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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The changing political and social context within Myanmar has created many opportunities to improve and sustain the protection of girls’ and boys’ rights from violence, abuse, neglect and exploitation. Whilst important gains have been made and the Government of Myanmar has shown strong commitment to ensuring the rights of all children are realized, there are still serious protection concerns remaining.

1.2 UNICEF has been present in Myanmar for over 60 years. In 2013, UNICEF’s Child Protection Section underwent a significant reorientation of its programming in response to an extensive mid-term review and the changing political and social context: the 2014-2015 Child Protection Programme was designed based on the outcomes of this process. A programme extension has now been granted for 2016-2017. This means in 2017 a design process will commence for the development of a new five-year Country Programme (2018-2022).

1.3 This independent evaluation will be formative in nature, providing a critical assessment of the decision-making processes since the mid-term review in relation to the implementation of core components of the Child Protection Programme – UNICEF’s systems-building approach in the development of a social work, case management system – and rapid-feedback to the current programme. The evaluation will also provide the critical evidence base needed to support the design of the new Country Programme.

1.4 The evaluation is anticipated to commence early 2016; final presentation and report will be due within a six month time period. Request for bidders targets well-established, international institutions that will be able to provide an Evaluation Team with expertise in child protection and across a variety of sectors.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 Whilst some gains have been made in Myanmar to improve the protection of girls and boys from violence, abuse, neglect and exploitation, serious protection concerns remain, including the numbers of children (namely youth and adolescents) in institutional care, treatment of children in contact with the law, prevalence of child labour, increasing rates of trafficking, and ongoing conflict and communal violence. These concerns are compounded by outdated and inappropriate legislation, lack of a national policy on child protection, and limited national budgets and corresponding capacity of key Ministries and Departments with the mandate to protect children. The Ministry of Social
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Welfare, Relief and Resettlement received just 0.08 per cent of the national budget in 2014. As a result, the Department of Social Welfare (DSW) does not have a presence at township level, which is the lowest level of administration within Government, and struggles to play a meaningful role in protecting the rights of children. The historic lack of a presence on the ground correlates to a lack of vision on the part of the Ministry that is designated to lead for child protection. Despite these constraints, the Ministry and DSW are committing their internal resources to scale up social work case management support for the most vulnerable children and families in the limited areas where they have a presence (the Department has offices in every state or regional capital city and has 12 district level offices).

2.2 A national social protection strategy3, developed by the Ministry of Social Welfare Relief and Resettlement and adopted by the Myanmar Government at the highest level in 2014, underscores the need for 6,000 social work case managers across all of Myanmar’s 330 townships and is a strong signal, not only of the Ministry of Social Welfare’s buy-in and ownership to this important piece of work, but also the wider Government’s political commitment to this approach.

2.3 UNICEF Myanmar believes investing resources in building the systems needed to prevent and respond to child protection issues is critical at this point in time to set the foundation for future work, and that in a country with very little social welfare capacity, social work case management should be the priority.

2.4 In July 2013, UNICEF’s Child Protection Programme underwent an extensive mid-term review in response to the rapidly changing political and social context. Programming until this point in time had primarily focused on downstream ‘project’ work through NGO partners, due in large to the fact that the political climate was not conducive to influencing policy and legal systems or implementation at the national level. The opening of the country in 2012 and the significant push for reform by the new Government created space for UNICEF to shift its focus to upstream work and building closer partnerships with Government. This shift required a new approach, greater allocation of staff resources for advocacy and capacity building and an emphasis on coordination. The new work was organized into three main focus areas:

- Child Care and Protection;
- Justice for Children; and
- Child Protection in Emergencies, including Children in Armed Conflict.

2.5 In the development of the 2014-2015 multi-year work plan, the Child Protection Programme reoriented these core work areas under one key outcome statement: children in need of support, care and protection are identified by and have access to public, social welfare systems.

2.6 The change needed in order to achieve this outcome was defined as an improvement in the enabling environment (laws, policies, and coordination structures), an increased supply of quality child protection services, including in emergencies (social work case managers, alternatives to institutional care, psychosocial support and life skills education for adolescents), and an increase in demand for these services. This meant:

2.7 The current programme was designed to target systems level change to best address the multiple and nuanced challenges presently hindering the provision of protection for children in Myanmar. This targeting of ‘systems level change’ was rooted in the assumption that significant improvements in the protection of children would not occur unless the legislation, policy frameworks, regulations, human resource capacity (particularly in social work case management), and oversight of child protection service providers were in place and strengthened.

2.8 The theory of change behind the programme is that if there is strengthened political commitment and national capacity to legislate, plan and budget for quality child protection systems; and child protection services are developed and promoted, including in emergency situations; and communities are aware and engaged in the protection of their children and adolescents; then the Myanmar Government will commit further resources to underfunded Ministries and Departments, particularly in the area of social work; and engage in policy and legislative changes to support quality child protection systems and services, including in emergencies. This means, in turn, communities will seek out and utilize these services and hold service providers accountable.

2.9 The areas of work described above were organized under five key outputs for the 2014-2015 programme:

1. Strengthened policy and programmatic decisions on alternative care for children;
2. Increased social welfare system capacity to respond to child protection;
3. Strengthened legislative and institutional capacity to provide adequate care to children in contact with the law;
4. Increase efforts to protect children from exploitation, including child labour, trafficking and sexual exploitation; and
5. Implementation of national and international standards to prevent and respond to grave violations and contribute to ongoing peacebuilding, including in emergencies.

2.10 Output 2 and the activities determined under it are key for the purposes of this evaluation: the development of a national case management system, that responds to child protection concerns, is a central pillar of the Child Protection Programme and is a consistent link across the other four outputs. The assumption has been made that social work case management, as a child protection response, is appropriate and connects efforts across the development of alternative care options, provision of adequate care for children in contact with the law, addressing specific child protection issues such as child labour and trafficking, and responds to children affected by emergencies, including children in armed conflict. It has been considered fundamental to a systems-building approach and one that promotes the leadership of the national Government in ensuring that children are protected from violence, abuse, exploitation and neglect. It is also seen as a politically
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relevant intervention, as it links to the Social Protection Strategy, which is seen by the Ministry and others as a key framing document for the growth and development of a social welfare system (and child protection).

2.1 In addition to co-chairing the National Social Protection working group with the Government and providing drafting support to the strategy, UNICEF is supporting this effort to ensure that DSW begins investing in social work case management despite their continued resource constraints. UNICEF and DSW have worked together to ensure that DSW dedicates ‘social work case managers’ within their social work cadre in the department; ensures case managers are adequately trained; that the reach of Government social workers is effective, positioned to go to scale; and that the case management approach is linked with other departments, ministries, and NGO/CBOs working on child protection.

2.12 These activities have focused efforts on building the strong foundation needed to develop an effective scalable social work case management system that protects children: operational, results based, nationally owned, and politically relevant. 27 townships, across 15 states/regions were identified for the initial roll-out of the case management system, with three DSW case managers mobilised in each township in July 2015. Of the 27 townships, 19 have NGO presence – supported through UNICEF – to support DSW in implementation and awareness raising. The case management response is also cross-cutting in the sense that it aligns with and supports activities under the other four key outputs. See Annex 2 for details.

2.13 Besides the internal mid-term review in 2013, there has been no evaluation to date to systematically assess the Child Protection Programme. Recent changes in the programme design described above present an opportune moment for in depth reflection on UNICEF’s achievements and gaps to date and a way forward to meet UNICEF’s commitments to prevent and respond to child protection issues in Myanmar. The evaluation timeline is considered appropriate in context of the significant reorientation of the programme in 2013, current activity implementation and the anticipated planning and design process for the new Country Programme.

3. EVALUATION PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

3.1 The purpose of this formative evaluation is to assess the merit and worth of the decision-making processes since the mid-term review, in relation to the development of a child protection system in Myanmar, and particularly the use of social work case management as a key entry point to protect children’s rights.

3.2 The evaluation will provide rapid-feedback on the programme’s strengths and weaknesses to improve the current programme and generate the evidence base needed to inform the design process of a new five-year programme. The evaluation will also generate learning for evidence-based advocacy on systems strengthening targeting the Government of Myanmar, donors and key child protection partners.

3.3 Being a formative, improvement-oriented evaluation, the primary audience will be the Child Protection Section and senior management within UNICEF; additional audience will include the Reference Group, comprised of key development partners and subject matter experts. The
Government of Myanmar, in particular DSW, key donors and child protection actors working in Myanmar may also find the report useful in informing future systems strengthening work. Similarly, actors in the region may draw on these findings and apply learning in other contexts.

3.4 The objectives of the evaluation are to:

1. Determine the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact (where feasible) and sustainability of the systems-building approach the Child Protection Programme has taken, considering:
   a. The roll-out of the national case management system in Myanmar and the extent to which the model has the capacity to go to scale in the current governance context;
   b. The strength of the linkages made with the national, case management system across other areas of the Child Protection Programme;
   c. Resources allocated to policy development and provision of technical assistance to revise legislation;
   d. The strength of the working relationship with Government and efforts to build capacity within key ministries to protect children; and
   e. The strength of collaboration with key implementing partners.

2. Assess the effectiveness of programme monitoring and the integration of key organisational principles and approaches, namely equity, gender equality and human-rights, in particular child rights, in child protection programme planning, implementation and monitoring.

3. Provide rapid-feedback and actionable recommendations for the refinement of the systems-building approach in the Myanmar context, focusing on:
   a. Needs for adjustment, increased investment and/or redesign of current activities;
   b. Opportunities and challenges in scaling up the case management system to national coverage;
   c. Strengthening linkages between the social welfare system, the justice sector and work in emergency areas;
   d. Targeting resources for the development of policy and legislation, including support for implementation;
   e. Lessons learned and innovations for building capacity of key Government counterparts in child protection in countries in transition; and
   f. Strengthening partner collaboration and programme coordination.

4. EVALUATION SCOPE

4.1 The period covered by this evaluation spans from mid-2013, with the extensive mid-term review process and reorientation of the current programme, to the present. The evaluation will cover the township, district, state/region and national levels in Myanmar, as relevant to the activities under assessment. Target areas for data gathering will include both implementation townships (27) and others to ensure an appropriate comparison can be made. The number and location of target areas will be identified together with the Evaluation Management Team, taking into consideration the different timing and implementation phases of the different areas of work under the Child Protection Programme.
4.2 The evaluation will not seek to assess the impact of the Child Protection Programme, understood as lasting changes in the conditions of children as a direct consequence of UNICEF’s systems-building support for the social welfare and justice system. It will, however, make every effort to assess the main outcomes of the programme thus far and whether the needs that provided the rationale for the programme to re-focus have been met or not. In addition to reviewing the main outcomes, the evaluation will consider the following contextual factors: the political context, the country-level socio-economic development and the strength of state governance to protect children’s rights.

4.3 UNICEF’s performance will be assessed against its programme theory of change, as well as international and regional standards\(^4\) and policies, including UNICEF’s legal and normative framework for child protection\(^5\) as a reference.

### 5. EVALUATION QUESTIONS

5.1 Below are a set of guiding questions to be responded to by the evaluation. However, it is expected that the evaluators may propose additional questions or sub-questions in the proposal and/or inception phase.

**Outcomes**
- What are the intended/unintended, positive/negative results achieved by the Child Protection Programme in relation to the systems building approach, across all five outputs, since the re-orientation of the programme in 2013?
  - What are the existing gaps and bottlenecks?
  - What are the key measures required to improve the social welfare sector considering the changing needs and context of Myanmar?

**Relevance**
- To what extent are the decisions to re-orientate the Child Protection Programme to focus on systems building justified and appropriate?
  - How relevant is the current portfolio of activities under Output 2 for an effective case management system?
  - How well are the activities across the other four outputs, helping to achieve and sustain the anticipated results?
- Are UNICEF’s advocacy and coordination efforts well targeted?
  - How well does the Government share the vision of what this child protection system is and what it should be?
  - To what extent is the Government demonstrating support and interest in the work to a) implement a national child protection system; and b) increase the capacity of the justice sector in child friendly practice?
  - To what extent are key child protection actors demonstrating efforts to collaborate with Government?

---

\(^4\) ASEAN handbook (Aug 2010):  

\(^5\) See: http://www.unicef.org/protection/
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Effectiveness

- How well is the national case management system working to respond systematically to instances of violence, abuse, exploitation and/or neglect?
  - To what extent do case managers and service providers have the capacity, resources and motivation to respond appropriately?
  - How satisfied are clients with the response they have received?
  - What are the major gaps and bottlenecks that are impacting on achieving the expected results?

- How effectively are coordination mechanisms working to create and sustain linkages across sectors, and between child protection actors, as a result of UNICEF’s investments?

- To what extent are awareness raising activities building the confidence of communities and individuals to engage with the social welfare and justice system?

- How well is UNICEF targeting its support to revision of legislation and policy, and can this be justified in the context of other activities?

Efficiency

- To what extent has UNICEF’s approach to systems-building been cost-effective?
  - To what extent has the availability and use of resources enabled or constrained the performance of the case management system?

- Have other resources been made available for similar activities and/or the same systems apart from UNICEF?

Sustainability (and scaling up)

- What would be the resource implication(s) to scale up the case management system to reach national coverage, and is the current model appropriate?

- Are there indicators that show ownership of the Government of the case management system, including activities, priorities, strategic development and budget allocation?

- To what extent has the roll-out of the case management system contributed to the generation of sub-national and national capacity such that it will be sustainable, if UNICEF funding ceases?

- How can awareness raising activities become effectively sustainable?

Cross-cutting issues (incl. programme monitoring, advocacy, equity, gender equality and human rights, conflict sensitivity)

- Have the protection needs of children and international/regional standards remained central to programme planning, design, implementation and monitoring, advocacy efforts, and in building capacity of Government and key partners?

- How effectively has the child protection programme integrated UNICEF’s commitment to equity, gender equality and human-rights, as well as conflict sensitivity, and what results have been achieved in relation to these commitments?
  - To what extent have the distinct needs, vulnerability and capacities of girls and boys (incl. youth and adolescents) being identified and addressed in the planning, implementation and monitoring of the case management system?
  - How is the program using gender specific information and analysis to overcome any barriers to gender equality?
o Does this process include monitoring and responding to any unintended negative consequences?
o Are sex and age-disaggregated data collected, monitored and analysed for gender equality to inform the programme?

6. EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

6.1 This evaluation is predominantly intended to furnish information for guiding the Child Protection Programme improvement, hence much of the evaluation effort will focus on tracing the learning that was accrued in the process of focusing the programme, and shape it to perform better in the new Country Programme (2018-2022). By focusing the analysis on the programme implementation process, this evaluation will also contribute to improving the performance of the ongoing programme (2016-2017). The first way to do so will be by the evaluators’ providing regular feedback and suggestions in the course of the evaluation process to the Child Protection Section, senior management within UNICEF and other key stakeholders. The second way will be by involving the Child Protection Section in the evaluation, without infringing its independence, so that they learn for themselves what is working and what is not through rapid-feedback.

The evaluation is expected to adopt a mix of quantitative data collection and qualitative approaches such as:

- **Desk review**
  Desk review of existing project information including concept notes, proposals, quarterly narrative and financial reports, work-plans, monitoring frameworks etc. developed as a result of the programme to build a programme timeline and systematically document progress. The desk review should also include a review of relevant literature and practice in neighbouring countries which will generate evidence that either supports, or questions the approach taken and point to examples of how linkages between social welfare and other sectors have been strengthened through a case management system to support child protection.

- **Key informant interviews**
  Guiding questions will be developed for interviews with key informants including, but not limited to, the members of the Reference Group; UNICEF programme staff; Government officials at national and sub-national (incl. DSW, Ministry of Finance and others); members of the judiciary; Parliamentarians, Child Protection focal points; relevant non-government partners; the community, including youth and adolescent; and others which may be identified as critical to the evaluation.

- **Focus group discussions**
  Focus groups will enhance the understanding gained during key informant interviews and provide an additional method to cross-reference and triangulate information. These discussions may be facilitated through existing coordination mechanisms, such as the Township Committees on the Rights of the Child (TCRC), and also targeted groups of key stakeholders – local level administration, national level counterparts, key implementing partners etc. Direct and indirect impact of the child protection
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6 Specific documents include Partnership Cooperation Agreements (PCAs), Child Protection Case Management Baseline Report (Save the Children), Standard Operating Procedures for the Case Management System, and strategic briefing notes - Investing in Social Work Case Management; Alternative Care White Paper; Case Management Information Management System Concept Note; Justice for Children Brief.
system on beneficiaries may also be documented and should include parents, children, and community members.

- **Case studies**
  Where appropriate, and when full consent is given, case studies may be used to illustrate the effectiveness and impact of:
  - The mobilization of case managers under the national case management system;
  - Linkages between the case management system and other sectors i.e. coordination and/or referrals; and
  - Support for national level development of child-focused policy or legislation.

Specific case studies will help demonstrate where UNICEF’s support has helped to direct appropriate assistance to children in need of protection, influenced local response and/or impacted on inclusion of international standards in policy/legislation. Case studies may reflect both positive and negative findings. The selection of these case studies will be based on an agreed criteria set at the beginning of the evaluation.

- **Comparison study**
  Of the 27 townships where the case management system has been rolled-out, eight do not have NGO presence. A sample from these eight will be selected as part of a comparison study to determine how the system is working across both typologies. Further, a number of townships that have not been targeted for the roll-out of the national case management system will be selected and relevant stakeholders interviewed to assess their performance on child protection. The results will be compared with the findings from the townships that have been targeted for the intervention. The comparison process will help identify areas where UNICEF’s support has contributed to the prevention, monitoring and response to child protection at the township level and measure its cost-effectiveness (VfM), as well as sustainability.

6.2 A list of relevant international instruments and policies on human rights, in particular child rights, equity and gender equality will guide the evaluation process. Methods for consulting effectively with affected populations will need to be developed in consultation with UNICEF with a particular focus on the ‘do no harm’ principle, i.e. ensuring that the safety and security of beneficiaries and partners is not compromised by any actions on part of the evaluators. All data generated will be disaggregated, including sex, age and disability whenever this data is available.

6.3 The evaluation design will also seek to promote utilisation as stakeholders start to use the findings of the evaluation before the final report is produced. The evaluators will ensure constant communication with the Evaluation Management Team throughout the exercise about the progress of the evaluation and the preliminary findings and hypothesis. It will be also important to ensure that there are ‘no surprises’ in the main evaluation reports.

6.4 In ensuring quality, the Evaluation Team is required to adhere to the UN Norms and Standards for Evaluation, as well as to the UNICEF’s revised Evaluation Policy, UNICEF Procedure for Ethical Standards in Research, Evaluation and Data Collection and Analysis and UNICEF’s Evaluation Reporting Standards.
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7 See: [http://www.unicef.org/evaluation](http://www.unicef.org/evaluation)
6.5  **Methodological rigor will be weighted significantly in the assessment of proposals. Bidders are therefore invited to question the methodology presented in this TOR and improve on it, or propose an approach that is deemed more appropriate.**

7. **EVALUATION MANAGEMENT AND GOVERNANCE**

7.1  The evaluation will be managed by an Evaluation Management Team (EMT). A Reference Group (RG) composed of representatives of key stakeholders at the national level will be established to act as a sounding board, and facilitate and review the work of the evaluation. They will also serve as an independent validation of facts and findings. The RG will provide inputs and feedback on the findings and recommendations at all stages of drafting. In addition, the UNICEF Regional Office for East Asia and the Pacific (EAPRO) will provide oversight and quality assurance.

*Evaluation Management Team Composition:* Co-Lead and manager of contract – Evaluation Specialist (UNICEF shared position, based in Cambodia); Co-Lead – Child Protection Specialist (UNICEF Myanmar); Members – Child Protection M&E Focal Point(s) (UNICEF Myanmar) and M&E Specialist (UNICEF Myanmar).

*Reference Group Composition:* Three major development partners in Myanmar; UNICEF Regional Senior Child Protection Advisor; UNDP Governance Team Leader; a local research institution that is focusing on child rights.

7.2  In close collaboration with the EMT, the selected Evaluation Team will have the overall responsibility for organizing and conducting the evaluation. This involves:

- Review of the existing documentation and development of evaluation methodology and data collection tools;
- Managing the process of interviews, focus group discussions, review of project documents to ensure that sufficient information is gathered to make as informed assessment in line with the evaluation’s objectives; and
- Provide qualitative and quantitative data analysis and recommendations.

7.3  Throughout the evaluation process, the Evaluation Team will be responsible for ensuring the quality of the data collected as well as ensuring that all data collection activities are in compliance with ethical and safety standards. The Evaluation Team will be responsible for all logistical arrangements, including travel, accommodation, equipment to be used throughout the evaluation (subject to discussion, where travel permissions and authorizations will need to be secured by UNICEF). A local research institution will be contracted to provide at least two research assistants that will support data collection in the field. They will be considered members of the Evaluation Team. One of the external evaluators will be appointed as the Evaluation Team Leader. The Team Leader will be responsible for the operational management and smooth and efficient conduct of work by all members of the team. They will have primary responsibility for ensuring quality and timeliness of all deliverables.
8. EVALUATION DURATION, PROCESS AND DELIVERABLES

8.1 The evaluation will be conducted in four phases as follows:

**Phase 1: Scoping and Inception Phase (February – March 2016)**

During the first phase of the evaluation, the Evaluation Team will conduct a brief scoping visit to Myanmar to carry out initial interviews as well as collect the necessary documentation to complete a desk-review of literature, key qualitative and quantitative data and critical information provided by UNICEF and partners.

The purpose of the inception phase is to enable the evaluators and UNICEF to reach a common understanding as to the nature of the task, the questions to be addressed, the sources and methods to be used, and the outputs to be delivered. It will also enable the Evaluation Team to undertake initial consultations with key informants.

The main outputs from this phase will be:

- **Literature Review** that documents the process to build the current approach and highlights the strengths/weaknesses, while pointing to other country examples of how linkages between social welfare and other sectors have been strengthened through a case management system.

- **Inception Report** (approximately 30 pages, not including Annexes) that provides detail on the evaluation methodology, timeframe, key questions, the stakeholders to be involved and main results of desk review. The report will include:
  - A stand-alone executive summary;
  - Background and context analysis, showing an understanding of child protection programming in the context of Myanmar;
  - Evaluation purpose and scope, confirmation of objectives and the focus of the evaluation;
  - Evaluation criteria and questions, final set of evaluation questions, and evaluation criteria for assessment of performance;
  - Evaluation methodology, a sampling plan (incl. final sampling criteria), a description of data collection methods and data sources (and a rationale for their selection), draft data collection instruments (with a draft data collection toolkit that will be piloted before starting the data collection), an evaluation framework for evaluating evidence and a data analysis plan, a discussion on how to enhance the reliability and validity of the conclusions and utilisation, the limitations of the methodology and how to address them, as well as a description of the quality review process;
  - Proposed structure of the final report;
  - Evaluation work plan and timeline, a revised work and travel plan, resources requirements;
  - Annexes (incl. evaluation framework, data collection toolkit, data analysis framework).

This will be presented to the EMT and the RG for review and feedback, and its subsequent approval.

- **Two-page Evaluation Brief**, summarising the purpose, key questions and process for the evaluation, for sharing with internal and possibly with external stakeholders.
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**Phase 2: Data Collection and Preliminary Briefings (April – June 2016)**

This is the main data-collection phase. The timing, schedule and itinerary for field missions must be agreed with UNICEF Field-Offices and the Country Office, which will facilitate as appropriate. The Thingyan holiday season (mid-April) will influence appropriate start date.

The Evaluation Team should begin by focusing on Output 2 and the associated activities as a core pillar of the systems-building approach. Once findings have been determined and validated the team should continue exploring how select activities implemented under the other four key outputs are aligned with and supported by the case management system. Identifying existing and/or new opportunities for linkages should be prioritised.

At the end of the data collection a series of briefings with key stakeholders will be convened by the EMT and include members of the RG, implementing partners, Government officials, amongst others. The Evaluation Team will present on initial findings to these key stakeholders.

The main outputs from this phase will be a:

- **Power Point Presentation** summarizing the evaluation process and initial findings, and an accompanying document of standalone talking points. Further findings gathered during the meetings discussion will be integrated into the preliminary briefing report.

- **Preliminary Briefing Report** for discussion with UNICEF’s Child Protection Section and senior management. The purpose of this is to provide rapid-feedback for programme improvement and validation of findings to be followed up in Phase 3.

**Phase 3: Draft Report and Consultation (June – July 2016)**

This phase is intended to allow time for more detailed follow up on key areas of the evaluation, cross-checking and validation of the provisional analysis from Phase 1 and 2, and address gaps in information. This phase should allow time for the Evaluation Team to analyse all findings in detail and draft a first report that provides a comprehensive assessment and draws preliminary conclusions and recommendations.

Two rounds of consultation and revision are envisaged for this drafting process. The evaluators will compile feedback in the form of a comments matrix for each round of consultations.

The output from this phase will be the:

- **Comprehensive Draft Report** for circulation to the RG for final comments

**Phase 4: Final Evaluation Report and Dissemination (Aug 2016)**

The final report (approximately 50 pages) should include:

- A standalone executive summary (maximum 2-3 pages);
- Short description of methodology, including an outline of the process of the evaluation in the Annexes;
- Statement of findings, well substantiated by analysis of data, with township level specificities where relevant that address each of the key evaluation questions and which are grouped under the headings of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, protection and other cross-cutting issues;
8.2 The final evaluation report should be presented in a way that makes the information accessible and comprehensible to a public audience. Recommendations should be firmly based on evidence and analysis, be relevant and realistic, with priorities for action made clear.

8.3 A final visit to Myanmar country office will be scheduled to communicate the findings and conclusions of the evaluation and discuss uptake of recommendations. Facilitated, participatory workshops will be conducted by the Evaluation Team with UNICEF staff and potentially key partners. This is subject to further discussion with UNICEF and can be detailed in the inception phase.

8.4 Data, tables and graphics will be submitted to UNICEF Myanmar as part of the evaluation deliverables. Reports will be prepared in English; however, power-point presentations and executive summaries of reports will be translated in Myanmar. It is expected that reports will follow UNICEF-adapted UNEG standards for evaluation reports.

8.5 The estimated timeframe below sets out the critical component of the evaluation. It assumes that the TOR will be finalized by early November and that the Evaluation Team will be recruited by January 2016. Final dates will be revised once the Evaluation Team are contracted for the evaluation.

**Figure 1 – Tentative Evaluation Timeframe**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Time Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Scoping and Inception Phase</td>
<td>Draft Inception Report (conceptual framework, methodology, workplan and questionnaires)</td>
<td>4 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Final Inception Report (incl. data collection tools to be piloted) and Two-Page Evaluation Brief</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Data Collection and Preliminary Briefings</td>
<td>Presentation on Initial Findings (Power Point Presentation)</td>
<td>6 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preliminary Briefing Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Draft Report and Consultation</td>
<td>Comprehensive Draft Report</td>
<td>4 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Final Evaluation Report and Dissemination</td>
<td>Final Report</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participatory Workshops (Power Point Presentation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. **EVALUATION TEAM**

9.1 The evaluation will be conducted by an institution. The institution must have a good track record and extensive experience in planning and conducting evaluations, particularly in the field of child protection. The composition of the proposed team must be gender balanced to ensure accessibility of both male and female informants during the data collection process. It should include at least three international consultants that will be matched with a local research institution. The latter will provide at least two research assistants to support community-level data gathering as well as translation and facilitation, as needed.

9.2 The three international consultants should meet the following specific requirements:
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- Excellent value for money, including competitive consultancy rates, a detailed work plan and budget, a clear methodology to ensure products will be delivered in line with the agreed costs, a mitigation strategy for financial risk.
- An excellent understanding of evaluation principles and methodologies, including capacity in an array of qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods, notably process evaluation, evidence of research or implementation expertise in child protection programmes, an awareness of human rights, gender equality and equity in evaluation and UNEG norms and standards.
- Knowledge and demonstrated experience in systems building from a UN or INGO perspective, coupled with technical knowledge of rule of law and justice sector reform.
- Experience of working in a South-East Asian context is desirable, together with understanding of Myanmar context and cultural dynamics.
- Expertise in communications, dissemination and advocacy around evaluation findings, including a good understanding of the use of evidence-based approaches to influence stakeholders.
- Adaptability and flexibility, client orientation, proven ethical practice, initiative, concern for accuracy and quality.
- Excellent English communication and report writing skills.

9.3 The two local research assistants should meet the following specific requirements:
- Myanmar national with strong, working level English.
- Demonstrated experience in quantitative and qualitative research skills.
- Strong statistical and analytical skills.
- Firm understanding of human rights-based approaches to programming, including gender and equity considerations.
- Fluency in another, relevant ethnic language would be an asset.

9.4 Knowledge of UNICEF’s mandate, procedures and working methodologies, and an in-depth understanding of the organisation approach to systems building would be an asset for all members of the Evaluation Team. (See the RFPS for more details on the team composition.)

10. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

10.1 The evaluation covers information that is sensitive and confidential and the Evaluation Team may also have direct contact with children as informants. The Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation in the UN System will be provided to the Evaluation Team. Full compliance with all its provisions will be required.

10.2 In addition, the Evaluation Team may have access to data on specific child protection cases in which case the confidentiality of the individuals concerned and the case details must be respected and maintained. Within the briefings and reports, individuals involved in child protection cases should not be identifiable directly or indirectly. Care should be taken when reporting statements or interviews. When in doubt, it is recommended to feedback to the informant and ask them to confirm their statements.
10.3 All informants will be offered the option of confidentiality, for all methods used. Dissemination or exposure of results and of any interim products must follow the rules agreed upon in the contract. In general, unauthorized disclosure is prohibited. Any sensitive issues or concerns should be raised, as soon as they are identified, with the EMT.

11. SELECTION PROCESS

11.1 These TOR will be the basis for Request for Proposal of Services (RFPS) for institutional responses. Therefore detailed costing tables need to be presented with each submission or proposal, inclusive of 1) personnel costs, 2) evaluation costs (i.e., transportation, DSA, translation services, report editing) and 3) overheads.
# ANNEX 2: LIST OF QUALITATIVE INTERACTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Township</th>
<th>Key Informants</th>
<th>Case Studies</th>
<th>Focus Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dawei</td>
<td>DSW (file review + group interview)</td>
<td>Statutory case A (child &amp; parent)</td>
<td>FGD with community receiving MRCS awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DSW Deputy Director (individual interview)</td>
<td>Statutory case B (child &amp; parent)</td>
<td>FGD with children receiving MRCS awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YKBWA (file review + group interview)</td>
<td>Non-statutory case A (child &amp; parent)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MRCS (group interview)</td>
<td>Non-statutory case B (child &amp; caretaker)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>World Vision (individual interview)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Investigation Officer, Township Police (individual interview)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Investigation Officer, Sub-Township Police (individual interview)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Township Law Officer (individual interview)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Township Judicial Officer (group interview)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GAD Township Administration (individual interview)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ward Administration and Community Members (group interview)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hpa’an</td>
<td>DSW (file review + group interview)</td>
<td>Statutory case A (child &amp; parent)</td>
<td>FGD with community receiving MRCS awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YKBWA (file review + group interview)</td>
<td>Statutory case B (child &amp; parent)</td>
<td>FGD with children receiving MRCS awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MRCS (group interview)</td>
<td>Statutory case C (child)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Save the Children (individual interview)</td>
<td>Non-statutory case A (child &amp; parent)</td>
<td>Interview with discharged child A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>World Vision (individual interview)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview with discharged child B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anti-Trafficking Task Force (group interview)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Investigation Officer, Township Police (individual interview)

### Township Law Officers (group interview)

### Township Judicial Officers (group interview)

### GAD Township Administration (individual interview)

### Ward Administration (group interview)

### Forensic Doctor (individual interview)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mahauungmyay</th>
<th>DSW (file review + group interview)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DSW District Director (individual interview)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RMO (file review + group interview)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MRCS (group interview)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anti-Trafficking Task Force (group interview)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Investigation Officer, Township Police (individual interview)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Child Protection Police, Mandalay (group interview)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anti-Trafficking Police, Mandalay (individual interview)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Judge, Mandalay Juvenile District Court (individual interview)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Township Law Officer and Judicial Officer (group interview)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GAD Township Administration (individual interview)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ward Administration (group interview)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statutory case A (mother)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-statutory case A (mother)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-statutory case A (child)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boy staying in DSW Training School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FGD with community receiving MRCS awareness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FGD with children receiving MRCS awareness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Case Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mawlamyine</strong></td>
<td>Director of DSW girls’ training school (individual interview) &lt;br&gt; Director of DSW boys’ training school (individual interview) &lt;br&gt; DSW (file review + group interview) &lt;br&gt; YKBWA (file review + group interview) &lt;br&gt; MRCS (group interview) &lt;br&gt; Point B (group interview) &lt;br&gt; Anti-Trafficking Task Force (group interview) &lt;br&gt; Investigation Officer, Township Police (individual interview) &lt;br&gt; Township Law Officers (group interview) &lt;br&gt; Township Judicial Officers (group interview) &lt;br&gt; GAD Township Administration (individual interview) &lt;br&gt; Ward Administration (individual interview) &lt;br&gt; District Education Officer (individual interview)</td>
<td>Statutory case A (parent) &lt;br&gt; Statutory case B (parent) &lt;br&gt; Child in training school A &lt;br&gt; Child in training school B &lt;br&gt; Child in training school C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Myitkyina</strong></td>
<td>DSW (file review + group interview) &lt;br&gt; DSW Director (individual interview) &lt;br&gt; Township level authorities (GAD, Judicial Officer, Legal Officer, Police Officer, Health Officer, Education Officer)</td>
<td>Statutory case A (child) &lt;br&gt; Statutory case B (mother) &lt;br&gt; Statutory case B (child) &lt;br&gt; Statutory case B (mother)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DSW District Director (individual interview) &lt;br&gt; RMO (file review + group interview)</td>
<td>FGD with community receiving MRCS awareness &lt;br&gt; FGD with children receiving MRCS awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyaung-U</td>
<td>DSW (file review + group interview)</td>
<td>DSW District Director (individual interview)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nyaung-U</td>
<td>DSW District Director (individual interview)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Organizations and Stakeholders</td>
<td>Cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyi Gyi Tagon</td>
<td><strong>GAD Township Administration</strong> (individual interview)</td>
<td>Statutory case A (parent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ward Administration (group interview)</td>
<td>Statutory case B (child &amp; uncle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>World Vision (focus group discussion)</td>
<td>Non-statutory case A (parent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-statutory case B (parent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sittway</td>
<td><strong>DSW</strong> (file review + group interview)</td>
<td>Statutory case A (parent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>DSW Director</strong> (individual interview)</td>
<td>Statutory case B (child &amp; uncle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>RMO</strong> (file review + group interview)</td>
<td>Non-statutory case A (parent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>MRCS</strong> (group interview)</td>
<td>Non-statutory case B (parent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Plan (NGO)</strong> (individual interview)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Anti-Trafficking Task Force</strong> (group interview)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Investigation Officer, Township Police</strong> (individual interview)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Township Law Officer</strong> (individual interview)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Township Judicial Officer</strong> (individual interview)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>GAD Township Administration</strong> (individual interview)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Ward Administration &amp; Elders</strong> (group interview)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taunggyi</td>
<td><strong>DSW</strong> (file review + group interview)</td>
<td>Statutory case A (child &amp; parent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>DSW Director</strong> (individual interview)</td>
<td>Statutory case B (parent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>RMO</strong> (file review + group interview)</td>
<td>Non-statutory case A (child &amp; parent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>MRCS</strong> (group interview)</td>
<td>Non-statutory case B (child &amp; parent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>People in Need (NGO)</strong> (individual interview)</td>
<td>Non-statutory case C (child)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Trafficking Task Force (group interview)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigation Officer, Township Police (individual interview)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township Law Officers (group interview)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township Judicial Officers (group interview)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAD Township administration (individual interview)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward Administration (individual interview)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>102</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ANNEX 3: EVALUATION MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Sub-questions/Indicators</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Data Collection Instrument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Outcome: Children in need of support, care and protection are identified by and have access to public, social welfare systems | **Outcome**: Children in need of support, care and protection are identified by and have access to public, social welfare systems | **Outcome 1**: Strengthened policy and programmatic decisions on alternative care for children;  
**Outcome 2**: Increase social welfare system capacity to respond to child protection cases;  
**Outcome 3**: Strengthened legislative and institutional capacity to provide adequate care to children in contact with the law;  
**Outcome 4**: Increase efforts to protect children from exploitation, including child labour, trafficking and sexual exploitation – supported by increased capacity and coordination among actors, including government and the private sector;  
**Outcome 5**: Implementation of national and international standards to prevent and respond to grave violations and contribute to ongoing peace-building, including in emergencies. | **Impact / Outcome**  
1.1 What are the intended/unintended, positive/negative results achieved by the Child Protection Programme in relation to the systems building approach, across all five outputs since the re-orientation of the programme in 2013?  
1.2 What are the existing gaps and bottlenecks?  
1.3 What are the key measures required to improve the social welfare sector considering the changing needs and context or Myanmar? |  
(Outcome 1) How have (the use of) alternative care options, including residential care, evolved since 2013? How does this relate to UNICEF’s programming? How many children are in alternative care, which children are in alternative care and what is the nature of alternative care services? What are the existing gaps in services and their use? How does policy and programming in relation to alternative care need to change and improve?  
**Indicators**: Quality of data and evidence on residential care has increased; number of children entering training schools has reduced (?)  
(Outcome 2) What has the progress been toward the development and establishment of a social welfare response to child protection (case management system)? How many children are covered by the social welfare system / accessing social welfare services? How do these services respond to child protection cases? How do they fail to respond / how are they limited and why? |  
Key informant interviews with UNICEF Child Protection Section;  
Key informant interviews with DSW;  
Existing case data;  
Interviews with case managers;  
Interviews with children and parents who have had interactions with the case | Key informant interview schedule;  
Beneficiary interview schedule |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators: Number of townships with Case Management Government Capacity to identify, refer and respond to child protection cases; number of children accessing social welfare services</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What legal and institutional reforms have taken place in relation to children in care and contact with the law since 2013? How has the Child Protection Programme contributed to these developments? Where have reforms been difficult to achieve and why? What are the remaining changes and reforms that are needed and how could they be achieved?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators: Status of adoption of national Child Law; Number of new judges trained on child-friendly judicial procedures; Development and adoption of rules and procedures for the Anti-Trafficking in Persons Law</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(How) have social welfare services, the case management system, contributed to the protection of children from exploitation, including child labour, trafficking and sexual exploitation (as a result of UNICEF programming)? What are the barriers to effectively protecting children?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators: Number of trafficking, exploitation and child labour cases brought to the case management systems</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How has UNICEF’s systems building activity, and particularly the case management system, contributed to the protection of children in emergency settings? Where are the gaps in protection for children in emergency settings, and how could these be addressed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators: Number of case management systems established in emergency settings; number of child protection cases in emergency settings brought to case management systems</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

8 UNICEF Scale: 0 – None, 1 – Comprehensive revised draft exists, 2 – New draft revised with key ministry, 3 – New draft reviewed by National and International stakeholders, 4 – New Child Law is adopted.

9 UNICEF Scale: 0 – None, 1 – Anti-Trafficking in Persons Law gaps analysed, 2 – First draft of the Chapter on Protection of child victims of trafficking completed, 3 – Chapter on Protection of child victims of trafficking completed, 4 – Rules and procedures adopted.
## Relevance

<p>| 2.1 To what extent are the decisions to re-orientate the Child Protection Programme to focus on systems building justified and appropriate? | 2.1.1 How relevant is the current portfolio of activities under Output 2 for an effective case management system? | Key informant interviews with UNICEF Child Protection Section; Key informant interviews with Government and NGO partners; Interviews with case managers; Interviews with township level officials; Interviews with children and parents who have had interactions with the case management system; Document review; government child protection budget and staffing information |
| 2.2 Are UNICEF’s advocacy and coordination efforts well targeted? | 2.1.2 How well are the activities across the other four outputs helping to achieve and sustain the anticipated results? |  |
|  | Indicators: Activities under other outputs contribute to the effectiveness of the case management system (Y/N) |  |
|  | 2.2.1 How well does the Government share the vision of what this child protection system is and what it should be? | Key informant interview schedule; Beneficiary interview schedule; focus group discussion guides (parents and children) |
|  | Indicators: Government partners articulate consistent vision of child protection system and its purpose |  |
|  | 2.2.2 To what extent is the Government demonstrating support and interest in this work to: (a) implement a national child protection system; and (b) increase the capacity of the justice sector in child friendly practice? |  |
|  | Indicators: Increased government spending on developing and strengthening national child protection system (including social welfare and justice sector); increased number of government staff dedicated to providing child protection services (i.e. trained case managers); proportion of justice sector officials (police, judges, prosecutors) who have received training in child-friendly methods and techniques |  |
|  | 2.2.3 To what extent are key child protection actors demonstrating efforts to collaborate with Government? |  |
|  | Indicators: Key child protection actors (including NGOs) have established effective collaborative relationships with Government (Y/N) |  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>3.1 How well is the national case management system working to respond systemically to instances of violence, abuse, exploitation and/or neglect?</th>
<th>3.1.1 To what extent do case managers and service providers have the capacity, resources and motivation to respond appropriately?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 How effectively are coordination mechanisms working to create and sustain linkages across sectors, and between child protection actors, as a result of UNICEF investment?</td>
<td><strong>Indicators:</strong> Case managers have received training in child protection case management; case managers demonstrate capacity to respond to child protection cases appropriately; case managers have access to necessary resources to respond to child protection cases appropriately; budgets allocated to case management systems at township level address all necessary components of child protection response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3 To what extent are awareness raising activities building the confidence of communities and individuals to engage with the social welfare and justice system?</td>
<td>3.1.2 How satisfied are clients with the response they have received?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4 How well is UNICEF targeting its support to revision of legislation and policy and how can this be justified in the context of other activities?</td>
<td><strong>Indicators:</strong> Clients express satisfaction with response / services delivered by case management system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1.3 What are the major gaps and bottlenecks that are impacting on achieving the expected results?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Indicators (Question 3.2):</strong> Appropriate mechanisms for data sharing and referral are in place between relevant child protection actors, and are utilised effectively (i.e. education, health, social welfare, justice sector); members of relevant sectors (education, health, social welfare, justice sector) regularly attend child rights committee meetings at the GAD level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Indicators (Question 3.3):</strong> Community members are familiar with/express confidence in the social welfare system and justice system; individuals participating in focus group discussions describe relevant scenarios in which they would access social welfare or justice services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Indicators (Question 3.4):</strong> (‘Positive/child rights friendly’) changes to legislation and policy in relation to child protection, social welfare services and the justice system have been achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Key informant interviews with UNICEF Child Protection Section; Key informant interviews with Government and NGO partners; Interviews with case managers; Interviews with township level officials; Interviews with children and parents who have had interactions with the case management system; Case manager survey; Data from case files (including client satisfaction form); Focus group discussions with parents and children at community level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Key informant interview schedule; Beneficiary interview schedule; Survey tool; Case file checklist; Focus group discussion guides (parents and children)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>4.1 To what extent has UNICEF’s approach to systems building been cost-effective?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Have other resources been made available for similar activities and/or the same systems apart from UNICEF?</td>
<td>4.1.1 To what extent has the availability of resources enabled or constrained the performance of the case management system?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators</strong>: Availability of resources has not served to constrain the performance of the case management system (Y/N)</td>
<td><strong>Indicators</strong> (question 4.2): Government (as well as NGOs and other actors) have devoted resources to implementing activities in relation to child protection system strengthening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability (scaling up)</th>
<th>5.1 What would be the resource implication(s) to scale up the case management system to reach national coverage, and is the current model appropriate?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Are there indicators that show ownership of the Government of the case management system, including activities, priorities, strategic development and budget allocation?</td>
<td>5.3 To what extent has the roll-out of the case management system contributed to the generation of sub-national and national capacity such that it will be sustainable, if UNICEF funding ceases?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators</strong> (question 5.2): Government has referred to case management system in its strategic plans / committed to the development of the case management system; government has allocated sufficient budget to the implementation of the case management system</td>
<td><strong>Indicators</strong> (question 5.3): Case managers at sub-national level demonstrate capacity to deliver child protection services without UNICEF funding or support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Key informant interviews with UNICEF Child Protection Section; Key informant interviews with Government and NGO partners; Interviews with case managers; Government child protection budget and staffing information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Key informant interview schedule | Key informant interview schedule; Beneficiary interview schedule; Case file check list; Focus group discussion guide |
5.4 How can awareness raising activities become effectively sustainable?

| Cross Cutting Issues | 6.1 Have the protection needs of children and international/regional standards remained central to programme planning, design, implementation and monitoring, advocacy efforts, and in building capacity of Government and key partners? | 6.2.1 To what extent have the distinct, vulnerability and capacities of girls and boys (incl. youth and adolescents) been identified and addressed in the planning, implementation and monitoring of the case management system?

**Indicators:** Programme documents (including for planning and monitoring) and decision making identify and address the distinct needs, vulnerabilities and capacities of girls and boys of all ages;

6.2.2 How is the program using gender specific information and analysis to overcome any barriers to gender equality?

**Indicators:** Children of all genders and ages are accessing social welfare services, including the case management system;

6.2.3 Does this process include monitoring and responding to any unintended negative consequences?

**Indicators:** Case managers are aware of the particular vulnerabilities of different groups of children and have taken measures to address and respond to those vulnerabilities;

6.2.4 Are sex and age-disaggregated data collected, monitored and analysed for gender equality to inform the programme?

**Indicators:** Sex and age-disaggregated data are collected, monitored and analysed for gender equality to inform the programme | children at community level; Government strategic planning documents | Key informant interviews with UNICEF Child Protection Section; Key informant interviews with Government and NGO partners; Interviews with case managers; government child protection budget and staffing information; Survey with case managers; Document review | Key informant interview schedule; Survey tool; Case file check list; beneficiary II guides |
Introduce the evaluation according to the following script:

We are in the process of conducting a formative evaluation of UNICEF’s child protection programming in Myanmar. We have some questions for you regarding your experience with the programme specifically, and with child protection in Myanmar more broadly.

Are you happy to participate in the interview?

(If the respondent agrees to participate) We appreciate your agreement to participate in this interview. The evaluation is first and foremost a learning exercise for UNICEF so please do be open and candid in your responses as you can. While we would like to draw upon your contributions in our report, we will always keep your comments anonymous. You may not have answers to all of the questions so don’t feel you need to answer them - we are interested to learn from your knowledge, views and experiences.

Section 1: Introductory questions

Please give me a brief overview of your role and responsibilities. In particular, how does your work relate to child protection in Myanmar?

Can you give a bit of background/context in relation to the child protection system in Myanmar? What is the status of the system at present (feel free to focus on your area of knowledge and experience)?

What do you think are the most important measures that are needed to improve the social welfare sector in the Myanmar?

Section 2: Relevance

How familiar are you with UNICEF’s child protection programming? If you have collaborated with UNICEF, what has this involved?

Are you familiar with UNICEF’s ‘system’s building approach’ to child protection, which focuses on case management? From your perspective what were the reasons behind the decision to shift from a community based approach to a systems building approach? Do you think it makes sense in the Myanmar context? Why or why not?

Are you aware of UNICEF’s efforts to support the revision of legislation and policy? Do you feel they are relevant to improving child protection systems? Why or why not?

Section 3: Outcomes

In your view, what have the main achievements of the programme been? Have there been any unexpected consequences of UNICEF’s work in this area? What are the remaining gaps, and why? What are the challenges that are hindering the success of the programme?

Section 4: Effectiveness

Are you familiar with how the child protection case management system is functioning at present (to respond to cases of violence, abuse, exploitation or neglect)?
We have some detailed questions about the function of the case management system below. You may or may not have comments in relation to these questions, but where you do, please consider whether and how UNICEF has contributed to and improved the system, and how their efforts could be improved.

1. Do case managers and service providers have the capacity, resources and motivation to respond effectively to cases?

2. Do you have any information about the numbers of cases that have been referred to the case management system (i.e., in a particular township)? Is reporting a challenge? Where do referrals come from? What are the barriers to cases being referred to the case management system?

3. Do individuals and communities have confidence in the social welfare and justice system? Are they aware of the services that are available to them?

4. Are cases effectively resolved? What is working well and what isn’t working well?

5. What are the most common outcomes of cases? Are cases referred to the justice system? Are necessary services in place and are cases being referred to these services? What are the gaps?

6. Do you have a sense of whether the presence of NGOs is relevant to the effectiveness of case management systems at the township level?

7. Do you feel the division between statutory cases (which are addressed by DSW) and non-statutory cases (which are resolved by NGOs) is working well in practice? Are there any problems in collaboration?

8. How are coordination mechanisms working in practice?

9. To your knowledge are there any information management systems in place? How is information managed and shared between relevant actors?

10. Have the different needs of boys and girls, been identified and addressed within the system? How so?

11. How do you feel the case management system is working/will work in the context of conflict and emergencies?

12. What are the contextual factors that influence the function of case management systems from township to township? We want to choose a diverse set of townships to visit – what characteristics do you think we should take into account?

Section 5: Efficiency

Do you feel that the resources UNICEF has allocated to the case management system have improved its effectiveness? Has a lack of resources constrained the system/limited the effectiveness of the system in any way? Please give specific examples to illustrate where spending achieved impact, where spending was wasteful, and where greater investment is needed in order for the system to be effective.

Has your agency (or partner agencies) allocated any resources to the development of a case management system? Do you intend to so?

Section 6: Sustainability

Do you think the case management system could be scaled up to the national level? Why or why not? What would be the barriers/challenges to doing so?
Has the case management system contributed to the capacity of national and sub-national actors? How so, and what are the remaining gaps?

What steps has the Myanmar Government (and in particular your agency) taken to support the child protection case management system? Have relevant strategies/priorities been adopted? Has a budget been committed to the programme? Are relevant activities being implemented? Please give specific examples.

How has the government’s approach to child protection changed? Has UNICEF’s programming contributed to this? How?

Section 7: Conclusions

If you could make any recommendations to UNICEF regarding their programming going forward, what would they be? Are there any gaps where you feel they should be programming and aren’t?

FGD discussion Guide – Parents, Community Leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of evaluator(s):</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of participants:</td>
<td>Males:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion/Ethnicity:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ideally, focus group discussions should be held with 6-8 parents/community leaders (of the same gender). They should be conducted in a secure, quiet place.

Introduce yourself and the purpose of the study: the study will help us understand what risks children face in the community, what actions are being taken by the government and other organisations in the community, and what more could be done protect children in the future.

Explain that it is voluntary, gain informed consent and advise participants about anonymity.

Section 1: Child protection information

1. As parents/community leaders do you worry about your children’s safety? Why?

2. What are the least safe spaces for children in this community? Are there places where you worry for your children to go? Are there some places that you are more worried about girls going to than boys or vice versa? Which places? Why?

3. What are the forms of violence that children experience most frequently in your community? (Probe to determine how violence is defined by participants in the group). Are there particular groups of children who are more likely to experience violence? Which groups? Why?

Section 2: Awareness about child protection

4. Has anyone ever spoken to you about ‘child protection’? Do you know what this means? What does it mean to you?

5. Do you know any organizations in the local area who are working on child protection? Who are they? What do they do? What is your view about the work you are doing? Why? (Prompt about the local DSW, Red Cross Myanmar or other relevant NGOs).
Section 3: Child protection in practice

6. What happens in this community if a child gets into trouble? Is there anywhere children can go to if they have problems? Who?

7. If a child came to you and said he was being abused at home or at school, or if another adult reported this to you, would you intervene? Why/why not? Can you tell me of any cases that you have heard of, or that you have been involved in? What happened? Who was the case reported to? What was the outcome? What do you think about it?

8. Have you ever heard of a ‘social worker’/child protection officer? Do you have these in your community? What do they do? What do you think of them? Have you ever sought help from a social worker (for yourself or another person/child)? Can you tell me about what happened?

9. Which government bodies or other organisations working in the area do you trust? Why? Are there any that you don’t trust? Why? (Prompt about the local DSW, Red Cross Myanmar or other relevant NGOs)

Section 4: Response scenarios

“Now I am going to give you some made-up scenarios about children. I'd like you to tell me if you think the events in the story are realistic, and whether and why this type of thing happens. Then I will ask you what the person in each story should do in this type of situation.”

Are the events described in the story things that sometimes happen? Can you tell me a case?

10. Gang violence: Your son Htway is frightened to go to school. When he comes home from school he often looks disheveled and sometimes you notice marks and bruises on his body. One day you ask him about it and he confesses that he is having trouble with a gang of boys. They often threaten to hurt him, and sometimes they wait for him outside of school, and when he comes outside they steal his food and money and sometimes hit him.

Discussion questions: What do you think about this story? Have you ever heard of a case like this? What happened? If this happens, what would you do? Are there any (government) organisations in the local area who support boys like Htway? What do they do?

11. Sexual abuse: Myaing is a 12 year old girl in your child’s school. She seems very withdrawn, distracted and worried all year. This is because her uncle, who lives at her house, is abusing her sexually. He comes into her room at night and forces her to touch him in sexual ways. One day Myaing told her friend about this. She asked her friend if she could stay overnight at her house because she was frightened about going home.

Discussion questions: What do you think about this story? Have you ever heard of a case like this? What happened? If this happens, what would you do? Are there any (government) organisations in the local area who support girls like Myaing? What do they do?

12. Neglect at home: Shein, a 10 year old boy who goes to school with your child, was very disengaged in class, and sometimes looked worried or afraid. He was always hungry, sometimes very dirty and was often falling asleep in class. Shein started to miss several days of school in a row and was falling behind in class. One day one of his classmates saw him selling newspapers on the street.

Discussion questions: What do you think happened in this story – why is Shein behaving this way? Have you ever heard of a case like this? What happened? If this happens, what would you do? Are there any (government) organisations in the local area who support boys like Shein? What do they do?
Section 5: Recommendations

13. What do you think would make your community safer and better for your children and other children? Do you have any recommendations for what the [government] should do to make things safer for children?

Thank the participants for their time. Explain again that the study will help understand what risks children face in the community, and what actions can be taken to improve the situation for children in the future.

Children and Young People – FGD schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of evaluator(s):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of participants:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age range:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion/Ethnicity:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ideally, focus group discussions should be held with 6-8 children and young people of the same gender, ages 12 years and above. They should be conducted in a private place, where respondents cannot be overheard by anyone.

Introduce yourself and the purpose of the study: the study will help us understand what risks children face in the community, what actions are being taken by the government and other organisations in the community, and what more could be done protect children in the future.

Explain that it is voluntary, gain informed consent and advise participants about anonymity. This FGD must only be done after the parents or guardians of all children under the age of 18 have given their consent for their child to participate.

Section 1: Background information

1. To begin, let’s talk a bit about you and your community.
   a. How old are you?
   b. Do you go to school? Which one?
   c. Who is responsible for caring for children in your community?
      i. Prompt respondents about alternative care arrangements if necessary: What about children who do not live with their parents?

Section 2: General safety

2. Do you ever worry about your safety or your friend’s safety in this area? Why?
3. What are the least safe spaces for you and your friends in this community? Are there places where you worry to go? Why?
   a. Are there some places that you would be more worried about girls going to than boys or vice versa? Which places? Why?

4. Can you think of groups of children that are particularly vulnerable? If so, who are they?
Section 3: Awareness about child protection

5. Has anyone ever spoken to you about ‘child protection’? Do you know what this means? What does it mean to you? Where did you hear this information? Do you think this information was useful? How?

6. Has anyone ever spoken to you about ‘child abuse’? Do you know what this means? What does it mean to you?

7. Do you know any organizations in the local area who are working on child protection or who help children in trouble? Who are they? What do they do? What is your view about the work you are doing? Why? (Prompt about the local DSW, Red Cross Myanmar or other relevant NGOs).

Section 4: Child protection experience

8. If you were having a problem at home would you tell anyone? Why? Why not? If so who would you tell? What about at school?

9. Have you ever heard of a ‘social worker’/child protection officer? Do you have these in your community? What do they do? What do you think of them? Have you ever sought help from a social worker (for yourself or another person/child)? Can you tell me about what happened?

10. Which government bodies or other organisations working in the area do you trust? Why? Are there any that you don’t trust? Why? (Prompt about the local DSW, Red Cross Myanmar or other relevant NGOs)

Section 5: Response scenarios

“Now I am going to give you some made-up scenarios about children. I’d like you to tell me if you think the events in the story are realistic, and whether and why this type of thing happens. Then I will ask you what the person in each story should do in this type of situation.”

Are the events described in the story things that sometimes happen? Can you tell me a case?

14. Gang violence: Your friend Htway is frightened to go to school. He is having trouble with a gang of boys. They often threaten to hurt him, and sometimes they wait for him outside of school, and when he comes outside they steal his food and money and sometimes hit him.

Discussion questions: What do you think about this story? Have you ever heard of a case like this? Has this ever happened to you or your friends? Can you tell me about a case? If this happens, what would you do? Are there any (government) organisations in the local area who support boys like Htway? What do they do?

15. Sexual abuse: Myaing is a 12 year old girl in your school. She is a good friend of yours, but recently she has been very unhappy at school. She is very quiet and distracted and worried. This is because her uncle, who lives at her house, is abusing her sexually. He comes into her room at night and forces her to touch him in sexual ways. One day Myaing told you about this. She asked you if she could stay overnight at your house because she was frightened about going home.

Discussion questions: What do you think about this story? Have you ever heard of a case like this? What happened? If this happens, what would you do? Are there any (government) organisations in the local area who support girls like Myaing? What do they do?

16. Neglect at home: Shein, a 10 year old boy is in your class. He is always hungry, and dirty and was often falling asleep in class. He often tries to steal food from the other children at school. Recently Shein stopped coming to school. One day you saw him selling newspapers on the street.
Discussion questions: What do you think happened in this story – why is Shein behaving this way? Have you ever heard of a case like this? What happened? If this happens, what would you do? Are there any (government) organisations in the local area who support boys like Shein? What do they do?

Section 5: Recommendations

17. What do you think would make your community safer and better for you and other children in your community? Do you have any recommendations for what the [government] should do to make things safer for children?

Thank the children for their time. Explain again that the study will help understand what risks children face in the community, and what actions can be taken to improve the situation for children in the future.

Individual Interview Guide (Child who has had contact with case management system)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of evaluator(s):</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location (township and village):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender and age of respondent:</td>
<td>Gender: Age:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siblings:</td>
<td>Genders: Ages:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion/Ethnicity:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ideally, individual interviews should be held in a one to one setting (two to one, including the translator). If the child being interviewed is more comfortable, it is okay for him or her to bring a trusted companion into the interview. Interviews should be conducted in a secure, quiet place.

Introduce yourself and the purpose of the study: the study is about the risks and dangers children face in Myanmar and about the actions taken by the government and partner organisations to respond when a child is in trouble. We are looking to learn from your experiences so that we can find out what is happening in practice and what more could be done protect children in the future.

Explain that it is voluntary, gain informed consent and advise participants about anonymity.

Section 1: Background information/Warm-up

18. Who do you live with? Who looks after you at home?

19. Do your parents work? What are the main sources of income in your household?

20. Do you go to school? Do you ever have to miss school for any reason? Why?

21. If the child DOES attend school then ask:
   a) Do you do any work? If so, what kind of work do you do? About how many hours a week do you spend working?

22. If the child DOES NOT attend school, then ask the child whether (s)he attends any training or whether (s)he works and if so what sort of work and for how many hours

23. Do you like spending time at home? Why/why not? If not, do you go anywhere else instead?
24. Where do you spend most of your time when you’re not at home? What do you do? Who do you spend time with?

25. Are there any problems you are dealing with at home, at school or in the community? Is there anything that makes you feel unsafe or at risk of harm?

Section 2: Case history

26. As we mentioned, we are particularly interested to learn about your experience with the child protection (case management) system? Do you know what I mean by this? What do you understand it to be?

27. Can you tell me the story of how your case came to the child protection system? Was it because of any problems you were having? Maybe problems and school or problems at home? Ask probing questions to get as much detail as possible about the events that led up to the referral (any experience of violence, abuse, neglect, exploitation, etc).

28. (If not already addressed) How was your case referred? Did you ever tell anyone about the problems you were having? Do you know who referred the case? Why do you think they did so? (Prompt to find out as much as you can about the referral, who made it, how and why).

29. Who contacted you or your parents about the problems you were facing? (ie NGO or DSW or police?)

30. How did you feel about the fact that the case had been referred? What about your family – how did they feel? Did you trust the people who were handling the case?

31. Then what happened? Ask probing questions to learn how the case was handled / who handled it and what happened. Try to learn who was involved at each stage, what their role was, whether the child removed from his or her home at any point, did the child or his or her family received any services/support? Also try to get a sense of the time frame within which all of this occurred. If the case involves a justice sector response probe to determine the extent that due process/child friendly procedures were implemented?

32. How was the case resolved? What was the outcome of the case? Whose idea was this? What did you think about it? What did your family think about it? Determine what decision was made and what follow up actions were taken. Probe to understand the details of how this was implemented / what that entailed / who has been responsible for implementing it.

33. How are things for you now? Has the problem improved? Are there any new problems you are dealing with now? Is there anything in your life that you would like to change? What are your goals and hopes for the future?

34. Looking back, do you agree with the way the case was handled and the decisions that were made? Do you wish things had been different? How?

Section 3: Recommendations

35. What do you think would make your community safer and better for you and other children? Do you have any recommendations for what the [government] should do to make things safer for children?
Thank the participants for their time. Explain again that the study will help understand what risks children face in the community, and what actions can be taken to improve the situation for children in the future.

**Individual Interview Guide – Parent whose child has had contact with case management system**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of evaluator(s):</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location (township and village):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender and age of respondent:</td>
<td>Gender: Age:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children (circle gender and age of child concerned)</td>
<td>Genders: Ages:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion/Ethnicity:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ideally, individual interviews should be held in a one to one setting (two to one, including the translator). Interviews should be conducted in a secure, quiet place.

Introduce yourself and the purpose of the study: the study is about the risks and dangers children face in Myanmar and about the actions taken by the government and partner organisations to respond when a child is in trouble. We are looking to learn from your experiences so that we can find out what is happening in practice and what more could be done protect children in the future.

Explain that it is voluntary, gain informed consent and advise participants about anonymity.

**Section 1: Background information / Warm-up**

36. Tell me a bit about your family? Who lives with you at home?

37. What are the main sources of income in your household?

38. What are the main challenges or sources of stress you face within your household? Are there any particular difficulties involving your children?

39. Do your children go to school? (Ask specifically about the child involved in the case) Do they ever have to miss school for any reason? Why?

40. If the children DO attend school then ask:

   a) Do your children do any work? If so, what kind of work do they do? About how many hours a week do they spend working?

41. If the child DOES NOT attend school, then ask the child whether he attends any training or whether he works and if so what sort of work and for how many hours

42. Do you like spending time at home? Why/why not? If not, do you go anywhere else instead?

43. Where does your child spend most of his or her time when not at home?
Section 2: Case history

44. As we mentioned, we are particularly interested to learn about your experience with the child protection (case management) system? Do you know what I mean by this? What do you understand it to be?

45. Can you tell me the story of the case involving your child?

*Ask probing questions to get as much detail as possible about the events that led up to the referral (any experience of violence, abuse, neglect, exploitation, etc) and the parent’s perspectives on these issues.*

46. (If not already addressed) How was the case referred? Do you know who referred the case? Why do you think they did so? *(Prompt to find out as much as you can about the referral, who made it, how and why).*

47. How did you feel about the fact that the case had been referred? What about your child/other members of your family – how did they feel? Did you trust the people who were handling the case?

48. Then what happened? Ask probing questions to learn how the case was handled / who handled it and what happened. Try to learn who was involved at each stage, what their role was, whether the child removed from his or her home at any point, did the child or his or her family received any services/support? Also try to get a sense of the time frame within which all of this occurred. If the case involves a justice sector response probe to determine the extent that due process / child friendly procedures were implemented?

49. How was the case resolved? What was the outcome of the case? Whose idea was this? What did you think about it? What did your child and other members of your family think about it? Determine what decision was made and what follow up actions were taken. Probe to understand the details of how this was implemented / what that entailed / who has been responsible for implementing it.

50. How are things for your child now? Has the problem improved? Are there any new problems you are dealing with now? Is there anything in your life that you would like to change? What are your goals and hopes for the future?

51. Looking back, do you agree with the way the case was handled and the decisions that were made? Do you wish things had been different? How?

Section 3: Recommendations

52. What do you think would make your community safer and better for your children and other children? Do you have any recommendations for what the [government] should do to make things safer for children?

*Thank the participants for their time. Explain again that the study will help understand what risks children face in the community, and what actions can be taken to improve the situation for children in the future.*
Case Manager Survey Tool

Our organisation, Coram International, is conducting an evaluation of UNICEF’s Child Protection Programme in Myanmar – we are focussing on the case management system. We would like to learn from you a bit about your work as a case manager, to help us understand how the programme is going. We have prepared a couple of questions – it should only take 10 – 15 minutes. Please be as honest as you can in your answers: we want to learn from you experiences. All of the information you give us will be kept strictly anonymous, and we will not write down your name.

You do not have to fill out the survey form if you don’t want to, and you can choose not to answer any or all of the questions. Would you like to take the survey? (Please circle a response).

Yes / No

We would like to use some of what you tell us in our report, but we will never use your name. Is that okay?

Yes / No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Township:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Who is your employer? (Circle the best answer) NGO / DSW

2. What is your role? (Circle the best answer) DSW case manager / NGO case officer / case supervisor

3. How long have you been in your role as a case manager? (Circle the best answer) Less than one year / one year / two years / three years / over three years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training and capacity building</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Have you received any training on case management and/or child protection? (Circle the best answer) Yes / No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How many days of training have you received? (Fill in a number) Number of days ________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. On a scale of 1-5, how well has the training prepared you for your role as a case manager? (1 = not very well, 5 = very well) 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge and working methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Please number the seven case management steps in the order in which you complete them Follow-up and review ________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Case Closure and Implementation

- Case closure
- Intake
- Implement the case plan
- Case planning
- Assessment

### 8. When do you consider a case to be an urgent case?

- a. When the abuse occurred within the past 24 hours
- b. When the case is brought by the child him or herself
- c. When the abuse occurred within the past 48 hours
- d. When the child has been accused of a crime

### 9. After a case has been referred to the police or health providers, my role in the case is finished (circle true or false)

- True / False

### 10. Which actors attend a case conference? (circle all that apply)

- a. Health workers
- b. Teachers
- c. The police
- d. The township administration
- e. The child’s parents

### 11. Which actors do you share data with on a regular basis? (circle all that apply)

- a. Health workers
- b. Teachers
- c. The police
- d. The township administration
- e. The justice sector (prosecutors/judges)

### 12. On a scale of 1 – 5, how do you rank your relationship with each of the following groups (1 being poor/difficult and 5 being strong / very effective)

- a. Health workers: 1 2 3 4 5
- b. Teachers: 1 2 3 4 5
- c. Police: 1 2 3 4 5
- d. Township administration: 1 2 3 4 5
- e. Community members - adults: 1 2 3 4 5
- f. Community members (children): 1 2 3 4 5
File Review Tool

Step 1: Incident report

Does the file contain information about the child as per the form?

☐ Yes

☐ No

Has a case number been assigned to the case?

☐ Yes

☐ No

If the abuse was within the last 48 hours has the case been marked as urgent?

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ Not applicable (abuse not within last 48 hours)

Step 2: Intake

What is the nature of the case as recorded in the file?

Has the case been recorded as statutory or non-statutory?

☐ Statutory

☐ Non-statutory

If the case is non-statutory has it been referred to DSW?

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ Not clear

☐ Not applicable – statutory case

Has the case been correctly identified as statutory or non-statutory?

☐ Yes

☐ No

What level of risk has the case been assigned?

☐ High risk

☐ Medium risk

☐ Low risk

☐ Risk level not assigned

Has the case been given an appropriate risk rating which reflects the nature of the case?

☐ Yes
Has a consent form been filled out?

☐ Yes
☐ No

Has an immediate needs assessment been conducted?

☐ Yes
☐ No

Did the initial assessment involve a visit to the child’s/ home family within the first 48 hours?

☐ Yes
☐ No

If the abuse took place within the previous 48 hours, has a medical examination with a health authority taken place?

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Not applicable (abuse not within last 48 hours)

If the abuse took place within the previous 48 hours, has a police report been completed?

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Not applicable (abuse not within last 48 hours)

**Step 3: Assessment**

Has a full assessment of the case been completed (including the completion of the assessment form?)

☐ Yes
☐ No

Did this full assessment take place within 1 week of opening the case?

☐ Yes
☐ No

How many times has the case managed made visits to the child’s family/ school/ institution? (Provide details)

________________________________________________________________________________________

What was the nature/ purpose of these visits, and have they been well documented?

________________________________________________________________________________________

In addition to making visits, what other contact has the social workers had with the child/ family? (Provide details)

________________________________________________________________________________________

**Step 4: Case planning**

Has a case conference with health and police been conducted within two weeks of the assessment?

☐ Yes
Have there been any NGOs/ CBOs also involved in any conference? What role have they provided?

- Yes
- No

(If possible to determine from the file review) have a police report and a medical examination been completed?

- Yes
- No

Has the Case Manager chaired a planning meeting for the child and has a planning form been filled out?

- Yes
- No

What actions have been planned for to resolve the case, and who have these been assigned to (actions, responsible individuals, timelines etc.)?

Step 5: Implement case plan

What evidence is there that this plan has been carried out (recorded actions, responsible individuals, timelines etc.)?

What have been the outcomes/ results of any actions taken?

Step 6: Follow up

What is the nature of ongoing/ follow up of the case? Have ‘follow up forms’ been completed?

Is there evidence that the frequency of monitoring is proportionate to the risk level (e.g. twice a week for high risk, once a week for medium risk, and once every two weeks for low risk)?

Does the child’s case warrant legal support and if so has this been provided? Is there any evidence that the need for legal support was determined/ assessed/ discussed?

Step 7: Case closure

What were the final outcomes/ is the latest status (if ongoing) of the case/ have these been recorded?

Has the case been closed?

- Yes case closed
- No case ongoing

(If closed) has a case closure form been filled out?

- Yes
- No
(If closed) was it determined that the child’s situation was safe/ stable upon closure of the case?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

ANNEX 5: EVALUATION BRIEFING


Coram International, a London based consultancy team specialising in child rights, is currently undertaking a formative evaluation of UNICEF’s child protection programming and, in particular, its systems building approach to child protection. The evaluation will cover the period from 2013 – present.

The primary purpose of the evaluation is to develop learning to improve UNICEF’s programming: the evaluation will provide actionable recommendations that can contribute to the improvement and refinement of UNICEF’s approach to child protection in the Myanmar context.

The evaluation will assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and (where possible) outcomes of UNICEF’s programme. Because the evaluation is meant to be formative in nature, rather than focussing on determining the impacts and outcomes of the Child Protection Programme, it will attempt to assess the approach taken by the programme, whether the assumptions made in the theory of change (TOC) are appropriate, whether activities and interventions are indeed contributing to progress within the framework of the TOC, and determine why or why not progress is occurring towards UNICEF’s primary goal: to ensure that children in need of support, care and protection are identified by and have access to public, social welfare systems.

The evaluation will focus on assessing UNICEF’s work to establish social work case management as a means of implementing child protection at the township level. Not only is the case management system a priority area for UNICEF, and the key mechanism for delivering protection services to children: it links to other programme areas, including community level awareness raising, legislative reform, and anti-trafficking and emergency focussed programming.

We are currently conducting our first phase of data collection. We appreciate your agreement to meet with us and participate in the exercise. The evaluation is first and foremost a learning exercise for UNICEF so please do be open and candid in your responses as you can. While we would like to draw upon your contributions in our report, we will always keep your comments anonymous. You may not have answers to all of the questions so don’t feel you need to answer them - we are interested to learn from your knowledge, views and experiences.
ANNEX 6: THEORY OF CHANGE

2016-2017 Theory of Change – Summary Narrative

Child Protection Programme

A. Situation analysis

Despite some gains made over recent years to improve the protection of children in Myanmar from violence, abuse, exploitation and neglect, serious protection concerns remain. These include the numbers of children in institutional care, treatment of children in contact with the law, prevalence of child labour, increasing rates of trafficking, and ongoing conflict and communal violence. These concerns are compounded by outdated and inappropriate legislation, lack of a national policy on child protection, low awareness and harmful social practices and beliefs, and limited national budgets and corresponding capacity of key Ministries and Departments with the mandate to protect children. Social sector spending remains the lowest in the region: the Ministry of Social Welfare, Relief and Resettlement received just 0.08% of the national budget in 2014. As a result, the Department of Social Welfare (DSW) does not have a presence at Township level and struggles to play a meaningful role in protecting children. Despite these constraints, the Ministry and DSW are committing their internal resources to scale up social work case management support for the most vulnerable children and families in the limited areas where they have a presence. A national social protection strategy, adopted by the Myanmar Government in December 2014, underscoring the need for 6000 social work case managers across all 330 Townships, is a strong signal of political commitment to this approach. This has not yet been resourced.

Myanmar is undergoing significant reforms in many sectors. However, rule of law reform has yet to take root in the political environment. Available information shows that children and families mostly use informal justice systems to resolve problems. Children – both boys and girls – who do come into contact with the law (as victims, witnesses or perpetrators) often suffer rights violations including detention without trial, delayed trials, lack of access to legal representation, and inadequate social services. There are two juvenile courts and approximately 8 detention centres for children. These are known as ‘training schools’. There is no information available on how many children, if any, are held in other detention facilities. Legislation gaps lead to continued violations against children. The minimum age of criminal responsibility is currently 7 years of age. This fails to meet international standards.

In the absence of a resourced social welfare / child protection system, supported by appropriate legislation, policies and oversight, unaddressed protection concerns are growing in Myanmar. The number of children living in institutional care has increased: 21,791 children living in 227 registered residential care facilities (2014) compared to 17,322 children in 217 registered facilities (2010). There are estimated to be tens of thousands more children living in unregistered institutions and religious based care facilities. Child work continues to be highly visible – over 1 in 5 children are employed – with few pathways to identify and move children, both girls and boys, out of the worst forms of child labour. Recruiting persons under 18 into the armed forces is prohibited by law however the Tatmadaw and seven non-state armed groups are listed as persistent perpetrators for the systematic recruitment and use of children in conflict. As of June 2015, 646 boys have been released from the Tatmadaw under the Joint Action Plan (signed 2012). The protracted situation of forced displacement in Rakhine
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and Kachin and Northern Shan States has placed children at disproportionate risk of violence and abuse, including sexual exploitation, trafficking, and early marriage – particularly young girls. Adolescents represent a significant proportion of these displaced populations.

**B. Outcomes and expected change**

Under the overall Country Programme of Cooperation between UNICEF and the Government of the Republic of the Union of Myanmar and its two year extension 2016-2017, the Child Protection (CP) programme will build on the achievements made to date, capitalize on ongoing political and legal reforms, and advocate for new reforms in important sectors. The *overarching goal* will be to support Myanmar’s economic and democratic transition by ensuring that the foundations laid through work to date (2011-2015) are deepened and expanded, resulting in significant increases in the number of children in need of support covered by social welfare services in the country, thereby increasing their protection. Although outside of the direct influence of UNICEF Myanmar, we can significantly contribute to this goal through realizing the *outcome* of the 2016-17 programme: ensuring that ‘*children in need of support, care and protection are identified by and have access to public, social welfare systems*’.

The *change we want to see* in order to achieve this outcome is an improvement in the enabling environment (laws, policies, and coordination structures), an increased supply of quality child protection services including in emergencies (social work case managers, alternatives to institutional care, psychosocial support and life skills education for adolescents), and an increase in demand for these services. This means strengthened political commitment, accountability and national capacity to legislate, plan and budget for scaling up interventions that prevent and respond to violence, abuse, exploitation and neglect of children; increased national capacity to provide access to child protection systems through decentralization; and increased awareness and confidence in these systems from children and families, including in emergency situations.

In 2016-2017, the CP programme will target systems level change to best address the multiple and nuanced challenges presently hindering the provision of protection for children in Myanmar. Systems level change is rooted in the assumption that significant improvements in the protection of children will not occur unless the legislation, policy frameworks, regulations, human resource capacity in social work, and oversight of child protection service providers are in place and strengthened.

The logic that has been applied is that:

*If* there is strengthened political commitment and national capacity to legislate, plan and budget for quality child protection systems; *and* child protection services are developed and promoted, including in emergency situations and with NSAs; *and* communities are aware and engaged in the protection of their children and adolescents;

*then* the Myanmar government will commit further resources to underfunded Ministries and Departments, particularly in the area of social work; *and* engage in policy and legislative changes to support quality child protection systems and services, including in emergencies; *and, in turn*, communities will seek out and utilize these services and hold service providers accountable.

Increasing the number of children reached by social welfare systems and child protection requires work on multiple, interdependent levels. For example, progressive legislation and policies must be matched by resources made available to accountable stakeholders to implement at decentralized level; *and* increased social welfare services and number of social workers at the decentralized level must be matched by awareness and confidence of communities and children to use these services and
Table 1: Assumptions, Risks and Mitigation Measures as related to outcome and expected change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assumption (A):</th>
<th>Risks (R) and Mitigation Measures (M):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome:</strong> children in need of support, care and protection are identified by and have access to public, social welfare systems</td>
<td><strong>R:</strong> Government backslides on commitments to the CRC. Discriminatory legislation and/or policies restrict access for all children in Myanmar to social welfare systems. <strong>M:</strong> Ensure appropriate level advocacy (through deliberate planning) at opportune times, including in the advancement of the Child Law and other relevant legislation and polices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1: The Government and other key actors recognise that all children have the right to be protected from violence, abuse, exploitation and neglect</td>
<td><strong>R:</strong> Investments and scale up are slow, leading to lack of coverage for children <strong>M:</strong> Take steps to increase the capacity of government to advocate internally for more investment, including through leveraging the social protection strategy and other relevant government commitments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2: The Government are willing and able to invest in legislative and policy reform on protection of children, including post-election</td>
<td><strong>R:</strong> The Government and external actors decrease their attention and investment in child protection, including in emergencies <strong>M:</strong> Promote a coherent vision of child protection with government and external partners, and ensure the emergency response is not isolated from broader child protection ‘development’ investments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3: The Government and the international community are willing and able to make meaningful financial investments in child protection, including in emergencies</td>
<td><strong>R:</strong> Efforts to change social behaviours are not appropriate to the context and risk undermining effective interventions at different levels <strong>M:</strong> Social behaviour change work is embedded in clear analysis and consultation with multiple stakeholders to ensure maximum impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4: Efforts to change social behaviours are appropriate to Myanmar’s rapidly changing context and are not undermined</td>
<td><strong>R:</strong> Efforts to change social behaviours are not appropriate to the context and risk undermining effective interventions at different levels <strong>M:</strong> Social behaviour change work is embedded in clear analysis and consultation with multiple stakeholders to ensure maximum impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Outputs and interim results

The outcome will be achieved through realising **five outputs** targeting the types of change we want to see happen across selected thematic areas. These five outputs are linked to a set of interim results.

**Output 1:** Strengthened policy and programmatic decisions on alternative care for children – supported by increased data and knowledge of the situation of children in institutional care in Myanmar and policies and legislation which promote prevention of family separation and family based alternatives to orphanage care.

**Output 2:** Increased social welfare system capacity to respond to child protection cases – supported by knowledge and key skills of an increasing number of social work case managers, and advocacy for increased government and donor focus on the needs of the child protection / social welfare sector.

**Output 3:** Strengthened legislative and institutional capacity to provide adequate care to children in contact with the law – supported by coordinated and inclusive policies, legislation, plans and capacity building that reflect international standards.
**Output 4:** Increase efforts to protect children from exploitation, including child labour, trafficking and sexual exploitation – supported by increased capacity and coordination among actors, including government and the private sector.

**Output 5:** Implementation of national and international standards to prevent and respond to grave violations and contribute to ongoing peacebuilding, including in emergencies – supported by approaches to increase harmonization across a broad range of stakeholders, and engagement with communities (including adolescents) on awareness of child protection risks and proactive engagement to mitigate those risks.

The underlying logic is that:

*If* UNICEF Child Protection focuses on (2) increasing the capacity of the social welfare system to respond to child protection cases and this is supported by (3) strengthened legislation and institutional capacity within the justice sector to better support children as victims, witnesses and perpetrators; and if these efforts are supported by (1) stronger policy and programming around alternative care so that children are not moved from hazardous situations into dangerous orphanage care;

*then* the enabling environment will promote better protection for children. This will be matched by the supply of services delivered by institutions and service providers that have the knowledge, skills and resources to prevent and respond to key child protection concerns in an appropriate way that serves the best interests of children.

*AND* if the above is coupled with specific interventions 4) to protect children from commercial sexual exploitation, trafficking and the worst forms of child labour, and if in emergencies and armed conflict (5) there is a consistent implementation of international standards, including increased responsibility of duty bearers;

*then* persistent and emerging child protection issues will be targeted. This will be supported by work in emergency and armed conflict to bridge both international obligations and those of national duty bearers, as well as national systems.

Our cross cutting priorities – adolescence, emergencies, gender and resilience – are considered across all interventions because we believe these are key to ensuring that all children in need of care and support are able to access public social welfare systems, including in the context of emergencies. Ongoing work to engage with NSAs is foundational to this to ensure the protection of all children in Myanmar. Collaboration with other sectors ensures this sensitive and important work remains a priority for UNICEF.

*Table 2: Assumptions, Risks and Mitigation Measures as related to the 5 core outputs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assumption (A):</th>
<th>Risks (R) and Mitigation Measures (M):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 1:</strong> Strengthened policy and programmatic decisions on alternative care for children.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **A1:** Government support and approval to access residential care facilities for further research. | **R:** Approval to access residential facilities denied.  
**M:** Regular contact with the Ministry to ensure research remains a priority; continued advocacy. |
| **A2:** Government follows through with intentions to support studies. | **R:** Government reneges on commitment to support studies into institutional care.  
**M:** Continued advocacy. |
Output 2: Increased social welfare system capacity to respond to child protection cases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A1. Government supports expansion of social welfare system with adequate human resources.</th>
<th>R: Lack of capacity of assigned DSW Case Managers. Activities still don’t progress due to capacity; ground work pre-election becomes irrelevant with change of government, including costing exercises.</th>
<th>M: Enhancing existing plan on Training &amp; Supervision.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A2: Government makes social workers available for training, assigns internal trainers and allocates physical space.</td>
<td>R: Government does not incorporate training into their regular curricula.</td>
<td>M: Government is fully involved in the development of the curricula to help ensure ownership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3. Training packages are comprehensive, learning is retained and applied in practice.</td>
<td>R: Significant gaps in training package; Case managers receive an overload of information.</td>
<td>M: Test and evaluate initial training and modify based on feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R: Training is not sustainable; Learning is not retained and/or applied; Other factors make it difficult for case managers to apply learning – cultural relevance, manager support.</td>
<td>M: Ensure conditions are in place for institutionalization of training programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4. Information Management Systems are used by partners routinely and effectively and case information is reflective of the situation.</td>
<td>R: IMS are not used routinely and/or effectively and equipment is not maintained; IMS is not functional in reality; Low government buy-in to respond to trends;</td>
<td>M: Adequate training on use of the IMS. Contracting of IT company to provide ongoing support and maintenance to the IMS systems. Continued advocacy on the important of information management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5. Awareness raising messages are effectively targeted and understood and these are appropriate for Myanmar.</td>
<td>R: Changes in policies and plans are not considered appropriate by Myanmar people; Family separation remains a sensitive topic and messaging is not handled effectively; Media backlash counters awareness raising activities.</td>
<td>M: Adequate research and consultation on awareness raising approach/materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R: Expectations on what the CP social welfare system can do are not managed effectively.</td>
<td>M: Monitoring awareness raising activities and ensuring partners receive appropriate support/resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6. Government and stakeholders are interested in and support the development of the National Child Protection Policy.</td>
<td>R: Little commitment and support from Government and stakeholders.</td>
<td>M: Ensuring Government is fully involved in each stage of the process and targeted Ministries to be advocated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Output 3: Strengthened legislative and institutional capacity to provide adequate care and protection to children in contact with the law.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A1: DSW is in a position to strongly advocate for the child law amendments and is supported by line Ministries, Parliament and the President’s Office.</th>
<th>R: Child Law amendments fall below International Standards through the Government and Parliamentary approval process.</th>
<th>M: UNICEF will offer assistance to the key department responsible for development of the draft law (DSW) in facilitating meetings with other government ministries. UNICEF will also explore opportunities to work with the Parliament to build the capacity of relevant committee members on issues related to legislative reform concerning children.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R: Training remains limited and superficial.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2: Ongoing collaboration with the supreme courts will continue and two days in the training programme will be allocated to child protection.</td>
<td>M. UNICEF will continue advocating with the Supreme Court to develop extensive training materials on justice for children and institutionalize the trainings. UNICEF will collaborate with other UN agencies and development partners to ensure sustainability of trainings and breadth of content.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3: Specialised procedures in the justice system and strengthened legislation will increase quality services and lead to better treatment of children in contact with the law in Myanmar.</td>
<td>R. Specialisation and child friendly taskforces are formally created but not adequately trained – quality is not improved; No use of tools; Policy decision may be made but not be implemented in practice.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Capacity building with members of the justice system to ensure implementation of policies and best practice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4. Specialisation within the justice sector is appropriate to Myanmar context and learnings are applied in practice.</td>
<td>R. Training is not sustainable and are not applied to practice; Internal activities are not institutionalized; Lack of management support for implementation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Research and consultation in development of specialization and advocacy approach. Provide support and technical guidance to ensure activities are institutionalized.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Output 4:** Increased efforts to protect children from exploitation including child labour, trafficking and the commercial sexual exploitation of children.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A1: Government and stakeholders agree that the redrafting of the rules and the procedures has to take place as a priority for the next 2 years.</th>
<th>R: Regardless if amendment of Anti-Trafficking in Persons Law (ATIP) is deemed a priority the drafting of the Rules and Procedures still may be delayed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M: UNICEF will closely monitor the evolution of priorities to ensure that contributions are made to ongoing legislative processes. UNICEF will contribute to the ATIP law review, and will further advocate for developing Rules and Procedures after the law is amended.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M: UNICEF will closely monitor the evolution of priorities to be able to swiftly react. Field office staff will increase involvement to support local officials of concerned departments to operationalize their responsibilities even if Rules and Procedures are not developed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A2: Active participation and advocacy leads to increased awareness, sharing of information and harmonised approach among the CP sector.</th>
<th>R. No buy-in, no interest, no action by other members of working groups; Low and/or passive participation, no sharing of information amongst members; A harmonised approach agreed on paper but no action to implement; Political considerations overlooked; Coordination messages blocked within working group; Sensitive issues means sharing of information is restricted.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Awareness of prioritization and different agendas. Continued advocacy and participation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A3: Increasing awareness and sharing information will help build trust and minimise the risk of exploitation – i.e. prevalence of child labour in the formal sector is a result of lack of awareness of laws.</th>
<th>R. Increased awareness and demand but there is no response – trust is broken by the system failing to respond; Entitlements are known but justice system capacity and/or interests do not match demand.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Matching efforts in building capacity within the justice system.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A4: Communities able to report child protection concerns and institutions have capacity to enforce consequence on perpetrators.</th>
<th>R. Communities lack of trust in institutions result in a lack of reporting.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Awareness raising amongst communities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Government lack of interest in implementation of laws and as a result there remains no consequence for breaking laws.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Building the capacity of the institutions and systems to be able to respond to violation of law/ demand for services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Output 5: National and international standards are implemented to prevent and respond to grave violations against children as per UNSC Resolutions 1612/1882 and to contribute to on-going peace building, including responding to emergencies.

**A1:** Children associated with armed conflict included in peace process discussions and NSA leadership engaged.

- **R.** NSA leadership not available due to a lack of comprehensive ceasefire agreement.
- **M.** Maintain contact with social wings and liaison offices of NSAs on programmatic issues and capacity-strengthening opportunities to ensure CAAC issues are covered in broader ceasefire agreements and peace negotiations.
- **R.** Children associated with armed conflict not included in broader ceasefire agreements and peace negotiations.
- **M.** Continued advocacy with Government and NSA to ensure the interests and needs of CAAC are included in ceasefire agreements and peace negotiations.

**A2:** Monthly meeting with Tatmadaw continues to review lists of suspected minors and UNICEF able to advocate for their immediate release.

- **R.** Tatmadaw does not self-identify suspected minors within their ranks.
- **M.** Work-plan developed with Tatmadaw with specific indicators to measure their performance on self-identification and be able to advocate with objective data.

**A3:** Myanmar is regarded as an emergency situation and humanitarian funds continue to flow.

- **R.** Myanmar is considered less and less an emergency context which makes humanitarian fundraising difficult; advocacy efforts are not perceived as neutral e.g. marking and fencing mines is not unbiased activity.
- **M.** Increased investment in building resilience as complementary to humanitarian response.
- **R.** Availability of data from government controlled areas vs non-government controlled e.g. MRM reporting – distorts donors funding. Focus remains only on Gov. controlled areas.
- **M.** Continued advocacy with donor community to ensure the needs of children affected by emergencies in non-government controlled areas are considered in funding decisions.

**A4:** Link between disability and Mine Victims Assistance (MVA) is understood and evident in policy and planning.

- **R.** DSW counterpart is weak; Link between disability and MVA is not made explicit in social protection strategy.
- **M.** Continued advocacy through dialogue with government on the importance of making the link between disability and MVA explicit.

**A5:** Awareness of dangers - such as mine risk or underage recruitment - will reduce rates.

- **R.** Recruitment is linked to other issues, such as lack of alternatives to income, and these issues remain unaddressed.
- **M.** Other issues are addressed through broader programming.
- **R.** MRE efforts do not work as it is difficult for community mobilisers to speak out due to fear of targeting/retaliation; Lack of enabling environment and/or services means an educated community will be unable to access services leading to a rise in tensions.
- **M.** Behaviour change needs to be enabled by changes in policy and increase in institutional capacity to be able to respond.

**A6:** Institutional culture of the Tatmadaw means that top down directives are followed and the implementation of the Joint Action Plan (JAP) is respected as institutional priority.

- **R.** Elections equal a loss of investment as ministerial representation changes and advocacy needs to start again; The vertical nature of government structures continue to inhibit progress – lack of communication between national and state/region level; Directives to apply learning to practice are not followed.
- **M.** Continued advocacy and monitoring with government and Tatmadaw to ensure directives from national level are responded to at the state/region level.
A7. UNICEF able to continue to mobilise all CTFMR (Country Taskforce for Monitoring and Reporting on Grave Violations) members to support exercise.

R: Shortage of human resources and funding to continue monitoring efforts.

M: Funding gaps clearly highlighted and shared with UNICEF HQ for support on funding on UNICEF core mandate + mobilizing non-emergency CP staff to join monitoring missions; and bi-laterals in country are engaged for both financial and political support.

R. Limited access to military facilities.

M: Coordinated advocacy efforts continue to ensure Government and Tatmadaw grant access to CTFMR as per JAP.

A8. Field level activities support established coordination mechanisms and are adequately resourced.

R: No access to affected populations at field level to establish coordination mechanisms and lack of human resources at the field level.

M: Ensure inclusion and full participation of national capacity (government stakeholders and local NGOs) in coordination mechanisms.

D. Implementation strategies and targets of change

Implementation strategies and targets of change include:

1. **Building Evidence** – including on the numbers and situation of children living in institutional care, the impacts of migration on children, and the effectiveness of social work case management on child protection outcomes. This is done by working with academics and policy/advocacy specialists to generate evidence, and targets key decision makers in Government at the policy level.

2. **Policy Dialogue and Advocacy** – targeted assistance to government on the development of relevant legislation and policies; and the diplomatic and donor community to ensure political and financial support for key protection issues.

3. **Capacity Development** – including training support to key actors in the system – judges, police, social work case managers, NGOs, tourism sector, and other private sector actors.

4. **Social Behaviour Change** – focuses on raising awareness at the community level around key child protection risks, including emerging threats; and systematic engagement with young people and adolescents.

5. **Coordination and Partnerships** – targeting inter-ministerial platforms and working groups, donors, and NGOs.

Refer to annexes under section ‘E’ for detail on these implementation strategies and targets of change as they relate to the core areas of work for UNICEF’s child protection program.
Formative Evaluation of UNICEF’s Strategy and Approach to Child Protection Systems Building

Children in need of support and care are identified by and have access to public social welfare systems

And the change we want to see

- Strengthened policy and programmatic decisions on alternative care for children
- Increased social welfare system capacity to respond to child protection cases
- Strengthened legislative and institutional capacity to provide adequate care to children in contact with the law
- Increased efforts to protect children from exploitation, including child labour, trafficking and sexual exploitation of children
- National and international standards implemented to prevent and respond to grave violations and contribute to ongoing peacebuilding, including responding to emergencies

What would make a difference?

- Weak legislation
- Limited investment
- Poor policy
- Low capacity
- Limited awareness
- Weak networks
- Harmful social practices and beliefs

Children in need of care and support are not identified by and/or can not access the public social welfare system
**ANNEX 7: ETHICAL PROTOCOL**

The evaluation will be guided by Coram International’s Ethical Guidelines for Research. Prior to data collection taking place, the Director of International Programmes and Research, Professor Carolyn Hamilton, must approve the evaluation methodology, tools and ethical protocol. Ethical approval must also be obtained from UNICEF Myanmar.

**How will evaluators be recruited and trained?**
The Project’s Lead Evaluators (Carolyn Hamilton, Kara Apland and Elizabeth Yarrow) have had training and extensive experience carrying out evaluation with diverse groups of children, young people and adults, and are suitably qualified. These evaluators will be responsible for ensuring that the ethical protocol is followed and for addressing any ethical concerns or issues that may arise during the course of the study. National evaluators who have significant experience working with children have also been selected to assist with data collection.

All evaluators will undergo an in-depth training session prior to the data collection phase. This training will include: an introduction to the evaluation methods to be used in the evaluation, the data collection tools, and the specific ethical and child protection considerations and procedures that evaluators will need to take into consideration and respect while carrying out the evaluation.

**Is informed consent required from all participants in the evaluation?**
Yes, as the study involves carrying out data collection from persons, it is essential that all respondents give their voluntary and informed consent to participate in the study.

Evaluators will explain to participants in clear, age-appropriate language that participants are not required to participate in the evaluation, and that they may stop participating in the evaluation at any time. Evaluators will carefully explain that refusal to participate will not result in any negative consequences. Evaluators will obtain oral consent from participants before beginning all interviews.

Consent forms will not be used in this study as they may appear ‘official’ and ‘intimidating’. Furthermore, we cannot assume that all participants, particularly children will have a sufficient level of literacy to understand a written consent form. Therefore, oral consent will be obtained from each participant, including children. In the case that the child is under the age of 16 years, oral consent will also be required from the child’s parents. At the beginning of each interview/ focus group, evaluators will explain the purpose of the evaluation in accessible and child appropriate language. Evaluators will also ask children to repeat back information about the evaluation, to ensure that children have understood what they are consenting to.

**Does the evaluation involve vulnerable populations? And if so, how will ethical issues arising out of this be addressed?**
Yes, the evaluation will involve speaking with children aged 10-18 years; as well as persons who may have been victims of domestic violence, forced marriage and/or other rights abuses.

The evaluation will employ the principle of ‘best interests of the child’, in which the welfare and best interests of the participants will be the primary consideration in methodology design and data collection. All evaluation will be guided by the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child,
in particular Art. 3.1 which states: “In all actions concerning children, whether undertaken by public or private social welfare institutions, courts or legislative bodies, the best interests of the child shall be a primary consideration.”

Particular care will be taken to ensure that questions are asked sensitively and in a child-friendly, manner that is appropriate to the age, gender, ethnicity and social background of the participants. Evaluators will speak with participants in their local language. Clear language will be used which avoids victimisation, blame and judgement. Where it is clear that the interview is having a negative effect on a participant, the interview will be stopped.

Children will be provided with the opportunity to participate in data collection with a trusted adult or friend if this would make them feel more at ease. Evaluators will identify staff at institutions (e.g. schools, community groups, detention centre staff) that are available to accompany participants, if requested.

Interviews may cover particularly sensitive or traumatic material, and it is important to ensure that participants feel empowered and not solely like victims. Interviews will finish on a ‘positive or empowering note’ (e.g. through asking questions about what would improve the situation of children in the relevant study sample). This will help to ensure that participants do not leave the interview focusing on past experiences of abuse. Where participants reveal past experiences of violence or abuse, evaluators will convey empathy, but will not show shock or anger, as this can be harmful to children who have experienced violence.

During the data collection process, participants may disclose information that raises child protections concerns (i.e. information indicating that they are currently at risk of or are experiencing violence, exploitation or abuse). Prior to the data collection taking place, evaluators will be provided with copies of the child protection policies and procedures of each institution from which participants are recruited, if relevant (i.e. schools, community groups, detention facilities) and should familiarise themselves child protection referral mechanisms and child protection focal points. Evaluators will also be trained on UNICEF’s child protection procedures. In the event that the child interviewee reveals that they are at high risk of ongoing or immediate harm, or discloses that other children are at high risk of ongoing or immediate harm, the evaluator will prioritise obtaining the child's informed consent to report this information to the appropriate professional as set out in the child protection policy, or, in the absence of such a policy, the person with authority and professional capacity to respond. If the child declines, the evaluator will consult with an appropriate the designated person under the local UNICEF Child Protection Policy, as well as the lead evaluator and other key persons in the evaluation team (on a need to know basis), concerning the appropriate course of action in line with the child’s best interests. If a decision is made to report this information to the designated professional, the child interviewee is carefully informed of this decision and kept informed of any other key stages in the reporting and response process.

**How will cultural appropriateness/sensitivity be determined and ensured?**

The methodology and data collection tools will be reviewed by the evaluation management team and evaluation reference group. In addition, all data collection tools will be subject to an initial pilot, to identify any potential issues and concerns to be addressed before the data collection phase takes place.
Is it likely that participants will be misinformed about the purpose of the evaluation?
The evaluators will fully explain the nature and purpose of the evaluation. However, because the evaluation has been commissioned by UNICEF, participants may have expectations of being provided direct or specific assistance as a result of the evaluation. Evaluators will be advised and trained on how to explain the purpose of the evaluation to avoid raising expectations that they will be unable to fulfil.

Will participants be given anonymity and how will this be ensured?
Yes, all participation in the evaluation will be on an anonymous basis. The identity of all evaluation participants will be kept confidential throughout the process of data collection as well as in the analysis and writing up study findings. The following measures will be used to ensure anonymity:

- Interviews will take place in a secure, private location (such as a separate room or corner or outside space) which ensures that the participant’s answers are not overheard;
- Evaluators will not record the name of participants and will ensure that names are not recorded on any documents containing collected data, including on transcripts of interviews and focus group discussions;
- Evaluators will delete electronic records of data from personal, unprotected computers;
- Coram International will store all electronic data on a secure, locked server, to which persons who are not employed by Coram cannot gain access. All hard copies of data will be destroyed after the completion of the contract with UNICEF Myanmar. Electronic copies will be retained for future reference on the same secure, locked server. All employees of the Coram International, including volunteers and interns, receive a criminal record check before employment commences.
- Evaluation findings will be presented in such a way so as to ensure that individuals are not able to be identified; except in the case that the respondent is a public official who is willing to give consent to the recording of their title and position, and that this is felt to be important for the evaluation.

All participants will be informed of their rights to anonymity and confidentiality throughout the evaluation process. Participants should be informed where it is possible that their confidentiality will be compromised. This may occur where, in a particular, named setting, the background information relating to a participant may make it possible for them to be identified even where they are not named.

How will the physical safety and well-being of evaluators and participants be ensured?
Evaluators will receive a security briefing from the relevant UNICEF office, before travel to field locations; and will be required to travel in pairs or larger groups.

All evaluators will be required to produce a ‘certificate of good conduct’/ police clearance/ criminal record check or equivalent before commencing field evaluation.

---

27 Where desirable and appropriate, and on a strictly voluntary basis, public officials may consent to the recording of their ‘title’ or ‘position’ where this is thought to add value to the evaluation findings.
## ANNEX 8: SAMPLE OF TOWNSHIPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Township</th>
<th>Type of Programme</th>
<th>Geographic Location</th>
<th>Dominant Ethnicities/ Religions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tanintharyi</td>
<td>Dawei</td>
<td>DSW + NGO</td>
<td>South</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kachin</td>
<td>Myitkyina</td>
<td>DSW + NGO</td>
<td>North East</td>
<td>Kachin, Christian, Animist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayin State</td>
<td>Hpa’ An</td>
<td>DSW + NGO</td>
<td>South East</td>
<td>Karen, Buddhist, Christian, Animist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandalay Region</td>
<td>Mahauungmyay</td>
<td>DSW + NGO</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>Bamar, Buddhist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pyi Gyi Tagon</td>
<td>No case management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nyaung-U</td>
<td>DSW + NGO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Myinchan</td>
<td>DSW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon State</td>
<td>Mawlamyine</td>
<td>DSW + NGO</td>
<td>South East</td>
<td>Mon, Buddhist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rakhine</td>
<td>Sittway</td>
<td>DSW + NGO</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>Rakhine, Buddhist/ Rohingya, Muslim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shan State</td>
<td>Taunggyi</td>
<td>DSW + NGO</td>
<td>North East</td>
<td>Bamar, Shan, Pao Buddhist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Carolyn Hamilton is Professor Emeritus of Law at the University of Essex, a Fellow of the Human Rights Centre and Director of Coram International. She is an internationally known child rights lawyer who has published widely on issues of children’s rights and child law. She was the senior legal adviser for the Children’s Commissioner in the UK and the Families and Children Commissioner for the Legal Services Commission. She was, for many years, a practising barrister, taking cases at all levels of UK courts and in the European Court of Human Rights for children.

Elizabeth Yarrow is a Senior Researcher at Coram International. She has an LLM in International Human Rights Law (distinction) and a BA CANTAB in Social and Political Science (Hons). Liz has significant post-graduate and professional training in applied research methods, including in advanced evaluation, multivariate analysis, sampling and weighting, qualitative methods, and others; and has provided research consultancy services for UN agencies, (I)NGOs and governments in 20 countries across the world. Liz has particular experience in South East Asia, having worked for UNICEF and UN Women in Thailand, Lao PDR, Cambodia, Myanmar, Indonesia, Timor Leste, and Vietnam.

Kara Apland is a Senior Researcher at Coram International. Kara holds an MSc in Human Rights Law and Sociology (distinction) from the London School of Economics and Political Science and a BA in Political Science and Economics (honours) from Brown University. Kara has conducted applied social and legal research evaluations and assessments, in over 15 countries around the world. Kara specialises in the field of children’s rights, and has particular expertise in the thematic areas of child protection and systems reform. Before joining Coram International, Kara completed research fellowships from Brown University and Yale Law School.

Si Si Myint is an experienced UNICEF consultant and qualitative researcher. She holds a M.Ed (Comparative Studies), a B. Ed (Chemistry) and D.C.Sc (Computer Science). Si Si has excellent knowledge of children’s issues in Myanmar, including: migration, violence against children, gender-based violence, IDPs, emergency aid, the recruitment and use of child in armed forces and groups, child development, and education. She has previously worked as a child protection consultant for UNICEF, and the Department for Social Welfare, and she is a former Assistant Director in the Department of Myanmar Education Research Bureau with whom she has carried out numerous research projects.

Ku Ku Naw is a highly experienced consultant with 17 years’ experience in the field of child rights. She has a Master of Public Health (MPH) from Mahidol University, Thailand and Bachelor of Science (B.Sc.) in Mathematics from Yangon University. Ku Ku has undertaken a series of research, evaluation and project management roles since 1999, particularly for Save the Children, and has an in-depth knowledge and understanding of a range of child rights thematic issues in Myanmar including child protection, trafficking, sexual abuse and exploitation, conflict resolution, access to sexual and reproductive health services, child labour, child soldiers, and child participation.
ANNEX 10: BIBLIOGRAPHY

Data
- Child Protection Awareness Raising as of 2014
- Child Protection Awareness Meeting Times 2010-2013
- Case Management Interim Summary Report Q1 2016
- Census Data: Age Group Estimates, by Case Management Townships
- Child Population in Case Management Townships
- CBCP Number of Child Protection Cases (2009-2014)
- Child Protection Cases (2009-2014)
- Child Protection Cases (2009-2014) as of December
- Child Protection Cases (2009-2014), by year
- CPCM Dashboard December 2015
- Coram, Primary data
- Data on Six Grave Violations (MRM) 2007-2016
- Demography Information as of 2011
- DSW Statutory Case Summary in 2015 (July – December)
- List of 10 new Townships Expansion, 2016
- List of DSW Case Management Townships, January 2016
- List of Juvenile Cases, data from the Supreme Court, 2013
- Map of DSW Case Management Townships, April 2016
- Myanmar, Child Trafficking Snapshot, 2014
- Reported Trafficking Cases as of 2015
- TCRC Meeting in Child Protection System Township 2010-2014
- Township Population (2011)

Evaluation Guidelines and Standards
- UN Inter-Agency Resource Pack on Research, Monitoring and Evaluation in Communication for Development, February 2011
- UNEG Code of Conduct, March 2008
- UNEG Ethical Guidelines, March 2008
- UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports, 2010
- UNICEF Evaluation Policy, April 2013
- UNICEF, How to design and manage equity-focused evaluations
- UNICEF Procedure for Ethical Standards in Research, Evaluation, Data Collection and Analysis, April 2015
- UNICEF Style Book 2014
- UNICEF-adapted UNEG Evaluation Reports Standards, July 2010
- World Bank Institute, Guide to Evaluating Capacity Development Results, 2012

National Law and Policy
- Anti-Trafficking in Persons Law, September 2005
- Child Law 1993 (English)
- Child Law Consultation, Good Practices, 2015
- Child Law Review, proposed amendments
Formative Evaluation of UNICEF’s Strategy and Approach to Child Protection Systems Building

- Child Law Rules 2001
- Child Protection Law (draft)
- Code of Criminal Procedure 1898 (India Act V)
- Legal Aid Law, January 2016 (unofficial translation)
- Majority Act 1875 (India Act IX)
- Myanmar Citizenship Act 1982
- Myanmar Constitution 2008
- Myanmar Five-Year National Plan of Action to Combat Human Trafficking, 2014
- Myanmar Penal Code 1860 (India Act XLV)
- Myanmar, People’s Military Service Law 2010
- Prisons Act 1894 (India Act IX) (extract)
- Succession Act (extract)
- UNICEF Briefing paper on proposed amendments to the Child Law, 2012
- UNICEF, Preventing the Spread of Orphanages in Myanmar, White Paper (draft)

International Law
- UN Convention on the Rights of the Child
- UN Committee on the Rights of the Child (CRC), UN Committee on the Rights of the Child: Concluding Observations: Myanmar, CRC/C/MMR/CO/3-4, 14 March 2012

Research Papers and Reports
- Between Fear and Hope: Challenges and Opportunities for Strengthening Rule of Law and Access to Justice in Myanmar, September 2014
- Child Protection Case Management Baseline Report, January 2015
- Nixon, Joelene, Chit Saw, Aung Lynn and Arnold, State and Region: Governments in Myanmar, September 2013
- Raoul Wallenberg Institute, A Measure of Last Resort? The Current Status of Juvenile Justice in ASEAN Member States, 2015
- UNDP Myanmar, Bridges to Justice: Rule of Law Centers for Myanmar, March 2014
- UNICEF, Ending the recruitment and use of children by armed forces and non-state armed groups, 2014
- UNICEF, Legal Protection from Violence: Analysis of Domestic Laws Related to Violence against Children in ASEAN Member States, 2015
- UNICEF Myanmar, Justice for Children in Myanmar: Brief situation overview and discussion of ways forward, February 2014
• UNICEF, *New Vision for Children in Myanmar: Using recent data to analyse the situation of children and what it means for Myanmar*
• UNICEF, UNHCR, *Child rights and protection training for Border Guard Police*, January 2016

**Evaluations**
• Banks, Cyndi Dr ‘An Evaluation of “Strengthening Juvenile Justice in Myanmar”’, August 2011
• Xinxin Yang, Veloso, Diaz, Aldaba and Ariston, *Evaluation of the Intervention and Rehabilitation Program in Residential Facilities and Diversion Programs for Children in Conflict with the Law*, June 2015

**Theory of Change**
• Annex 1 – Child Care and Protection
• Annex 2 – Justice for Children
• Annex 3 – CP in Emergencies and CAAC
• Child Protection TOC Narrative
• TOC Diagram

**Internal reviews**
• Child Protection Mid-year Review, 2014
• Child Protection Section Retreat, August 2013
• Child Protection Section Retreat, July 2013
• Child Protection Section Retreat, October 2013
• Draft MTR Report (multiple versions)
• Where we go from here

**Strategies and Work Plans**
• Alternative Care Strategy, March 2014
• Alternative Care White Paper (English)
• Annual Work Plan 2015
• Briefing note on National Social Protection Strategy
• Child Protection Myanmar, 2014 Detailed Work Plan
• Child Protection Sub-Sector Strategy Kachin and Northern Shan 2014-2015
• Child Protection Sub-Sector Strategy Rakhine 2014-2015
• Child Protection Work Plan 2016-2017
• CPIE Sub-Section – 2014 Detailed Work plan, 2014
• Kachin CPSS Strategy
• Kachin CPSS Work Plan, September 2014
• Monthly Plan, Justice for Children, 2014
• Myanmar National Social Protection Strategic Plan, December 2014
• Myanmar, National Social Protection Strategy 2015 Briefing Note
• Rakhine CPSS Strategy
• Rakhine CPSS Workplan, March 2015
• The Supreme Court of the Union, ‘Advancing Justice Together: Judiciary Strategic Plan (2015-2017)
• UNICEF, Strategic Plan, Promoting Family Based Care Alternative Care for Children in Myanmar (draft)
Results and Monitoring Matrices
- Results Matrix 2016-2017 (RAM+)
- Result Matrix (2014)
- Result Matrix (2011)
- Simple Results Matrix 2016-2017 for RAM
- UNICEF Myanmar, Child Protection Monitoring Matrix, Kachin State, October 2014
- UNICEF Myanmar, Child Protection Monitoring Matrix, Kachin State, September 2014
- UNICEF Myanmar, Child Protection Monitoring Matrix, Rakhine State, October 2015
- UNICEF Myanmar, Child Protection Monitoring Matrix, Rakhine State, September 2015
- UNICEF Myanmar, Child Protection Monitoring Matrix, Rakhine State, August 2015
- UNICEF Myanmar, Child Protection Monitoring Matrix, Rakhine State, April 2015
- UNICEF Myanmar, Child Protection Monitoring Matrix, Rakhine State, October 2014

Monitoring Report – Child Protection Officer
- Adolescent Program, Loikaw, September 2015
- Case Study: DSW’s role in the CM System, September 2015
- Case Study: Systems, Taunggyi, September 2015
- Edits, Child Protection Guidance Note for UNICEF Field Staff, September 2015
- Edits, Child Protection Monitoring Questions, September 2015
- Report, Field Monitoring Tool, September 2015
- Report, Information Management, Loikaw, September 2015
- Report, Information Management, Taunggyi, September 2015
- Trip Report Summary, Loikaw, September 2015
- Trip Report Summary, Taunggyi, September 2015

Presentations
- PowerPoint Presentation, Case Management Review
- PowerPoint Presentation, CPIE and CAAC
- PowerPoint Presentation, Child Protection in Emergency
- PowerPoint Presentation, Technical Supervision in Case Management

Country Programme Documents
- What do we what to see for children (2015)
- MTR Report

Workshops
- Orientation Workshop on Case Management System to DSW State/Region Directors, April 2014
- Workshop summary sheet, April 2014

**Mine Risk Working Group and related documents**
- Mine Action Portfolio Template (Country Background), Myanmar Overview, 2015
- Mine Risk Working Group, National Meeting, October 2015
- Portfolio of Mine Action Projects: Myanmar 2016 Summary Graphs

**Case Management**
- Case Manager Township Child Populations as of 2011
- Case Management Incident Report Form, March 2015
- Case Management Mechanism, Guideline for Establishing Case Management Mechanism in DSWs Expansionary Townships, September 2014
- Case Management Orientation Summary, Bago, July 2015
- Case Management Orientation Summary, Dawei, June 2015
- Case Management Orientation Summary, Hakha, June 2015
- Case Management Orientation Summary, Loikaw, June 2015
- Case Management Training Manual Outline
- Client Satisfaction Survey Template
- Concept Note, Case Management Information Management System
- Dissemination Workshop, Brief Concept Note: The Standard Operating Procedures of the Case Management System, November 2015 (draft)
- Next Steps for Continued Roll-Out of the Case Management System, July 2015 (draft)
- Save the Children, Child Protection Case Management Minimum Standards Checklist, 2015
- Save the Children, Child Protection Case Management Monthly Dashboard, December 2015
- Save the Children, Child Protection Case Management Quality of Services Data Analysis, 2016
- SOP on Case Management, March 2015
- UNICEF, Save the Children, Addendum to Programme Cooperation Agreement, August 2014-2015
- UNICEF, Save the Children, ‘Child Protection Case Management in Myanmar’

**Adolescent Engagement**
- Adolescent Assessment
- Annex 1 – Narrative
- CP Sub-Sector Adolescent Engagement Initiative April 2015
- Understanding Adolescent Participation
- UNICEF, ActionAid, Adolescent engagement in Myanmar, 2015-2017
• UNICEF Concept Note – Adolescent Engagement, July 2015
• UNICEF Funding Proposal Australia – Adolescent Engagement, 2012
• UNICEF Myanmar – Strategic Engagement with Adolescents (internal)

**Key Notes**
• Key Notes, Administration of Juvenile Justice, January 2014
• Key Notes, Child Labour, 2014
• Key Notes, Ending Violence Against Children, 2014
• Key Notes, Ending Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children, 2014
• Key Notes, Ending Child Trafficking, 2014
• Key Notes, Preventing and Responding to Children Living and/or Working on the Street, 2014
• Key Notes, Provision of Adequate and Responsible Care for Children

**Miscellaneous**
• Assessment Paper, Current Situation of Children in Residential Care Facilities in Myanmar (draft)
• Brief – Engagement with NSAs (July 2015)
• Brief – MRM (July 2015)
• CAAC Forms 2013
• Child Protection Guidance Note on Monitoring
• Child Protection Monitoring Questions
• Concept Paper on strategic engagement among DSW UNICEF CP and NGO partners
• Country Task Force Monitoring and Reporting Mechanism, Brief
• CPIE Sub-Section – 2014 Terms of Reference, 2014
• DRC Kachin Partner Monitoring, August 2014
• Impact Assessment of EC Project on CAAC
• J4C Brief UNICEF Myanmar, February 2014 (draft)
• National Humanitarian Child Protection Sub-Section, Terms of Reference, 2014
• Note for the Record Shifting Context NGOs, February 2014
• PCA Program Doc, Family Based Alternatives for Children in Need of Care and Protection, August 2015
• Overview of Coordination Structures, July 2014
• Proposed TCRC Function, Draft for Review, November 2014
• Report on NPT Meeting 12-13 June 2014
• TOR Myanmar CP Sub-Sector 2014
• UNICEF, Child Protection Systems Building to Education Section, 2014
• UNICEF, Concept Paper: Strategic Engagement Among DSW, UNICEF and NGO Partners on Child Protection Interventions in Expansionary Townships
• UNICEF, General Recommendations on Action Against Child Labour, 2015
• UNICEF, Myanmar Red Cross Society, Strengthening Child Protection System for Protection of Vulnerable Children through Community Awareness Raising, August 2014-2015
• UNICEF, Myanmar Red Cross Society, Strengthening Child Protection System for Protection of Vulnerable Children through Community Awareness Raising, No Cost Extension, August - September 2015
• UNICEF, Save the Children, Addendum to Programme Cooperation Agreement, Protecting Children in Emergencies and Against Grave Violations in Conflict, August 2014-2015