every country.(iii) Context-specific indicatorsRefer to Recommendation 1.b Action (ii).(iv) Drawing on VAWG experienceWill be elaborated in ID. | UNICEF | (i) Will be established in all 14 countries by end of 5-year cycle.(ii) Will be developed in all 14 countries by end of 5-year cycle.(iii) Ref. 1.b (ii)(iv) ID. |
| **Recommendation 4.** UNICEF leads a systematic assessment of child protection system pathways and strategies, and identifies achievements, challenges, and entry points for building child protection systems in the Pacific context. This should include an analysis of opportunities for convergence, and synergies between child protection systems and other protection systems, such as those related to law and justice and VAWG, in order to better address the multidimensionality of children’s risk and vulnerability, and gender based violence.  |
| Agree | - As indicated above, Situation Analysis for 14 PICT’s which includes assessment of child protection system was conducted in 2017. -In-depth analysis of legal and policy framework for each of the 14 PICT’s was conducted by CP Legislation and Policy Expert during the first quarter of 2018. - Country-by-country analysis of challenges, entry points and opportunities for convergence and synergies with other programmes/areas of intervention conducted during 2018-2019 work planning exercise with 7 countries and shared at CP team meeting in March.- CP Legislation and Policy Expert will go to each country to assist in the development of Costed implementation plans.- Collaboration with law and justice: see response to Recommendation 6 (ii).- Collaboration with GBV/VAWG initiatives: see response to Recommendation 6 (i).  |  | In process. Will be completed for 7 countries by end of first year of new 5-year cycle.Will be completed for 10 countries by mid-term of next 5-year cycle and for 14 countries by end of 5-year cycle. |
| **Recommendation 5.** UNICEF provides technical and financial support to set up a simple and context-appropriate tool to map, assess and monitor national and local child protection systems across the region.  |
| Agree | CP Legislation and Policy Expert developed a tool to map, assess and monitor the Child Protection Legal and Policy framework and applied it to an analysis of the legal and policy framework of the 14 PICT’s. She will develop a similar tool to map, assess and monitor child protection services in the social welfare, justice, police, health and education sectors, as well as informal CP system components. | UNICEF | In process. All tools will be developed by end of first year of new 5-year cycle. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Recommendation 6.** UNICEF deepens, and formalizes where appropriate, institutional and operational partnerships with stakeholders working on (i) violence against women and girls (VAWG) and (ii) law and justice, and reinforces operational alignment across UNICEF’s new Country Programme, to strengthen child protection in key sectors, including (iii) health and (iv) education. |
| Agree | (i) Partnerships with VAWG stakeholders- Round table on VAC-VAW was conducted by CP and GBV Expert on 7 March 2018 with Pacific Women Shaping Pacific Development, RRRT/SPC, UNFPA, UN Women and DFAT. The Expert presented on VAC and VAW intersection, highlighting differences in statutory obligations, approaches and procedures and operational implications for legislation, policies, inter-agency mechanisms, guidelines, personnel training, hotlines, shelters, etc. Participants decided to form a technical working group and to elaborate a Technical Guidance Framework for all stakeholders to follow.(ii) Partnerships with Law and Justice programmesIn each country UNICEF will approach programme managers/advisors to see if there can be collaboration for development of child-sensitive court procedures and police SOP’s and development of modules to be embedded in existing pre and in-service training systems for judiciary professionals and police, as well as tools for monitoring, supervision, performance evaluation and information management to be embedded in existing systems. Collaboration could consist in leveraging already existing, on-going or planned interventions to include child protection.(iii) Child Protection in Education through UNICEF Country ProgrammeCP team will discuss entry points to develop and implement CP policy in education including establishment of child protection detection, reporting and referral mechanisms in schools, teaching self-protection to children, anti-bullying programmes, teachers’ code of conduct, child safeguarding recruitment procedures, etc. and development and embedding of modules on child protection, positive discipline, behaviour management etc. in existing pre- and in-service teacher training systems, and child protection tools in existing supervision, performance evaluation and information management systems.(iv) Child Protection in Health through UNICEF Country ProgrammeCP team will discuss entry points for development of health protocols for children victims and development and embedding of modules for health professionals in existing pre and in-service training systems; and same for training of community health workers to detect and report CP cases and to do parenting education; and child protection tools to be embedded in existing supervision, performance evaluation, service quality monitoring and information management systems.(v) Child Protection in Early Childhood and Development (ECD) through UNICEF Country ProgrammeCP team will discuss entry points to develop and implement CP policy in ECD including establishment of child protection mechanisms in ECD facilities, and development and embedding of modules on child protection, positive discipline, behaviour management etc. in existing pre and in-service ECD teacher training systems, as well as child protection tools in existing supervision, performance evaluation and information management systems. | UNICEF | Partnerships with external entities and agreements within UNICEF to be established by end of first year of new 5-year cycle for 7 countries, and for others by mid-term.Implementation to take place throughout 5-year cycle.  |
| **Recommendation 7.** UNICEF consolidates evidence on violence against children (VAC) and considers other means, such as new studies and analysis of existing administrative data, to assess and measure VAC and its consequences, and to convey urgency among policy makers to respond. |
| Agree | (i) Existing data on VAC already consolidated in Situation Analysis of 14 PICT’s.(ii) Advocacy with government national statistics institutions under way in collaboration with UNICEF Social Policy section to include existing global child protection survey modules (child discipline, child labour, child marriage, children’s living/care arrangements, sexual abuse, intimate partner violence and birth registration) as a first priority in MICS, otherwise in any other national household survey which will take place in the 14 PICT’s over the next five years.(iii) Country profile factsheets will be prepared for advocacy with high level decision-makers, including Parliamentarians, based on those developed in 2015 for the High Level Meeting on Violence Against Children.(iv) Information management system of all service providers (social welfare, justice, police, education, health) will be strengthened or established to improve the availability and reliability of administrative data on child protection cases, through the revision or development of simple data collection forms and systems.(v) If additional resources are available, qualitative and/or quantitative studies on issues and in countries where data and information are lacking will be conducted, for example on community justice, child marriage, impact of migration on children, customary adoption. | UNICEF | (i) Done.(ii) In process and to continue throughout 5-year cycle based on country-specific timeline for household surveys.(iii) To be completed by end of first year of new 5-year cycle.(iv) By the end of new 5-year cycle.(v) By the end of new 5-year cycle, if resources are available. |
| Partially agree | - Routine administrative data hardly exist in most PICT’s so cannot be analysed. - The programme covers all areas of child protection, not only violence against children. | N/A | N/A |
| **Recommendation 8.** UNICEF develops a strategic communications plan and user-friendly tools for national and regional stakeholders to convey messages about child protection systems strengthening as a means of preventing and responding to violence against children. |
| Agree | (i) UNICEF will develop a country-specific strategic communication plan to conduct advocacy activities aimed at convincing decision-makers to invest in child protection systems through legislation and policy development and resource allocation, to prevent and respond to all child protection issues, not only violence against children. These may include high level government officials in key positions, Parliamentarians, as well as influential traditional and religious leaders and the media.(ii) As indicated under response to Recommendation 7, advocacy country factsheets will be developed.(iii) At regional level, UNICEF will explore the possibility of having a session on child protection relevant to the respective sectors, during high level regional meetings such as meetings of Finance Ministers, Education Ministers, Health Ministers, Pacific Conference of Churches, etc.  | UNICEF | (i) Strategy for 7 countries to be developed by end of first year of 5-year cycle; for 10 countries by mid-term and 14 by end of cycle.(ii) By end of first year of 5-year cycle for 7 countries, 10 by mid-term and 14 by end of cycle.(iii) Throughout the 5-year cycle, based on opportunities. |