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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Communications for Development (C4D) is the application of the principles of effective communication to further development objectives. UNICEF is one of the lead international agencies in promoting and using C4D as a cross-cutting programme strategy to drive positive behavioural and social change. It applies C4D across a variety of sector-specific issues such as open defecation, exclusive breastfeeding for the prevention of HIV and AIDS, and communicating with disaster-affected communities in humanitarian emergencies. Most recently, C4D was integral to the response to the ebola epidemic.

In recognition of the importance of C4D, UNICEF has made substantial investment in developing both its internal capacity and the capacity of national partners in designing and implementing C4D strategies. It has also taken significant steps towards better integrating C4D as a cross-cutting programme strategy into systems, policies, plans and practices at all levels of the organisation.

Given UNICEF’s investment in C4D to date, the recent decision to fund further capacity development through the ‘C4D Strengthening Initiative’, and the ongoing evolution of C4D internally, a global evaluation was commissioned to look back over the past five years of capacity building efforts, and identify what has worked, areas for improvement and lessons learnt. The findings of the evaluation will guide future work in implementing C4D in UNICEF and strengthen its contribution to country programme results. This is the country case study report for Ethiopia.

The country case studies had four main objectives (these link to the four objectives of the overall global evaluation):

1. Assessing the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the CO’s efforts to (a) develop the individual knowledge and competences of staff in C4D and (b) enhancing the CO’s overall capacity.
2. Assessing the extent to which, and how appropriately, C4D has been integrated into the CO structures and programmes;
3. Assessing how relevant C4D related planning and implementation has been (including through use of the global C4D benchmarks) to the contextual needs of the country programme; and identify factors driving or constraining the relevance of C4D-related planning and programming.
4. Reviewing C4D related performance monitoring and, knowledge management and assessing the evaluability of results (outcomes and impact) achieved through programmes using C4D interventions.

Findings

The findings from the country case study are structured in line with the four objectives of the evaluation. They cover: C4D capacity development, the integration of C4D into the CO and its programmes, implementation of C4D into programming and the evaluability of C4D activities.

Capacity development

The assessment of capacity development looks at the efforts of UNICEF’s Ethiopia Country Office (ECO) to build its internal capacity on C4D through accessing global support (e.g. the C4D course at the University of Ohio) and country office led activities. UNICEF’s understanding of improved capacity includes both changes to individuals’ knowledge and practices on C4D and changes to the country office’s overall organisational capacity to implement C4D.

- Both the Communications for Development course at Ohio University (Ohio course) and the UNICEF Ethiopia led C4D trainings have been relevant to the needs of participants and the country office. They have targeted the right individuals and used the right mix of learning methodologies.
The Ohio course, which has been UNICEF Ethiopia's largest investment in building internal C4D capacity, has helped participants to develop new C4D skills, which has resulted in changed behaviours. The effectiveness of other country level C4D capacity development efforts has been more mixed.

While efforts to build the capacity of C4D specialists have been largely successful, understanding of C4D among programme staff more widely is still limited. This presents a barrier to further mainstreaming and could undermine the sustainability of capacity gains.

Current human resources on C4D are stretched. The level of work expected of sub-national C4D focal points is particularly problematic. What they have been tasked to deliver at the sub-national level is too challenging given the time they have to dedicate to C4D alongside their other technical responsibilities.

Support for C4D from the Representative and Deputy Representative is strong within UNICEF Ethiopia, but support is more mixed among Section Chiefs. Wavering support from senior management could undermine capacity gains and present a barrier to further mainstreaming.

While UNICEF Ethiopia's decision to send a large staff contingent to the Ohio course was an effective way of building C4D capacity it was relatively high cost (both in terms of time and money) and did allow a large number of staff to be trained in C4D. As such it was not the most efficient approach. Moving forward, reliance on the Ohio course as the primary means of capacity development is not a sustainable approach for the ECO to either maintain or grow its C4D capacity.

Integration

In order to assess the extent of C4D integration in country office structures and programming, the evaluation focused on a number of factors including: the extent to which there was a clear C4D strategy and vision across the country programme; how this strategy/vision has been reflected in core planning documents and processes; the extent and quality of reporting on C4D; the appropriateness of how the C4D function has been structured to deliver on the strategy and plans; the level of resourcing for C4D and the processes for resource mobilisation; and the ways in which C4D and external communications work together.

While there has been much discussion and thinking around C4D in UNICEF Ethiopia, there is an absence of a clear C4D strategy and/or plan for how internal (or external) C4D capacity should be built.

While C4D had a clear profile in the 2012-15 country programme and results framework, this has become less clear following the restructuring and the embedding of C4D in Sections such as Health, Education, WASH, Child Protection, etc. C4D results, or results that C4D contributes to are now harder to discern.

C4D is mentioned in the 2012 and 2016 Situation Analyses but relatively superficially. A number of more focused situation analyses have been undertaken that partly make up for this gap.

While the current structure of the C4D function provides a good way of bringing C4D support closer to Sections, and enhances Section’s ownership and accountability for C4D results, there remain challenges in coordinating C4D across Sections.

The current level of financial allocations to C4D initiatives is low and largely insufficient to meet the needs of the country programme. Three factors have contributed to this: the lack of systematic engagement of C4D staff in inputting to and reviewing funding proposals; the lack of clarity around C4D results; and donor reluctance to fund C4D interventions.

While there is no formal joint planning between C4D and external communications, there is informal and ad hoc collaboration. Given the substantial workload of C4D within ECO, this informal approach to collaboration seems appropriate and largely effective.

While there has been progress in integrating C4D into UNICEF Ethiopia’s structures and programming, at present, given the challenges indicated, integration is not sufficient to meet the needs of the country
programme. The two central issues are: capacity and resources. For the scale of the operations and the demand that is placed on C4D the number of staff with sufficient skills in communication methods, theories and principles is too limited. Likewise, level of resources allocated to C4D is too limited to ensure quality implementation.

**Implementation**

The evaluation assessed implementation from three different angles. First, it looked across the five sectors of UNICEF Ethiopia’s work and summarised the progress made in relation to C4D. Second, it looked at implementation from the perspective of the country office’s performance against a set of global C4D benchmarks. Lastly, it distilled a set of findings about building partner capacity on C4D. Together this provides a rounded picture of what UNICEF is accomplishing on C4D and the lessons it is learning.

- There has been a significant amount of activity around C4D in UNICEF Ethiopia. However, across the five C4D global benchmarks that are considered proxies for quality implementation, the ECO performance is mixed. This indicates a lack of consistency in the quality with which C4D is being designed and implemented. Key areas for improvement are: ensuring a more systematic and consistent use of evidence in the design and implementation of C4D interventions and ensuring that C4D best practices and innovations are actively disseminated externally.
- The limits of partner capacity are considered a major barrier to effective implementation of C4D initiatives. A range of strategies have been used to address this, including: training, technical assistance and system development. The current balance between these strategies however is not appropriate for building long term sustainable capacity among partners with a preponderance to training. Similarly, efforts to build partner capacity are not sufficiently joined-up across ECO Sections which leads to overlaps and inefficiencies. Partner capacity development needs to be more joined up and coordinated.

**Evaluability**

Evaluability\(^1\) was assessed by looking at whether it is possible *in principle* to evaluate the impact of a C4D intervention (i.e. whether there is a clear logic to the intervention, whether it is clear what behaviours are being changed, etc.) and whether it is possible to evaluate the intervention *in practice* (whether there is monitoring data being collected on behaviour change, the quality of that data etc.). Evaluability was assessed at two levels: at the level of the ECO Results Framework as a whole and at the level of two programmes with significant C4D components.

- The evaluability of C4D’s contribution to UNICEF Ethiopia’s country programme results is low. The lack of clarity around the causal logic linking C4D activities to outputs to outcomes presents a major problem. The indicators are low quality and often do not measure the results they are proxies for. Moreover, many are process indicators measuring scale and reach, rather than changes in behaviour. Baseline data has not been collected for C4D relevant results
- The evaluability of the two sampled C4D programmes is more positive. Both were judged to be evaluable *in principle* and *in practice*. There was considerably greater clarity in the theories underpinning both interventions, and the role that C4D results and activities play. In both cases it was possible to see how C4D activities were being used to bring about specific behaviour changes. Likewise, both programmes have contracted or are in the process of contracting an external partner to collect data against the results framework.

**Recommendations**

---

\(^1\) The extent to which a C4D intervention can be evaluated in the future
Based on the findings of the evaluation a number of recommendations have been proposed for UNICEF Ethiopia to take forward.

1. **Develop a clear strategy and plan for building C4D capacity in the country office.** This should mobilise a range of capacity development strategies, such as training, mentoring and stretch assignments, to ensure all programme staff have a solid foundation in C4D methods, theories and principles.

2. **Assess the demand for C4D support in each Section and region and develop realistic staffing arrangements, which ensures adequate support both within UNICEF and to partners.** The nature and number of C4D programmes and the number of government partners varies across sections and as such so does the required level of C4D support. ECO needs to recognise this in how it structures its staffing in C4D.

3. **Ensure better resource allocation for C4D.** Current funding for C4D is insufficient to meet programmatic needs. This should be addressed in two ways:
   a. **Put in place processes that ensure C4D Specialists have the opportunity to input into all funding proposals, starting from the inception and all the way through, that have a significant C4D component.** The current way in which C4D specialists engage with the proposal process is ad hoc and piecemeal. This leads to a situation where C4D activities are under resourced which undermines the quality of delivery.
   b. **Ensure that the current guidance on financial allocations to C4D is followed.** The under resourcing of C4D requires the existing guidance on allocating resources to C4D activities when developing proposals to be followed.

4. **Senior management (Representative and Deputy Representative) and Section Chiefs need to support the PMU C4D Specialist in funding and coordinating cross-cutting C4D initiatives.** The implementation of cross-sector C4D initiatives has been challenging, because of limited support and funding from Sections and problems in coordinating planning and implementation. Resolving these problems will require Section Chiefs to show genuine support for cross-sector initiatives and commit to resourcing them adequately. It will also require the Representative and Deputy Representative to see the value of cross-sector C4D initiatives and to drive cross-sector working forward across the country programme.

5. **Redouble efforts to ensure C4D initiatives are grounded in evidence.** While research and evaluations are being used to inform C4D interventions, this is not being done systematically. Ensuring communication strategies are evidence based is central to effective C4D.

6. **Continue to document best practices, innovations and learning on C4D, but ensure these are communicated externally, both in country among partners and with UNICEF at different levels.** UNICEF Ethiopia has significant experience implementing C4D and it is viewed by partners as the main source of expertise on C4D domestically. As part of its efforts to build the capacity of others and improve the implementation of C4D more effort needs to be put into actively sharing learning, best practices, guides and toolkits. This will in turn help attract resources for sectoral and cross-sectoral C4D interventions.

7. **Map out all of the capacity development activities that are currently being delivered across the country programme and identify opportunities for joint working and synergies.** UNICEF is delivering a wide range of C4D capacity development activities to partners, but each Section is doing this in isolation. As a result there is duplication of efforts and opportunities for cost-efficiencies are missed.
8. **Consider establishing a long term partnerships to support C4D capacity development.** Linked to recommendation 7, to help better coordinate the C4D capacity development efforts, consideration should be given to working with a limited number of organisations which could provide support across the country office. There have been discussions within the ECO about establishing such a partnership in the past; these need to be renewed.

9. **Ensure that C4D results are presented clearly in the results framework for the new CPD.** This should include: a clear causal logic in how C4D activities link to Section results at output and outcome level, a clear articulation of specific behaviour change results where relevant, clear indicators and baseline data collection.

10. **To build up the evidence base on what works in C4D, conduct a portfolio evaluation that looks across a samples of specific C4D programmes in Ethiopia.** Given the challenges that the country office has had to date in clearly positioning C4D in the results framework, in the future, were an evaluation of the impact of C4D on women and children to be commissioned, the best approach would be to evaluate a sample of specific C4D programmes. These could be grouped around specific sectors, or behaviour changes.
1. Introduction

Communications for Development (C4D) is the application of the principles of effective communication to further development objectives. It is a process of informing, empowering and promoting dialogue through communication tools to allow people to take actions that improve their lives and communities. UNICEF is regarded as one of the lead international agencies in promoting and using C4D as a cross-cutting programme strategy. Since 2009 UNICEF has made substantial investments in developing both its internal capacity and the capacity of national counterparts in C4D.

In recognition of the central role that C4D plays in UNICEF’s programming and the investment that has been made in building capacity, a global formative evaluation was commissioned of UNICEF’s capacity to strengthen C4D action. Its purpose is to look back over the past five years and identify what has worked, areas for improvement and lessons learnt.

A central part of the global evaluation are five country case studies in: Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Kyrgyzstan, Nigeria, and Vietnam. These provided opportunities to look more in depth at: how C4D capacity has been built; how C4D has been integrated into country office (CO) structures and programmes; how C4D programmes are being implemented; and the extent to which the impact of C4D initiatives could be evaluated in the future. This is the case study report from the Ethiopia country office (ECO).

The report is structured in five sections: **Section 1** is the introduction and includes details of the purpose, objectives and scope of the evaluation, the objectives and methodology for the country study. **Section 2** provides background both to UNICEF Ethiopia and the 2012-15 country programme. **Section 3** presents the findings of the evaluation. This is divided into four main sections: C4D capacity development; the integration of C4D in the UNICEF Ethiopia country programme and CO; implementation of C4D; and the evaluability of C4D. **Section 4 and 5** present the conclusions and recommendations.

1.1. Purpose, objectives and scope of the evaluation

The purpose of the global evaluation of UNICEF’s capacity and action in C4D is to generate credible and useful evidence on the requirements for successful implementation of C4D in order to strengthen UNICEF’s future action and results in this area. The findings of the evaluation will guide UNICEF’s future C4D work and partnerships in implementing the 2014-2017 Strategic Plan and country programmes. It will also feed into the development of the new strategic plan 2008-2021, particularly on the positioning of C4D as a core implementation strategy and in the formulation of an updated C4D strategy / framework and related guidance. The evaluation will also help determine UNICEF’s comparative advantage in C4D so as to inform UNICEF’s engagement in the wider development communication community, and position itself for C4D related contributions to advance the post 2015 sustainable development agenda and children’s rights.

The recent decision to launch the ‘C4D Strengthening Initiative’ makes this evaluation timely. The C4D strengthening initiative is a comprehensive programme of work designed to further strengthen UNICEF’s capacity to deliver C4D programmes. It has been launched in recognition of the growing demand for C4D with UNICEF. With this significant investment about to be made in C4D this evaluation will help to surface what has worked well in the past, what should be continued and what needs to change.

The scope of the evaluation is the period 2010-15. Within this period the greatest emphasis will be on the past four years (2011-15). The evaluation will look back past 2010, but this will only be to help understand the historical roots of more recent events.

---

2 The C4D Strengthening Initiative is build around four areas of action: 1. Systematising technical guidance; 2. Enhancing technical capacity; 3. Strengthening leadership and coordination; 4. Increasing institutional resources for core activities and innovations.
For the full terms of reference for the evaluation see Annex 3.

The evaluation is formative and focused on identifying improvements and learning on C4D. It is also theory based and built around testing the theory of change that underpinned UNICEF’s efforts to build capacity and integrate C4D in programming (see Annex 4 to view UNICEF’s theory of change for C4D capacity and action). The evaluation uses a case based approach that combines desk reviews and country studies to explore how UNICEF’s theory of change for C4D capacity development and integration plays out in a sample of 25 country contexts. The approach to causal inference used is contribution analysis.

1.2. Objectives and scope of the Ethiopia country case study

The Ethiopia report is one of five case studies. Each country case study has four main objectives:

1. To assess the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the CO’s efforts to (a) develop the individual knowledge and competences of staff in C4D and (b) enhancing the CO’s overall capacity.
2. To assess the extent to which, and how appropriately, C4D has been integrated into the CO structures and programmes;
3. To assess how relevant C4D related planning and implementation has been (including through use of proposed benchmarks) to the contextual needs of the country programme; and identify factors driving or constraining the relevance of C4D-related planning and programming.
4. To review C4D related performance monitoring and, knowledge management and assess the evaluability of results (outcomes and impact) achieved through programmes using C4D interventions.

1.3. Country case study process and methodology

Preparation and planning – prior to the country visit core documents were reviewed (See Annex 1 for a list of references) and a series of preliminary interviews were undertaken. As part of the preparations, two C4D programmes were selected for the evaluability assessment. They were selected based on the following criteria:

- Programmes that were relatively mature
- Programmes where C4D was a prominent part of the intervention
- Programmes which were located in Sections where C4D is central to the achievement of sector results

Prior to the country visit an online survey was also sent to ECO. This was to be coordinated and signed off by the Deputy Representative and reflect the ECO’s formal response to the evaluation. The survey covered factual issues and required the CO to make a judgment on current C4D capacity and performance. See Annex 6 to view the survey instrument.

Country visit – the case study team, travelled to Ethiopia 21-26 January, 2016. In total the team had 4 ½ working days. During this time a combination of semi-structured interviews and group discussions were held. These were undertaken with both internal stakeholders such as C4D Specialists, Section Chiefs, Technical Specialists, Deputy Representatives etc. and external stakeholders including implementation partners, government counterparts, and C4D capacity development providers. (See Annex 2 for a list of all of the people engaged either through interviews or group discussion).

All interviews and group discussions were structured using pre-prepared question guides. All interview or group discussion questions linked back to the overarching evaluation questions. Detailed written summaries were taken of all interviews / group discussions. All interviewees were asked for their Informed consent.
A field visit was made to a C4D programme. The programme was being implemented by World Vision Ethiopia (WVE) in Wolenchiti. It is an urban WASH programme with a strong C4D component around Menstrual Hygiene Management. During the trip the team conducted a group discussion with the WVE implementation team, and visited two of the schools where the programme is being implemented and again ran group discussions with a selections of students and teachers.

A validation workshop was held with members of the ECO senior management at the end of the visit.

**Analysis and write up** - To support the analysis an evidence matrix was used to bring together data from across the different data sources (document review, interviews/group discussions, survey). Based on this a synthesis was undertaken against key evaluation questions. To ensure consistency in how judgements were made across the country case studies, rating scales were used to assess the level of integration of C4D into CO strategies and structure and evaluability. In assessing the quality of C4D implementation, the global C4D benchmarks were used as proxies. For each benchmark a Red-Amber-Yellow-Green scoring scale was developed. This was used to assess the extent to which the CO has achieved the benchmarks in question (details of this scale can be found in Annex 7).

**Limitations of the Country Case Study**
- The time in country only allowed for the team to visit one C4D programme. This impacted the team’s ability to make judgments on how C4D programmes are being implemented in practice.
- The team were only able to interview the Field Chiefs and C4D focal point from one of the eight regional offices (Oromia regional office).

2. **Background**

2.1. **UNICEF in Ethiopia**

The Ethiopia country office has one of the largest country programmes in UNICEF with an annual budget of around USD$ 200 million. The country office is in Addis Ababa where approximately 200 (as per PBR) staff are based. A further 200 staff operate out of the eight regional (subnational) field offices.[1]

The country office is structured according to a number of Sections, which lead UNICEF’s technical work. These are: Child Protection, WASH, Health, Nutrition and Education. An Emergency Unit coordinates support around disaster risk reduction, mitigation, preparedness and recovery. Other key Sections include: the Project Management Unit (PMU), Media and External Relations (MER), and Research, Evaluation, Policy, and Monitoring (REPOM).

UNICEF Ethiopia works in partnership with a wide range of government ministries and sector bureaus at national and regional levels. It also works with NGO partners.

---

3 Amhara, Afar, Benshangul Gumuz, Gambella, Oromia, Somali, SNNPR and Tigray
2.2. Background to C4D in the Ethiopia country programme

2.2.1 C4D and the 2012-2015 country programme

UNICEF Ethiopia gave C4D a central role in its 2012-15 country programme, in line with UNICEF’s growing recognition globally that many key results that it seeks require behavioral and social change, hence the importance of C4D as a cross cutting programme strategy.

At the start of the 2012-15 CP, C4D was a stand-alone programme within the ECO and was identified as a key overarching strategy for achieving results. It sat under Programme Component 4 (Analysis, Communication and Participation), and in the results framework it had its own programme component result; two cross cutting intermediary results focused on capacity development of government and civil society partners and supporting the participation of children in the development process; and four sector intermediary results in education, disaster risk reduction, child protection and health, WASH and Nutrition. The underlying strategy was an overall systems approach to C4D, with C4D interventions at multiple societal levels.

In 2013, the ECO’s view of and approach to C4D changed (see sections 6.2.4 and 6.3.1 for a discussion of the factors that drove this decision). C4D was restructured from a stand-alone programme to being embedded into each of the five technical sectors of UNICEF’s work. The C4D programme component result was removed from the results framework and the four C4D intermediary results were integrated into Section results (primarily under ‘demand’ and ‘Enabling Environment’). Alongside this, five cross-cutting C4D areas were identified and captured under a cross cutting output. See Table 2 for details of this new structure.

Table 1 Role of C4D in the 2012-15 results framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cross cutting C4D interventions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support the health extension program through strengthening the C4D capacity of the Health Extension Workers (HEWs) and Health Development Arm (HDA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaching in-school children/adolescents both as a target group and as agents of change through school and community based platforms including school clubs, mini-media, and Parent Teacher Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaching out-of-school children and youth through C4D focused capacity building of youth centers, and other relevant community based structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing core partnership with major religious leaders to initiate joint advocacy and behavior and social norm change interventions around selected priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building to mass media entities for edutainment interventions focusing on agreed priorities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cross cutting output / intermediary results: Guidance and technical support for C4D mainstreamed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector specific C4D priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WASH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal, Newborn and Child Health (MNCH); Integrated community case management (ICCM); Expanded programme of immunization (EPI); Malaria; Emergencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Development; Access; Advocacy for retention; Safe school environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community based Infant and Young Child Feeding (IYCF); Community Based Nutrition (CBN); Micronutrients; Adolescent nutrition program; Adolescent de-worming programme; School behavior change communication; Productive Safety Net Programme (PSNP); C4D in emergencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Childmarriage (ECM); Female Genital Mutilation (FGM); Birth registration; HIV; Child Protection in Emergencies (CPIE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Protection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 The country programme document includes the following: partnering with the Government, communities, the private sector, the media, civil society groups and youth and children’s organizations to accelerate behavioural and social change.
### 2.2.2 The structure of the C4D function in the country office

The structure of C4D in the ECO has undergone a number of changes since 2012. In 2012 the C4D function sat within its own section. It was headed by a Chief of Communication for Development (P5) with five C4D specialists at NO level supporting different programme sections; one technical adviser; and two General Service staff. In this structure the C4D section both ran its own C4D initiatives and supported and worked in collaboration with the other sections on C4D. When this structure was first set up, the C4D unit did not have regular resources and suffered from under funding. At the start of 2012 this situation changed when the section was given an annual regular budget of USD 1.8 million.

In June 2013 the decision was taken to embed C4D functions and the Specialists into the Sections as a key cross cutting strategy. This partly resulted from a peer review exercise that was undertaken of the C4D Strategy that highlighted challenges in how C4D was operating, including a lack of clear accountability and ownership for C4D results. The decision also followed a mini Programme Budget Review that sought to address the large overspend in RR.

Figure 1 outlines how the C4D function is now structured. As part of the mainstreaming efforts **sector focused NOC C4D Specialists** sit in each of the programme Sections. Their role is, among other things, to advocate, support and advise programme colleagues on how best to integrate C4D into new and ongoing programmes. All the C4D specialists are NOC level. Education is the only section where the specialist is a focal point, rather than a dedicated C4D resource.

**C4D focal points** also sit in each of the regions.\(^5\) They report to their respective Chiefs of Field Office and are NOB’s. These are technical officers, who have been trained in C4D, with responsibilities for advocating, mainstreaming and quality assuring C4D activities within their regions. They have assumed these new C4D related responsibilities for all types Field Office programs, alongside their other technical tasks on sector program.

At the coordination level, is a NOD level **C4D Specialist** who sits in the PMU. Her role is to mainly provide guidance and technical support for C4D mainstreaming, coordinate cross cutting initiatives and partnerships and lead on capacity development. This role reports directly to the Deputy Representative. The PMU-C4D specialist also manages the C4D Technical Working Group. This is made up of all the C4D section specialists and regional C4D focal points. It provides the matrix management framework for coordinating C4D across the ECO.

---

\(^5\) Except in Gambella and Harai, and in the City Administrations of Addis Ababa and Dire Dawa.
In addition to these exclusive C4D roles, a number of sections have staff with a strong C4D focus in their job descriptions. Health is notable. While the health C4D specialist is primarily focused on building the capacity of FMOH and RHBs in planning and implementing behaviour and social change interventions, another member of the Section is a TA positioned staff, focused on polio and communication, which is virtually exclusively C4D related. Linked to polio there is also the Polio Communication Network (PCN) comprised of 14 communication health consultants working on polio C4D and also supporting routine immunization and child survival more broadly. Nine of these PCN members are placed in each zone of the Somali Region; with others supporting key EPI and polio priority regions. In addition, in Health an international is being recruited to lead cross-section work addressing the social norms that are preventing greater uptake of health services, while REPOM is looking into the possibility of hiring an international C4D consultant with particular expertise in child participation to work on the social protection programme.

In the mainstreamed C4D structure sector-specific C4D interventions are mainly funded through OR. Health C4D Specialist and PMU C4D Specialist have resources from RR and manage a budget. In the case of C4D Health, this is to support implementation of C4D at the Ethiopian Federal Ministry of Health (FMOH) and Regional Bureau of Health (RHB) levels; and in the case of the PMU C4D Specialist it is for supporting cross cutting functions like convening partners, internal training, and for conducting strategic research and assessments. The Regular Resources (RR) available to the PMU for supporting cross-cutting C4D activities in 2015 was USD 135,000.

### Figure 1 Structure of the C4D function after 2013

#### Roles and responsibilities

- Coordination of cross cutting strategies/partnerships
- Coordination of C4D technical working group
- Capacity building
- Research, Knowledge management and reporting
- Resource mobilization

- Quality assurance during AWP preparation and planning
- Standardised message development, and facilitate local adoption in collaboration with regional focal persons
- Strategic guidance and technical support in sector specific C4D interventions and aligning office wide cross-sectoral platforms at regional level
- Capacity building
- Knowledge management and sharing

#### C4D capacity development activities

Between 2012 and 2015 ECO has delivered and supported staff to attend a number of C4D capacity development activities. This has included:

1. **Internal staff training in 2012;**
2. **Sending a group of staff on the Communications for Development course at Ohio University in 2013/14 and 2014/15;**
3. **Informal and ad hoc forms of C4D capacity support such as on the job learning and mentoring.**
Details of this capacity support is provided in Table 3 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of capacity support</th>
<th>Details of the capacity support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. ECO level C4D training                    | • In 2012 a one-week C4D training course was delivered for UNICEF staff by DWI. This was an introductory course on C4D designed to provide programme staff with a basic grounding in C4D concepts and approaches. Between 30-35 staff attended.  
  • There were plans to run a similar course in 2015, but this were cancelled due to budget cuts. |
| 2. Communications for Development course at Ohio University | • Following the restructuring of C4D in 2014, 13 staff completed the Ohio University course on C4D. This is the highest staff contingent that has ever been sent from a single CO. An additional two C4D specialists took the training in 2015. |
| 3. Informal and ad hoc C4D capacity support  | • On the job learning events organised by the regional office, such as a one week C4D regional networking event that the PMU-C4D specialist and the head of external communications attended in 2015 in South Africa.  
  • In country learning events such as the C4D retreat in 2015 where the regional C4D advisor ran sessions around different C4D themes.  
  • Ad hoc and informal C4D sessions run by staff from HQ. For example, staff from the Child Protection Section NYHQ ran a short training for Child Protection staff on social norms.  
  • There has also been uptake, albeit very limited, of HQ-run C4D webinars.  
  • C4D Specialists have run informal sessions with sector colleagues on C4D and have provided ongoing mentoring. This has been ad hoc rather than part of any systematic effort to cascade training across the ECO.  
  • NCD C4D Specialist attended on stretch assignment in Tanzania for three months. |

The polio programme has also invested in C4D training, but this is conducted by UNICEF ECO polio team, and is funded through polio-specific budgeting agreed with the Regional Office and HQ through the polio programme.

While the focus of this evaluation is 2012-2015, it is also important to note that the investments in C4D capacity development did not start in 2012. In 2009 a six day C4D training was delivered for UNICEF staff and government and NGO partners. This was attended by 22 UNICEF staff and 21 government and NGO partner staff. Likewise, in 2010 workshops were run in the regions for programme managers, public relations and communication officers from all sectors. Similarly one C4D specialist, seven representative from the FMOH and two local consultancy firm were also sent to a course on C4D in Cairo run by DWI. No staff from the ECO have attended the University of Pennsylvania course on Social Norms.

---

3. Findings

This section presents the findings of the Ethiopia case study in relation to the objectives and questions of the evaluation. It is structured in four main sections: 3.1 covers capacity development; 3.2 looks at integration; 3.3 focuses on implementation; and 3.4 makes a judgement on how evaluable C4D interventions are.

3.1. C4D Capacity Development

This section presents the findings on UNICEF Ethiopia’s efforts to build its internal capacity on C4D through accessing global support and country office led activities. UNICEF’s understanding of capacity is broader than whether or not there have been changes to individuals’ capacities on C4D: UNICEF’s efforts have also encompassed organisational capacity-building for C4D at the country level. This includes ensuring there are appropriate numbers of staff working on C4D; that senior champions of C4D exist who outline a vision and create space for investment in high quality C4D programming; and that networks are formed between HQ, regional and country offices that facilitate technical support and the exchange of knowledge and learning around C4D. In assessing UNICEF Ethiopia’s capacity in C4D we have looked at all of these factors.

The findings presented in this section have been informed by a range of data sources, including: interviews with past participants of C4D training and where possible their managers, senior managers including section chiefs and the deputy representative, sector specific technical staff, and C4D staff. Where relevant findings also draw on the online survey completed by the country office and the review of key internal C4D strategy and planning documents. In all instances, findings are only presented if they are triangulated by multiple data sources.

The section is structured in five parts. It starts by looking at the relevance (6.1.1) and effectiveness (6.1.2) and efficiency (3.1.3) of the capacity support that has been provided between 2012-15 on C4D and whether it has changed individuals’ knowledge and practices. It then looks at the C4D technical guidance that has been used (3.1.4). Following this there is a focus on the extent to which organisation level capacities have been built. It first looks at what human resources have been created within the CO to support C4D (3.1.5); then the extent to which there are senior C4D champions in UNICEF Ethiopia (3.1.6); then the effectiveness of the support provided the ECO by the ESARO regional office and NYHQ on C4D (3.1.7). The section finishes with reflections on the factors that could undermine the future sustainability of C4D capacity in UNICEF Ethiopia (3.1.8).

Key findings:
- Both the Ohio course and the ECO C4D trainings have been relevant to the needs of participants and the country office. They have targeted the right individuals and used the right mix of learning methodologies.
- The Ohio course which has been ECO’s largest investment in building internal C4D capacity has helped participants to develop new C4D skills, which has resulted in changed behaviours. The effectiveness of the other C4D capacity development efforts are more mixed.
- While efforts to build the capacity of C4D specialists have been largely successful, understanding of C4D among programme staff more widely is still limited. This presents a barrier to further mainstreaming and could also undermine the sustainability of capacity gains to date. Investment in C4D capacity development remains limited in relation the demand from the country programme.

---

7 This is detailed in C4D Strategic and Plan for Action 2008-2012
8 See Inception report
9 The online survey was signed off by the deputy representative
3.1.1 Relevance of C4D capacity development in UNICEF Ethiopia

This section assess the extent to which the C4D capacity development activities that have been accessed by UNICEF Ethiopia have been relevant to the needs of the country office and the individual participants.

Both the Ohio course and UNICEF Ethiopia’s own C4D trainings were well aligned to the needs and demands of participants and the country office. In the case of the Ohio course the restructuring of the C4D function that occurred in 2013 meant that a new cadre of C4D staff across the CO and regions had to be trained. All new members of this new cadre attended the course. In most cases, none had any prior expertise in C4D. As such, the Ohio course’s focus on building core C4D knowledge and skills was well aligned with the needs of the individual participants and key to realising the CO’s vision of a restructured and integrated C4D function. While a formal capacity needs assessment or pre-training needs assessment was not undertaken, we found no evidence to suggest that this seriously affected the relevance of the course. However of the seven past participants we interviewed, we did find one instance of a more experienced C4D participant attending the course and indicating that while useful, it was quite basic and didn’t cover everything they had hoped, specifically social norms. A pre course assessment would have potentially revealed this misalignment.10

The relevance of the one week ECO-organised C4D training was similarly positive. The 2012 training coincided with the start of the new CPD which for the first time had a dedicated C4D Programme Component Result and Intermediate Results in each of the programmes. This created a strong need for basic C4D knowledge and skills across the CO and regions. This was reinforced by a strong demand with a number of programme officer’s identifying C4D training as a priority in their 2012 individual learning and development plans.11 A pre-training needs assessment was undertaken with participants to help shape the course content.12 Those who had attended the course spoke positively about its content and indicated that it was well aligned with their needs at the time. As is noted in section 6.1.2 however, needs have evolved and the cross-CO training on C4D needs to be redesigned and rolled out again.

Both the Ohio course and UNICEF Ethiopia’s own C4D training targeted the right individuals within the country office. The participants of the Ohio course were selected based on their recent recruitment as sector focused C4D Specialists or focal points. The decision was aligned with the CO decision to embed C4D in the sections. One member of staff said that they had not been allowed to attend the course because they were already considered a communications professional. Given the resource implications of sending 13 staff on the course, this decision makes sense. The participants on the ECO C4D training were programme officers from across the CO who had engagement in C4D. Again, on the whole this seems to have been a sensible decision.

---

10 It should be noted that the Ohio course was by design, a generic C4D course in order to make it available to all staff rather than restricting it to staff with certain level of capacity. An implicit objective of the course was to create a shared understanding on C4D across the organisation.

11 Ibid

The mix of approaches to learning used by the Ohio course aligned well with the needs of the participants from UNICEF Ethiopia and helped support learning. All of the past participants we spoke to commented on the value of the different learning / teaching methods used in the Ohio course. Some mentioned the benefit of receiving large quantities of reading material, others spoke of the value of the online-discussions. All mentioned the value of the face-to-face, practical component of the course in South Africa. This was singled out by a number of participants as the part of the course that helped cement their new knowledge and skills. As one participant noted: “the face-to-face part of the training, where we did practical work in teams, really added knowledge and skills. It helped me understand better what I’d been reading and writing about. This was the same for others from the ECO as well.”\textsuperscript{13} The practical exercises and interaction with colleagues from other countries was particularly appreciated.\textsuperscript{14} The only criticism we heard was how the learning between participants could have been more structured. Given the wealth of expertise on the course and the experience from different countries, a number of participants thought a more intentional approach to facilitating sharing was missing.

The Ohio course content was considered relevant by UNICEF Ethiopia staff, but there was also some criticism. The overall course structure and content was well received by participants. The focus on core C4D knowledge and skills was appreciated. However two out of 13 participants wanted greater focus on social norms and another said there was too much focus on health.\textsuperscript{15} Some said it was not easy to translate the lessons from the course to the Ethiopia context and that there was a missing link between the course and operationalising the learning in ECO.\textsuperscript{16} A number of informants suggested, the need for more support post-training to put the skills into practice, others highlighted follow up training that had more of a sector specific focus.

3.1.2 Effectiveness of C4D capacity development in UNICEF Ethiopia

This section assess the extent to which the C4D capacity development activities that have been accessed by UNICEF Ethiopia have been effective in improving C4D knowledge and practice. It covers both the Ohio and UPenn courses, and country and regional level C4D capacity development support.

The Ohio course, which has been UNICEF Ethiopia’s largest investment in building internal C4D capacity, has helped ECO staff to develop new skills and change behaviours. The effectiveness of country office led C4D capacity development efforts are more mixed. Using the Kirkpatrick model for evaluating the effectiveness of training, we have found evidence at both levels 2 (knowledge) and 3 (behaviour). Of the seven past participants we spoke to, all indicated that that they had gained new knowledge as a result of attending the course. For example, one interviewee noted how the course had improved her understanding of how the human rights based approach and C4D were linked and the importance of including people’s views in C4D programming.\textsuperscript{17} Another referred to how the course had provided her with a replicable framework for developing robust, evidence based communication strategies.\textsuperscript{18} Others stressed the insights they gained around research methodologies,\textsuperscript{19} undertaking situation analyses\textsuperscript{20} and the time needed to plan for behaviour change.\textsuperscript{21} In a group discussion with seven past participants, three indicated that the Ohio course had made a ‘significant’ contribution to their knowledge and skills, while two rated it as having made a ‘somewhat significant contribution.’

\textsuperscript{13} Key informant 1
\textsuperscript{14} Key informant 1; Group discussion 1; Key informant 2.
\textsuperscript{15} It’s important to note that the C4D course exposed participants to a broad range of social, behavioral and communication theories, including social norms. However, the course was not on social norms. The UPenn course provides an in-depth look at social norms.
\textsuperscript{16} Group discussion 2
\textsuperscript{17} Key informant 1
\textsuperscript{18} Group discussion 4
\textsuperscript{19} Key informant 3
\textsuperscript{20} Group discussion 1
\textsuperscript{21} Key informant 1
All the participants we spoke to also provided examples of how they have adopted new behaviours and practices as a result of attending the course. For one participant the most notable change they had seen in themselves and others was in insisting on the use of evidence to inform C4D initiatives and the participation of communities:

“Sometime the need is so urgent; you need to quickly develop brochures in 2 days. What we really started to do after the course is negotiate with colleagues around using evidence based strategies and engaging communities. Push to do KAP surveys or conduct FGDs. While they might not be perfect, 2-3 FGDs can really add value.”

Others gave examples of how they designed the terms of reference and commissioned a KAP survey to provide a baseline for C4D indicators, and provided C4D training to staff and government counterparts.

Where possible, we sought to triangulate these self-reported changes with the peers and line managers of past participants of the Ohio course. For the four individuals where we were able to do this, evidence from the line managers corroborated the self-reported changes from past participants. For example, one peer noted how the participants was more confident in their interaction with other staff around C4D following the Ohio course. Another, commented how a participant of the course, passed on their newly refined skills to colleagues by helping to develop a C4D strategy in emergencies and delivering training at the regional level.

Compared with the Ohio course we were not able to give the same level of scrutiny to the other C4D capacity development activities, partly because previous participants were more difficult to identify. But the evidence we collected seems to suggest that their effectiveness was more mixed. The 2012 ECO C4D training for example, was only rated as having made ‘somewhat of a contribution’ to improvements in C4D within the ECO. While the two participants we spoke to said from what they remember they were satisfied, but none could point to specific changes in behaviours. Likewise, only one ESARO regional level C4D networking meeting has been run in the period of enquiry, and while both attendees spoke positively about the event and pointed towards new knowledge they had gained, no examples where provided of behaviour change.

There is scope for improvement in C4D Specialists’ competency in advocating for and influencing internal and external stakeholders around C4D. The role of the C4D Specialist is multi-faceted. They need to have the core C4D knowledge and skills, they also need a good sector knowledge to help them translate core C4D concepts and theories into specific sectoral work. Alongside this they need to be good influencers. This is especially important because of the way the C4D function is structured in ECO with C4D specialists embedded within sections. We found this to be an area for further development. For example, one informant commented how “skills in persuasion and advocacy needed to be refined”, another noted how they would like to see C4D staff being more “proactive and promoting new, more innovative ways of communicating with government”. Another commented that sometimes C4D specialists were too reactive, responding to government’s requests around traditional ways of communicating, rather than pushing the government thinking by, for example, looking at how other countries do things. This
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22 Key informant 1
23 Group discussion 2
24 Group discussion 1
25 Group discussion 7
26 Group discussion 2
27 CO level survey
28 The lack of regional level workshops is a result of a regional C4D advisor only being in post since 2014.
29 Key informant 4; key informant 5
issue was also acknowledged in the country level survey, in which staff skills in this area were rated as only ‘moderately sufficient.’

While efforts to build the capacity of C4D Specialists have been successful, understanding of C4D among programme staff more widely is limited. This presents a barrier to the further mainstreaming of C4D. While C4D is prevalent across much of what ECO does, across a number of interviews and group discussions the point was raised that there is a lack of a clear understanding of C4D (see text box 1 for a selection of perspectives). While the ECO has spent time and resources building the capacity of its C4D specialists and focal points, similar efforts have yet to be put into developing the knowledge and skills of its wider programmatic staff. This is important to further mainstreaming because C4D needs to become everyone’s issue if it is to be fully embedded; this requires ensuring there is a good base capacity across the whole CO. This issue has been raised in a number of ECO documents. For example, the 2013 MTR Discussion paper notes that among the regional offices there was a “massive lack of understanding” around C4D.30

Text Box 1: Evidence illustrating the lack of a common understanding of C4D among programme staff

- “There is misunderstanding of the C4D concept internally. People link it with Information and communications production. Brochures and Materials. They don’t think you need to involve people.”31
- The understanding about valuing C4D is not there yet, even though it’s ‘mainstreamed’ – the socio ecological model is not really understood. C4D is really only thought about as materials…13 people trained [in C4D] is OK but there is a huge gap in the understanding in the programme staff. There’s a real gap. There are AWPs where there’s no C4D or in others where C4D is only tiny.32
- We need C4D sensitisation. People need to understand C4D. They need to get that it is more than brochures and posters.33
- I believe sometimes there is still confusion between communication and C4D. People still think that you can just communicate an idea and people will buy.34
- People say they are implementing C4D, but without knowing how to do it. Still need to develop the capacity of programme experts. The understanding of C4D is not great in the office35
- In house knowledge on C4D is not great. C4D is dynamic knowledge. You need to catch up with ongoing thinking and methods. We attended the [ECO C4D] training in 2012, but things have moved on. There should be standing group training, like PPP, RBM and other core office trainings36
- “There is limited understanding and receptiveness among POs in considering C4D as crucial in sector AWPs.
- “There are only seven people with full time jobs on C4D. Outside of these people there is a lack of knowledge on C4D and its value. We struggle with POs making sure that C4D is given equal weight in workplans. Same with section programme officers. C4D colleagues can do as much as they can, but if programme officers have control there are limits to what they can do37

The absence of structured country level capacity development in ECO is a contributing factor to why programme staff lack a solid understanding of C4D. While there was CO level training on C4D in 2012 this was not repeated. Likewise, training for the CO was planned in 2015 but did not happen because of cuts to RR. The absence of structured capacity development for programme staff was identified by a number of informants as a key reason for the confusion within the CO around what C4D is. For example one informant questioned why C4D is not part of the regular PPP training given its centrality to the work that ECO does.38 Another commented how if everyone is doing C4D when they are working

---

30 C4D MTR Discussion Paper, 2013
31 Key informant
32 Group discussion 3
33 Key informant 6
34 Key informant 5
35 Key informant 2
36 Group discussion 5
37 Group discussion 1
38 Key informant 3
towards behaviour and social change, everyone needs basic training. One informant argued that if the vision of the ECO is that C4D becomes the business of everyone, capacity needs to be scaled up. The gap in C4D capacity development has also been indicated in a number of internal C4D documents. The MTR, for example, recommended improved internal capacity, including training focused on core C4D competencies. Likewise, the 2013 C4D Discussion Paper argued that staff training was needed to ensure effective mainstreaming of C4D. Furthermore this is limited evidence to suggest that those who participated in the Ohio course cascaded their learning by training colleagues. While we found isolated instances of past participants running workshops for colleagues, and some providing informal mentoring to colleagues, these were not systematic and only done on the instigation of the individual.

While there has been investment in building C4D capacity, it remains limited in relation to the size of the overall country programme budget. It was not possible to pin down the exact amount that is spent on C4D capacity development annually. Estimates ranged from around US$50,000 up to US$150,000. Given the overall Ethiopia CO budget is US$200 million, irrespective of the exact amount of annual spend, it represents a small percentage of the overall budget and is arguably too low in light of the importance of C4D to the country programme. This point was emphasised in a number of key informant interviews.

### 3.1.3 Efficiency of UNICEF Ethiopia’s approach to C4D capacity development

This section assesses the extent to which issues of efficiency were considered as part of UNICEF Ethiopia’s decision making on how to build internal C4D capacity and whether there are efficiency issues which might impact the scale up of current activities.

While UNICEF Ethiopia’s decision to send a large staff contingent to the Ohio course was an effective way of building C4D capacity it was not the most efficient. UNICEF Ethiopia’s primary approach to building C4D capacity has been for staff to attend the Ohio course. The course runs over multiple weeks and has a two-week residential component. As such, it is a relatively expensive approach to building capacity (especially when sending 13 members of staff) both in terms of time and money - something that was recognised by ECO management. However, as has been discussed in earlier sections the course has been effective. It has helped build staff C4D knowledge and led to changes in practice. The long term and intensive nature of the course was central to its effectiveness. The efficiency of the investment would have been greater if course participants had in turn delivered C4D training to their ECO colleagues, but we found limited evidence to suggest this happened in any systematic way.

Moving forward, reliance on the Ohio course as the primary means for the ECO to either maintain or grow its C4D capacity is not sustainable. A more efficient approach is for staff that have attended the Ohio course to start transferring skills to colleagues in a more systematic way through training and mentoring, job shadowing, stretch/detail assignments, or for staff to attend regional or country level C4D training. These are less costly approaches that allow a larger number of staff to benefit from capacity development.

### 3.1.4 Use of C4D technical guidance

This section looks at the use of UNICEF C4D technical guidance among UNICEF Ethiopia staff.

---

39 Group discussion 4  
40 C4D Discussion Paper 2013  
41 Key informant 1  
42 While UNICEF HQ covers the costs of the Ohio course fees, the ECO is responsible for covering participants flights and accommodation. The total costs incurred by the CO in terms of per diem and flights for 13 staff is USD 57,500. The evaluation team also explored with ECO staff the amount of time they spent engaging with the online component of the course, and whether this was time that was used during or outside work. We were unable to get a clear response.
UNICEF’s C4D technical guidance is widely used among C4D staff. Key informants identified a wide range of UNICEF C4D technical guidance documents that they had accessed and used. The reports, which have had the widest use in UNICEF Ethiopia, were:

- Facts for Life


The two main ways in which informants are using the technical guidance are: as material for C4D training and in designing C4D initiatives. A number of staff also mentioned the ROSA C4D strategy as a key source of reference. For some this was the best C4D guidance available. One explanation for this could be that the regional strategy is a more contextualised document and therefore more relevant to the specific needs of staff in Ethiopia. This was in contrast to HQ level C4D strategy documents which informant viewed as outdated and largely redundant.

3.1.5 Human resources for C4D

This section assess the human resources available for C4D and their sufficiency for meeting the needs of the country programme.

UNICEF Ethiopia’s human resources on C4D are currently stretched. The survey indicated that overall the ECO views its current levels of human resources as ‘moderately sufficient’ to meet the needs of the country programme. This view was corroborated by a number of stakeholders who stressed that current C4D resources are stretched and that C4D Specialists are struggling to meet the demands placed on them by the country programme. This pressure is felt differently across Sections, with some, such as Health, stating that current levels are sufficient, while others such as Child Protection and Education feeling more stretched. For example, in Child Protection the Social Mobilization Specialist is the program lead for ending child marriage and FGM/C which both have significant communication interventions and requires coordination with other sectors. In addition, the specialist is expected to provide support to other Section programs such as child protection in emergency, child friendly social welfare, birth registration and child justice.

While there is consensus that staff are stretched, there is less agreement on how best to address this. For some, recruiting more people is not what is needed, but rather improved capacity building of staff working on programs which involve significant C4D interventions in the respective section could reduce burden on the C4D focal persons. For others, it was vice versa.

The scope of the work that C4D focal points are tasked to deliver at the regional level is too challenging given the time they have to dedicate to C4D. Regional focal points are technical sector specialists who have C4D responsibilities bolted onto their day to day role. At the regional level they play an important role in engaging with the different sections, advocating for C4D, coordinating planning, checking the quality of C4D interventions, budget etc. While we were not able to speak to all of the focal points, the ones we did speak to and our wider interviews, revealed the challenges associated with this
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role in a country programme the size of Ethiopia and the size of the different regional zones. One
interviewee noted how they have received reports from the field saying that they are overwhelmed and
need more people and better trained programme staff. Her suggestion is for full time C4D officers at the
regional level. The role of the regional focal points is made even more challenging by the limited
understanding and receptiveness towards C4D that seems to exist among project officers in the regions.50

The impact of the current staffing situation means that the quality of C4D programming is
inconsistent across the country programme. The current situation is one in which C4D staff in UNICEF
Ethiopia are unable to meet the demands of all Sections. Support is provided based on where there is
adequate capacity. This inevitably affects C4D programming and leads to variable quality across the
country programme. These challenges with staffing could be exacerbated in the future by staff turnover
(see section 3.1.6 for more details)

3.1.6 C4D Champions

This section assesses the extent to which senior staff members within UNICEF Ethiopia champion C4D
through communicating its value internally and resourcing it.

While the Representative and Deputy Representative (past and present) were viewed as active C4D
champions within the CO, support among Section and field office chiefs is more mixed. Senior
management support for C4D was stressed as a key factor in explaining the extent to which C4D is or isn’t
mainstreamed within ECO. This was raised in a number of interviews. As one informant noted: “In
UNICEF nothing gets done without senior level support. If we are to continue to put C4D at the center of
the CO agenda, this requires ongoing senior management buy-in. It depends heavily on them.”51

Overall, there is a strong sense that both the Representative and Deputy Representative are supporters of
C4D and understand its importance to programming and therefore the need to invest in capacity
development. This has been important for keeping C4D on the CO agenda. Importantly, a number of
informants stressed that the two previous Representatives were also supportive.

However, some Section Chiefs champion C4D more than others. One interviewee spoke of Section
Chiefs being in one of three camps: vocal advocates for C4D; not actively encouraging C4D, but not
impeding it; and not engaged in C4D. Two Section Chiefs were identified as being particularly active
advocates. The extent to which a Section Chief understood and supported C4D was identified as a key
factor in explaining the extent to which C4D was integrated and funded in sections programming.

The evidence we were able to collect on field chiefs was more limited. We heard that on the whole they
are supporters, but there is still scope to improve understanding. PMU and External Communications
Chiefs were also identified as supporters and champions of C4D.

3.1.7 Support from the Regional Office and NYHQ for C4D capacity development

This section assesses the extent to which both the Regional Office and NYHQ are effectively delivering
against their C4D accountabilities and UNICEF Ethiopia’s satisfaction with current levels of support.

There is scope for improvement in how the HQ can support country offices such as ECO. The ECO
is largely unsatisfied with the support and leadership from the HQ around C4D. Across HQ’s main C4D
accountabilities and responsibilities ECO indicated that it was largely unsatisfied with performance (See
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Table 4). Particular mention was given to HQ putting more emphasis on updating tools, guidelines and reference material on C4D, which are viewed as outdated and difficult to find on the current C4D intranet site. The level of dissatisfaction in some areas of HQ support is surprising. For example, the Ohio course is a major initiative spearheaded by the HQ and one that a number of ECO C4D staff benefited from; yet the ECO rated their level of satisfaction with the HQ’s global C4D training and learning opportunities as low. It is also important to note that the absence of a regional advisor in ESARO until late 2013 was a major barrier to HQ providing effective support to the ECO as there was no interlocutor at regional level. Since 2013 HQ has worked closely with RO to develop guidance and other support material that the region office uses with ECO and other COs in the region.

Table 3: ECO’s satisfaction with HQ level support on C4D, taken from the country level survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HQ C4D accountabilities</th>
<th>Very unsatisfied</th>
<th>Unsatisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing overall strategic direction on C4D within UNICEF</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing global C4D training and learning opportunities for staff</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening the evidence base on C4D;</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing technical guidance on C4D</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading the development of global C4D tools and templates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating and managing platforms and process for C4D knowledge management and networking</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing overall strategic direction on C4D within UNICEF</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The support that is provided by the ESARO regional office on C4D is well regarded. Across ESARO’s main C4D accountabilities and responsibilities ECO judged it to be performing well. Our country level survey revealed satisfaction with the leadership and advocacy it is providing on C4D in the region and the technical support it provides. A number of interviewees commented on how useful they found the regional C4D advisor’s interventions and how her attendance at country level annual meetings, section meetings and meetings of the C4D team was highly valued. Participants of regional level meetings (for C4D specialists from across the ESARO region) also noted the utility of such events. The one area for improvement for the regional office is around greater sharing of best practices and experiences on C4D from within the region. At present, this does not happen in a structured or systematic way.

There is a lack of long term in-country partnerships to support C4D capacity development. ECO currently has no formal partnership that it can leverage to support internal (or external) capacity development around C4D. Under the previous C4D structure, ECO started to develop relationships with Clear Impact Consulting and another local firm (Dynamic Development Studies & Capacity Building Consult PLC) to develop and roll out C4D training for government partners in the social sector. While the idea was to graduate both relationships into long-term arrangements, this did not materialise following the restructuring of C4D. Given the challenges that the ECO is currently facing in relation to building staff capacity, re-establishing such arrangement could be a useful way of scaling up internal capacity.

Efforts were made to build a partnership with a consortium of regional Ethiopian universities to support evidence generation around C4D, but it lacked sufficient by-in from within the ECO to progress. In 2012 steps were taken to sign a programme cooperation agreement with a consortium of eight regional Ethiopian that would support UNICEF in C4D research and evidence generation. The idea was that the consortium would strengthen local capacity in behavioural research, to inform evidence-based C4D approaches, and to facilitate the monitoring and evaluation of UNICEF supported interventions. Despite being viewed as an innovative initiative to facilitate better evidence use in C4D the consortium lacked sufficient by-in from with the country office. One of the main concerns was that Sections already had good
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relationships with University departments that worked in their sector and that they used to conduct behavioral research; having to work with a consortium of 8 new universities was viewed as unnecessary and an inefficient way of working.55

3.1.8 Sustainability of the C4D capacity results

This section looks at the factors that could erode the sustainability of the results that have been achieved from the capacity development initiatives.

A failure to invest in building the capacity of the wider body of programme staff is a factor which could undermine the sustainability of the capacity gains in C4D. While the focus of ECO to date has been on building the knowledge and skills of a small cadre of C4D experts, their effectiveness is constrained by the weak understanding of C4D (beyond material production) in the CO. This was an issue which was raised consistently in key informant interviews (see section 6.1.2). Without further efforts to build capacity of the wider staff body in C4D, be it through more systematic cascading of training by C4D Specialists or a general C4D course provided to the country office, the C4D specialists will struggle to deliver on their role. This will over time undermine the investment that has been made in building the capacity of C4D Specialists.

Wavering support from senior management could also undermine the capacity gains that have been made in C4D. As discussed above, the role of senior managers as champions for C4D, particularly the Representative and Deputy Representative, is central to ensuring it remains a priority for the CO. ECO has been fortunate to have a string of Representatives and Deputies who have seen the value of C4D as a cross cutting programme strategy and have ensured resources and time were given to integrating it into the country programme. If a future Representative and/or Deputy came in who was either agnostic or unconvinced about C4D, there is a risk that the additional efforts that are needed to build internal capacity and ensure the current investment delivers its potential value would not happen.

Staff turnover is also a concern for sustainability. The last factor is turnover within the current cadre of C4D specialists. At the moment they have not trained others and wider training has not been rolled out. This presents a risk. If they leave, the investment in C4D capacity development will leave with them. Arguably, the decision to fill the C4D specialist’s roles with Ethiopia nationals rather than internationals will possibly mitigate this risk56, however this should not mean no strategy is put in place.

3.2. Integration of C4D into the CO country programme

The following section presents the findings on how far C4D has been integrated into UNICEF Ethiopia’s programme, plans and structures. The definition of integration used in the evaluation relates to six dimensions: 1. the extent to which the country office has a clear C4D strategy and vision; 2. how this strategy for C4D has been reflected in core planning documents and processes such as the situational analysis, country programme document and results framework; 3. the extent and quality of reporting on C4D through annual reports; 4. how the C4D function has been structured to deliver on the strategy and plans; 5. the level of resourcing for C4D and the processes for resource mobilisation; and 6. the ways in which C4D and external communications work together.

The findings presented in this section have been informed by a range of data sources, including: a review of core CO levels documents such as the CPD, situation analysis and the results framework, interviews...
with senior managers, technical staff and C4D specialists and the online survey. All findings are triangulated by multiple data sources.

The section is structured in five parts. It starts by looking at the C4D strategy (3.2.1), then presents the findings in relation C4D integration into planning (3.2.2) and reporting (3.2.3). Following this are sections on the structure of the C4D function (3.2.4), how resources for C4D are mobilised (3.2.5) and its integration with external communications (3.2.6).

Key findings:

- While there has been much discussion and thinking around C4D in UNICEF Ethiopia, there is an absence of a clear C4D strategy and/or plan for how internal (or external) C4D capacity should be built.
- While C4D had a clear profile in the 2012-15 country programme and results framework, following the restructuring and the embedding of C4D in Sections, what are C4D results, or results that C4D contributes to has become less clear.
- C4D is mentioned in the 2012 and 2016 Situation Analyses but relatively superficially. A number of more focused situation analyses have been undertaken that partly make up for this gap.
- While the current structure of the C4D function provides a good way of bringing C4D support closer to Sections, and enhances Section’s ownership and accountability for C4D results, there remain challenges in coordinating C4D initiatives across Sections.
- The current level of financial allocations to C4D initiatives is low and largely insufficient to meet the needs of the country programme. Three factors have contributed to this: the lack of systematic engagement of C4D staff in inputting to and reviewing funding proposals; the lack of clarity around C4D results; and donor reluctance to fund C4D interventions.

### 3.2.1 C4D Strategy

This section looks at whether UNICEF Ethiopia has a clear vision and strategy for C4D across the country programme.

**While there has been much discussion and thinking around C4D, there has been an absence of a clear C4D strategy for the country office.** A C4D Strategy note was produced as part of the preparations for the 2012-2015 country programme. This outlined the top level priorities for the forthcoming CPD and was externally peer-reviewed. A Programme Strategy Document was also developed in collaboration with officials from the Ministry of Women, Youth and Children and Ministry of Education. Following the restructuring no strategy update was undertaken. The MTR presented the agreed cross cutting strategy areas and a number of internal position and discussion papers have been produced that elaborate on this further, but there is no intention to produce an updated C4D strategy. Rather, C4D will be integrated into section strategy notes.\(^{57}\) The absence of a clear strategy has perhaps been problematic. We heard from field offices that they are unsure what the C4D strategy is.\(^{58}\) The new CPD will be an important opportunity for Sections to clearly articulate their C4D strategy.

**While there is recognition of the need for C4D capacity development, there has been no clear assessment of what the needs are nor a clear plan for how these should be addressed.** In a number of internal documents the need for building both counterpart and internal capacity on C4D is recognised. This is one of the responsibilities of the PMU C4D specialist. However, at the time of writing no plan had been developed. Likewise, there has not been a capacity needs assessment to understand capacity
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needs. We found evidence of this being undertaken by some sections in relation to counterparts (e.g. the comprehensive health communication assessment recently conducted in all regions indicated key capacity building areas to strengthen the C4D functions at federal and regional levels) but this was piece meal. Likewise, a training needs assessment was undertaken in advance of the 2012 ECO training, but has not been repeated. Currently, all Sections state that they only have a moderate understanding of their capacity needs, Education indicated they have a low understanding but would like to improve.

3.2.2 Integration of C4D in planning processes

This section assesses the extent to which C4D has been integrated into core planning processes and documents of UNICEF Ethiopia.

At the start of the 2012-15 country programme, C4D had a clear profile in the results framework, following the restructuring it is less clear. At the start of the 2012-15 country programme C4D had its own programme component result, two cross-cutting results and four sector intermediary results. Following the 2013 MTR it was decided that there was no need for C4D to have its own outcome level results, therefore C4D was integrated into the results structure of the Sections by incorporating all C4D intermediate results (IRs) into the ‘demand creation’ space of the sections. In the revised results structure each Section has results which have been identified as C4D related or require significant C4D inputs. These are outlined in Figure 2 below. It is not completely clear how C4D fits into each section. In the case of Health, Nutrition and Child Protection the C4D outputs are clear. In WASH and Education much less so. Across all of the section results, the links between the indicators and outputs are confusing. On one level the ambiguity in the results framework possibly reflects a lack of systematic thinking. But it is also likely to be a reflection of the significant restructuring that C4D underwent mid way through the 2012-15 country programme.

Figure 2 C4D Results and indicators from the CO results framework
Efforts have been made to better integrate C4D into the core planning processes of the CO, but these are hampered by capacity constraints. The ECO produces Annual Workplans every two years. These are produced by all sections and regions. There are 153 AWPs in total.60 As part of its role in overseeing the AWPs the PMU produces and disseminates technical guidance on how to mainstream C4D in AWPs to all Section and Field Offices. The PMU also has a quality assurance template that it uses to check each AWP to ensure they meet key UNICEF minimum standards: the existence and resourcing of C4D activities is included in this. The challenge with this process is that by the time the AWPs are quality assured they have already gone through a number of rounds of discussion between UNICEF staff and government counterparts and there is often no the appetite or time for any major revisions. As a result, the C4D quality assurance process is not much more than a toothless exercise of pointing out the faults of C4D planning and budgeting. In principle, there are opportunities to engage in the AWP process at an earlier stage, through a series of AWP workshops in the regions, which technical staff can attend, but in practice C4D specialists do not have the time to attend all workshops. Likewise, C4D focal points in the region need to get involved earlier, but they lack the capacity and mandate to do this.61 As a result, what we heard from a number of informants is that AWPs often lack C4D indicators, or where they exist the budget allocation is too limited.62 This is also echoed in a number of internal C4D documents as an area of ongoing weakness.63

C4D is mentioned in the 2012 and 2016 Situation Analyses but relatively superficially. Our review of the 2012 Situation Analysis64 found no specific section on C4D, nor a section which looks at the barriers / enablers of behaviour and social norms change or the enabling environment for communication. Reference is made to needing to change cultural norms in relation to FGM and gender and to the prevalence of harmful traditional practices and a recommendation is made to ‘strengthen efforts to replace discriminator, norms, attitudes and practices including violence against women’ (p27). Likewise, there is cursory discussion of behaviour change under WASH. Overall, the 2012 Situation Analysis engages with C4D to a very limited extent and perhaps indicates the level of integrated C4D thinking that was going on at the time.

An updated Situation Analysis was completed to inform the new 2016-19 country programme. While there is an analysis of the barriers and opportunities to behaviour and social change peppered throughout the report and across sectors, it is not systematic.

However, a number of more focused situation analyses have been undertaken that partly make up for the weaknesses in the country level analysis. Perhaps partly in response to this, a more rapid situation analysis was undertaken for the Programme Strategy Document. This looks at each of the sections, and explores some of the key behavioural and social norm related bottlenecks and challenges in each of the three Programme Component Result areas, including knowledge levels, attitudes and behavioural practices of caregivers/duty-bearers, prevailing traditional, religious and socio-cultural norms and the related issue of demand and utilization of services. This situational analysis helped inform the CPD. Because of the cultural and ethnic diversity within Ethiopia, regional offices also undertake situation analyses. To encourage a deeper and more systematic analysis of barriers and opportunities to behaviour and social change and the wider communications environment, PMU have integrated C4D specific guidance into its guidance to regional field offices.65 This includes support around identifying specific behavioural bottlenecks and helping to unpack different ways in which communities receive, process and
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act on information. The Oromia field office indicated that they recently completed a situation analysis for the region that had a very strong focus on C4D.66

3.2.3 Reporting on C4D

This section assess the consistency and quality with which C4D has been reported on by UNICEF Ethiopia.

While C4D has been reported on each year for the period 2012-15 in UNICEF Ethiopia’s annual reports, the quality of the reporting has been poor with a focus on activities and outputs and very little on outcomes. Between 2012-15 there has been consistent monitoring and reporting on C4D. While C4D was identified as a core cross-cutting strategy in the UNICEF 2006-13 Medium Term Strategic Plan, the ECO, along with all other COs, was mandated to report on progress against a set of C4D benchmarks. This was the case for 2012 and 2013. In the current 2014-17 Strategic Plan it is integrated under the wider implementation strategies of capacity development and service delivery. This has meant that it is no longer mandatory to report on C4D as a stand-alone cross cutting strategy. While reporting still takes place through C4D related indicators linked to Strategic Plan results area, in the absence of the benchmarks, C4D reporting is far less coherent.

The challenge with ECO reporting on C4D is that it is activity- and output-based. Across none of the Annual Reports or RAMs did we find evidence of reporting on higher level results. There are a number of reasons for this. First, the results framework is not clear about what is the behaviour change that is being sought. Second, the indicators that are being used do not measure the result they are associated with. For example, one of the outputs under nutrition in the revised results framework has a very clear focus on changing knowledge, attitudes and practices, but none of the three indicators allocated to this outputs actually measure this result. The focus is on the practices, but not the behaviours. Likewise, one of the health outputs is focused on building the capacity of the FMOH to plan and implement communication for development programmes, yet the indicator measures number of regions/woredas conducting social mobilisation campaigns. The impact of this is that reporting on C4D is very focused at the activity and output level.

However, there are signs of improvement. The new country programme is clearer in articulating C4D results and associated indicators and baseline KAP surveys have been undertaken. For example, baseline assessments have been conducted on FGMC, in education, WASH, Nutrition and Child Protection.67

3.2.4 Structure of the C4D function

This section analyses the strengths and weaknesses of how the C4D function is structured in UNICEF Ethiopia.

The current structure of the C4D function provides a good way of bringing C4D support closer to Sections, but there remain challenges. As discussed above ECO underwent a restructurung of its C4D function in 2013. This led to C4D specialists being embedded in each of the Sections and focal points appointed in each of the regions. The rationale behind this restructuring was to create better ownership, by- in and accountability for C4D, improve alignment of sector strategies, partnerships and interventions around C4D and reduce fragmentation and duplication of efforts.68 Across all of our interviews and focus groups there was a strong sense that the new model was the right structure for the ECO and that it addressed many
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of the challenges of the previous model. Interviewees stressed how the new structure brought C4D skills closer to where they were most needed; and how it was now easier to get tailored advice within Sections on C4D. The following quotes illustrate this:

“The major advantage [of the new structure] is that we have got someone with very good skills in C4D in programme section, so we are not going to another section for each and every request for C4D."

“The current model works well….It makes more sense to have C4D people embedded in Sections as they develop a better understanding of programme and the section counterparts. It allows them to be more proactive and to create synergies.”

The major challenge with the current structure relates to the coordination of cross-cutting initiatives. The revised country programme document identified a number of cross-cutting C4D priorities. The role of the PMU C4D Specialists is to spearhead these, however she has struggled as the Sections’ contributions (not just funding) towards these cross-cutting strategies and partnerships are often not prioritized and there is no allocation from regular resources to support them.

3.2.5 Resource mobilisation for C4D

This section assesses whether C4D resources are sufficient for the needs of the country programme and explores the factors which are supporting or preventing effective resource mobilisation.

The current level of financial allocations to C4D is considered low and largely insufficient to meet the needs of the country programme. The country level survey indicated that the current level of financial allocations to C4D is only ‘to a small extent’ sufficient to meet the needs of the country programme. This issue was also raised in interviews: a number of informants noted how C4D activities were “consistently underfunded”, how focal points always had to “lobby for more resources” and how inadequate resourcing of C4D meant that staff were “unable to effectively respond to government needs”. The limits of current financial allocations were also a common theme at a C4D retreat in 2013. During the retreat C4D staff working in the sections, regions and the PMU all indicated how a lack of adequate funding for C4D activities was presenting a barrier to effective C4D implementation. It is worth noting however, that the overall spend on C4D has increased year on year. Between 2012 and 2015 there has been an increase in the percentage of the country programme expenditure going to C4D. In 2012/13 it is estimated that the overall spend on C4D as a proportion of the overall country budget was 2-5%, while this has risen to 5-10% in 2014/15. ECO’s estimate that financial allocation to C4D in 2015/16 is approx. USD 6,300,000. Likewise, it is important to recognise that the polio programme at ECO is an outlier. The programme and associated budget is managed by a separate AWP and budgeting process between ECO, RO and HQ. Funding for Polio related C4D has largely been well funded over the period of study.

Three factors have contributed to inadequate financial allocations to C4D: the lack of systematic engagement of C4D staff in inputting to and reviewing funding proposals; the lack of clarity around C4D results; and donor reluctance to fund C4D interventions. Ensuring that there are sufficient resources allocated to C4D is central to ensuring quality implementation. As discussed above, at present this is not happening. A number of factors can explain this. First, there is a lack of engagement of C4D specialists in the development of funding proposals and concept notes. Informants consistently
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emphasised how C4D specialists are not being effectively engaged in the proposal process and as a result unable to check whether C4D activities are appropriately budgeted-for. As one informant noted:

"When we see proposals where C4D specialists are not involved, it's always about BCC material and it will be not more than 50k US, and there won't be strategic use of evidence. We need to be involved more and then we are empowered to influence the proposal." 74

Likewise, the country level survey indicated that the C4D team/leads are only involved in the resource mobilisation strategies of the country programme 'to a small extent.' 75 An internal document assessing progress post-restructuring also raised this as an area of concern. 76 ECO is aware of this issue and is taking steps to address it. For example, guidance on C4D resourcing has been produced to provide a steer to staff on allocations to C4D. 77 Similarly, there has also been talk of putting in place consistent mechanisms to mainstream C4D in resource mobilization, although exactly what that would involve is unclear. 78

A second factor explaining the inadequate resource allocations to C4D is the lack of clarity around C4D results in the CO results framework. As discussed in section 6.2.2, the revised results framework does not clearly articulate C4D results, and the indicators that exist are process rather than outcome-focused. Given that budgeting is based on the results framework and funding is allocated and mobilised for a particular outputs and outcomes, this is problematic. The lack of clarity around what is the behaviour change that is being sought contributes to a lack of clarity around what level of resources needs to go to C4D.

The final factor influencing resource allocation to C4D is donor reluctance to fund C4D. Informants noted how donors are rarely willing to fund exclusively C4D interventions and that it can be challenging to convince them of the value of C4D. Arguably this is no different from any other programme strategy: C4D is a means to an end, not an end in itself, and that what needs to be clearly communicated to donors is why the C4D intervention is the best way to achieve the result.

### 3.2.6 C4D and external communications

The following section explores the interaction between C4D and External Communications in UNICEF Ethiopia and whether there is scope for the two functions to work in a more complementary way.

**While there is no formal joint planning between C4D and external communications, there is informal and ad hoc collaboration.** Given the overlaps in the tools and approaches employed by external communications/advocacy and C4D there can be value in working jointly. In the context of the ECO, there is evidence that there is joint working, but this is done on an informal and ad hoc basis. A key initiative where joint working and collaboration is happening is the girl’s empowerment campaign focused on changing social norms. 79 For example, the PMU C4D specialist sits on the core task force for the campaign. Reference was also made to good coordination around FGM and Polio. 80 Given the substantial workload of C4D within ECO, this informal approach to collaboration seems appropriate and largely effective. The only word of caution is that this approach relies on good personal relationships. While this current relationship is good, when individuals change, this may not continue.
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There could be benefits in improving awareness in the CO of the overlaps between C4D and external communications and advocacy. While there seems to be agreement that ad hoc collaboration is the best mode of engagement between C4D and external communications, there was a sense from some informants that greater awareness of the overlaps and the complementarities would be useful, in particular how the theories and approach of C4D can help inform external advocacy efforts given the focus of both on behaviour change. At present there is a view that policy advocacy and C4D are very separate, one focused on government and the public and the other around downstream engagement with communities around service provision. This is an interesting finding given this understanding of C4D runs counter to that being promoted by HQ, which sees C4D as straddling both downstream and upstream work.

3.3. Implementation of C4D

The following section presents the findings of the evaluation in relation to UNICEF Ethiopia’s implementation of C4D. We have looked at implementation from three different angles. First, we have looked across the five sectors of UNICEF Ethiopia’s work and summarised the progress that they have made in relation to C4D. Second, we have looked at implementation from the perspective of the country office’s performance against a set of global C4D benchmarks. Lastly, we have distilled a set of findings about building partner capacity on C4D. By taking these three different views of implementation we can build up a rounded picture of what UNICEF is accomplishing on C4D and the lessons it is learning.

The findings presented in this section have been informed by a range of data sources: our synthesis of annual reports, triangulated with additional internal documents and key informant interviews. The data supporting the benchmark assessment comes from our online survey, document review, interviews and group discussions. The evidence on partners, is primarily from document review and interviews with partners.

The section is structured in three parts: experiences of UNICEF Ethiopia in implementing C4D and the challenges faced (3.3.1); the country office’s performance against benchmarks (3.2.2); and lessons that have been learnt from delivering capacity development activities to partners (3.2.3).

Key findings:

- Other than education, where progress around C4D seems to be less evolved, the implementation of C4D interventions has been a key part of all Sections’ work. Despite this progress, there have been common challenges. Key among these have been the implementation of cross-sector initiatives and a lack of resourcing around C4D interventions limiting their impact and scalability.
- There has been a significant amount of activity around C4D in UNICEF Ethiopia. However, across the five C4D global benchmarks that are considered proxies for quality implementation, the ECO performance is mixed. This indicates a lack of consistency in the quality with which C4D is being designed and implemented. Key areas for improvement are: ensuring a more systematic and consistent use of evidence in the design and implementation of C4D interventions and ensuring that C4D best practices and innovations are actively disseminated externally.
- The limits of partner capacity are considered a major barrier to effective implementation of C4D initiatives. A range of strategies have been used to address this, including: training, technical assistance and system development. The current balance between these strategies however is not appropriate for building long term sustainable capacity among partners with a preponderance to
3.3.1 Experiences of implementing C4D approaches

Table 5 below presents the experiences, lessons and challenges of UNICEF Ethiopia in implementing C4D over the course of the 2012-15 country programme. For each Section we also list the C4D priority strategies that were identified following the 2013 MTR.

Table 4 Experiences and challenges of implementing C4D, by sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sectors and C4D priorities</th>
<th>Experiences implementing C4D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cross sectoral strategies</td>
<td>Progress in implementation: At the start of the Country Programme UNICEF Ethiopia adopted a systems approach for C4D, but this faced challenges. C4D expertise and coordination was weak among government, meaning there was an insufficiently strong institutional anchor for C4D among Government counterparts. There was also limited preparedness by Government to engage with civil society organisations specialising in C4D. Overall, there was a sense that the efforts by UNICEF to strengthen strategic multilevel C4D platforms among key Government ministries were premature. The repositioning of C4D in the country programme as a cross cutting strategy embedded in Sections and a series of cross-sectoral initiatives was a response to this. Progress in implementing the cross-sectoral initiatives and partnerships have been mixed. While there have been notable successes, such as the partnership with religious leaders, efforts to, for example, capitalise on school-based platforms have had less traction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASH</td>
<td>Progress in implementation: The WASH Section has been promoting key WASH behaviours through C4D interventions. These include hand-washing with soap at critical times, proper toilet usage, food hygiene, safe water management and menstrual hygiene management. Much of UNICEF’s support has been to the ministries of Health, Education, and MOWCA. For example, UNICEF provided technical assistance to the Urban Health Extension Program to design context specific C4D strategies to reach urban communities with appropriate messages. Likewise, UNICEF supported the inclusion of Menstrual Hygiene Management (MHM) in the Health extension programme, and produced guidelines on National MHM and WASH communication. Support has also been provided to develop a National Sanitation Strategy document and Behavioral Change Communication strategy for Multiple use WASH Services. Challenges to implementation: A key challenge that WASH have experienced in the implementation of C4D has been the lack of long term planned and scalable C4D interventions. In most instances, WASH related C4D interventions have been event based, such as Global Handwashing Day. This limits the potential of C4D to provide sustained and relevant messages to WASH audiences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Health**

- MNCH
- ICCM
- EPI
- Malaria
- Emergencies

**Progress in implementation:** Health’s C4D focused has been on building the capacity of FMOH and RHBS for the planning and implementation of strategic social and behaviour change interventions. Technical and financial support was provided to the FMOH to undertake the National Health Communication Assessment and develop the National Health Communication Strategy (NHCS), and related guideline and tools. This is an important achievement given the commitment and overarching vision this illustrates from the FMOH for C4D. C4D has also been mainstreamed in the training of trainer modules, guidelines, manuals and tools that target Health Workers and Health Managers. Likewise, health C4D materials and tools and capacity building support has been provided to schools, media professionals and religious leaders around priority health issues. For example there have been C4D strategic plans, networks, trainings, M&E frameworks and supporting materials developed for polio eradication and routine immunization and technical assistance to and mobilization of local and religious networks to improve demand for an expanded programme on immunization (EPI). Support has also been provided to the Ministry of Health to carry out routine immunization training for mid-level managers, with a focus on C4D.

**Challenges to implementation:** The amount of time government partners are willing to wait for material development has been an issue. We heard how there is often pressure to get materials designed and produced without adequate review. Linked to this there have been challenges in ensuring materials are adequately tested and tailored. The amount of resources allocated by government to C4D interventions has also been a problem, as has the high turnover of FMOH communication staff. Transitioning of polio gains to routine programmes and broad child survival are also being supported, but are based on available funding, which is often not long-term.
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**Education**

- Early Childhood Development
- Access
- Advocacy for retention
- Safe school environment

**Progress in implementation:** In Education, particular emphasis has been given to Early Childhood Development, and access to education particularly for girls and children. Three main interventions related to capacity building and behaviour change communication have been delivered. The first involves building the capacity of education media centers and mini media in schools and youth centers. The second is the production and dissemination of a two year radio serial drama on cross-sectoral issues facing women and children. The aim of this was to enroll and retain out of school children by increasing communities knowledge of the value of education. The third intervention is training of media producers / journalists working with children and youth. UNICEF have also supported the development of a teaching guide for Muslim religious leaders that included behavior change messages such as: promoting girls education and provided technical assistance to the Ministry of Education (MoE) to develop a Communication for Development (C4D) strategy.

**Challenges to implementation:** The education section’s main challenge in implementing C4D has been the capacity of the MoE to engage with and coordinate C4D. A concern expressed was that there was not a natural interlocutor for UNICEF to engage with on C4D in the ministry.
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**Nutrition**

- IYCF
- CBN
- Micronutrients
- Adolescent nutrition program
- Adolescent deworming programme
- School BCC
- PSNP

**Progress in implementation:** Feeding and caring behaviors are critical determinants of nutritional status. C4D is central to improving these practices. UNICEF’s focus has been supporting the implementation of social and behavioural change communication interventions planned under each strategic objective of the National Nutrition Program by strengthening systems and building the capacities of health extension workers, the Health Development Army/women development army, and agricultural extension workers as well as teachers in delivering nutrition focused BCC. This has been achieved through training, technical support and the development of multi-media SBCC materials prepared in local languages. For example, UNICEF provided training to Health Extension Workers to provide counselling services and communicate key messages around Infant and Young Child feeding. Likewise, through the Adolescent Nutrition Programme BCC messages on adolescent nutrition and the consequences of child marriage and teenage pregnancy were communicated through school clubs. UNICEF also supported the coordination, development, adoption and enforcement of
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nutrition related policy and legislation and resource mobilization, e.g. enforcement of salt iodization, and the Code of Marketing on Breast Milk substitutes.

**Challenges in implementation:** One of the challenges faced by Nutrition in implementing C4D is the diversity and complexity of the barriers to behavior change and social norms around feeding and caring behaviors in Ethiopia. For example, the existence of diverse cultural practices and beliefs around young child feeding and care has become a major bottleneck to positive behavioral change. Moving forward UNICEF is trying to use more operational research to uncover the different behavioral barriers and ensure to address the barriers through appropriate messages and delivery channels that are appropriate to the local context.

### Child protection

**Progress in implementation:** C4D is a significant component of Child Protection programming in UNICEF Ethiopia and is integrated across each of the three sub-units of work: violence against children (VAC), Child friendly social welfare and Child Justice and Birth Registration. UNICEF has provided strategic support to MOWCA, BOWCAs and other partners to design and implement C4D interventions as well as adopt the National Harmful Traditional Practices strategy, with a related action plan and Social Norm Change communication strategy.101 The latter is considered a significant achievement for UNICEF.

C4D interventions are an important part of changing the existing social norms around CM and FGM/C. UNICEF has therefore supported a range of C4D interventions including: interpersonal communication which engages girls and families through trainings and dialogues, and collective action to ensure abandonment of both practices. The support that UNICEF has been able to generate from religious leaders in the elimination of FGM/C is particularly important. Advocacy for better allocation of budget and accountability mechanism for improved implementation of the existing law is also part of the C4D interventions under VAC. HIV and Adolescent programs are also implementing communication strategies as part of the prevention as well as promotion of services to enhance demand and access to child-friendly services.

C4D is also part of UNICEF’s child-friendly social welfare and CPIE programs. These are planned to encourage the adoption of behaviour and practices, which ensure safety of children. C4D strategies are in development on CPIE and Social Cash transfer, and capacity building trainings were provided to partners and staff working on this.

**Challenges in implementation:** The scope of C4D activities across Child Protection is significant but the capacity to deliver on this is limited. As discussed above, Child Protection, similar to other Sections only has one C4D specialist who is also responsible for the coordination of the ending child marriage and FGM/C programs implemented in six regions and at federal level. While other technical staff within the Section have C4D expertise this remains underdeveloped. One of the key challenges that Child Protection has faced is ensuring sufficient focus on a manageable number of results that C4D can contribute to. Because of the demand for C4D, there is a risk that capacity is spread too thinly. This could impact upon the quality of the C4D interventions being designed and implemented.

As illustrated in Table 5, clearly, there has been a significant amount of activity around C4D in UNICEF Ethiopia. Other than education, where progress around C4D seems to be less developed, the implementation of C4D interventions has been a key part of all Sections’ work. Despite this progress however, there have been challenges. The implementation of cross-sector initiatives has been problematic. Difficulties around securing buy-in and support from Sections, resources and encouraging coordination in planning and implementation have stalled progress in this area. Likewise, there are common issues emerging from sections around the lack of resourcing around C4D interventions limiting their impact and scalability. In the case of Child Protection the strong demand for C4D has posed challenges in prioritising work and focusing on a manageable number of results involving C4D.

#### 3.3.2 Performance against the global C4D benchmarks

The following section reviews UNICEF Ethiopia’s performance against the C4D benchmarks. These are a voluntary tool for country offices to report on the quality of C4D implementation. The C4D global benchmarks provide a proxy for the quality of C4D implementation. They have been developed by the C4D Unit in New York and will become a means for country offices to self-report on their C4D performance in C4D. This evaluation is being used as an opportunity to pilot the benchmarks and test means of...
verification. As outlined in Table 6 each of the benchmarks was scored on a four-point scale, from red (no evidence to suggest the benchmark is being met) through amber and yellow to green (high level of evidence that the benchmark is being met). To help guide the assessment, specific criteria were developed for each benchmark which contextualised the scale to the issue being measured. The detailed scales that were used can be found in Annex 7.

Table 5 Summary of ECO's performance against the global C4D benchmarks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmarks</th>
<th>Performance Rating</th>
<th>Summary of evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. New or existing mechanisms (task forces, working groups etc.) are established and functioning to plan, coordinate and strengthen C4D activities.</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>A number of mechanisms were identified for coordinating and strengthening C4D activities. All the groups are multi-partner and have UNICEF in a lead role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. C4D plans/interventions are informed by, use and monitor data and evidence on behavioural and socio-cultural factors as well as media and communication contexts</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>A range of research studies and evaluations have been undertaken over the past 4 years on C4D. The use of monitoring data is weak and evidence use does not seem to be systematic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Participatory processes are used to engage community representatives and members into sector programmes/interventions</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Participation had prominent profile in the initial 2012-15 country programme. While examples were found of participatory processes being used, there was a common reflection among both UNICEF and some external informants that overall participation is not consistently practiced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Plans/initiatives/ongoing programmes to strengthen C4D capacities of UNICEF staff, partners at national and sub-national levels</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>The ECO has made a good investment in strengthening the capacity of UNICEF internal staff and government counterparts, however efforts to date have lacked coordination and focused on training at the expense of wider systems development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. C4D best practices, impact assessments, tools, resources, innovations and lessons learned are documented and disseminated among key audiences.</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>The ECO has produced a wide range of best practice notes, manuals, and guides on C4D. A number of these have been translated into local languages. Their dissemination however remains piecemeal. None seem to be underpinned by communication plans and a number of informants indicated the need for UNICEF to more proactively communicate its learning and good practices in C4D.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Benchmark 1 – UNICEF is actively engaged in a number of mechanisms that serve to coordinate and strengthen C4D activities at the national level, for example. The National health communication working group and thematic communication taskforces; the National EPI communication working group; the National alliance for ending child marriage\textsuperscript{102} a national technical committee on girls education and an emergency cluster on education in emergencies.\textsuperscript{103} While these are all functioning groups, they are at different levels of development. For example, the education group is still relatively nascent.\textsuperscript{104} The groups vary in their C4D focus. Some, such as the national health communication working group are exclusively C4D, whereas others such as the technical working group of girls education is focused on girls’ education broadly, but has done focused work around identifying the behavioural barriers to getting girls into education. All the groups are multi-partner, led by the government and with UNICEF in a key role. For example, the national health communications working group is led jointly by UNICEF, WHO and FMOH.

\textsuperscript{102} Country level survey
\textsuperscript{103} Key informant 2
\textsuperscript{104} Key informant 2
Similarly, the emergency cluster group is led by government and coordinated by UNICEF and Save the Children Fund.

**Benchmark 2 – UNICEF Ethiopia has conducted a wide range of research studies and evaluations to inform C4D, however it is too early to say that evidence use has been systematically embedded in the design and implementation of C4D interventions.** Commissioned research studies and evaluations include KAP surveys, impact evaluations, endline evaluations and formative research on barriers to behaviour change. A number of these have directly informed the design and planning of C4D initiatives. For example, UNICEF-WHO supported an EPI-focused social and behavioural determinant survey in 2012. The findings were used in 2013 as the basis for revising the EPI Communication Plan. Likewise, UNICEF provided technical support to a National Health Communication Assessment in 2013 on interpersonal, behavioural and social change communication systems and structures. The findings were used to further develop the National Health Communication Strategy.

Despite the array of evidence that has been commissioned, it is not possible to say that commissioning and use of evidence to inform the design and implementation of C4D initiatives is systematic. For example, as discussed in section 6.2.2, the situation analysis did not cover C4D in any depth and failed to analyse the barriers and opportunities for behaviour change. Likewise, as discussed in section 6.2.3 the quality of monitoring data is poor and does not provide a good basis for ongoing adaptation and improvement. While informants recognized that there had been improvements in the use of evidence, the norm is that evidence is not used, although we did get the sense that this may be changing. For example, as part of the preparations for the next country programme document, there was discussion of the C4D team conducting mapping of current research and evidence (completed and ongoing) against the different behaviour changes that are included in the results framework. This would then be used to identify where primary research/data collection needed to be commissioned. In addition to this, a number of KAP surveys have been conducted to provide baseline data for the new CPD.

As in other areas of C4D Polio is again an outlier with regards to evidence use. Given the focus and high level of investment that has gone into Polio, the M&E frameworks that are in place are high quality and we relatively good evidence to suggest effective use of data from monitoring and evaluation data in programme design and implementation.

**Benchmark 3 – While there are examples of participatory processes being used by UNICEF Ethiopia to engage community representatives and members in C4D sector programmes/interventions, there is evidence that overall the ECO struggles to do this consistently.** Participation had prominent profile in the initial 2012-15 Country Programme. One of the crosscutting results that the dedicated PCR was designed to achieve was enhancing participation of communities, children and young people in the development process. There have been efforts to enhance participation across range of programmes. For example, as part of the healthy school initiative a radio serial drama was launched which included a strong media outreach component for engaging listening groups. The Adolescent nutrition programme also has a strong element of youth participation and empowerment. Likewise, UNICEF has been heavily involved and a big supporter of community dialogues as part of its efforts around ending FGM/C. However, despite these promising practices, there was a common reflection among both UNICEF and external informants that the principle of participatory C4D is not always put into practice. Some reflected that in their particular sector participatory practices were minimal, others that
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engagement and participation was generally missed out of how C4D initiatives were designed and implemented. The challenges the ECO faces in putting participatory principles into practice in C4D was also raised in the MTE of the 2012-15 country programme.

**Benchmark 4 - ECO has invested in building both internal and external C4D capacity, but this has not been underpinned by a clear strategy.** As is outlined in more detail in section 5.2.3, UNICEF has invested in strengthening the capacity of its staff in C4D primarily through sending 14 people to the Ohio course. While this has produced results, more is needed for the capacity gains to be sustainable and for significant improvements in the quality of C4D design and implementation to occur. Likewise, as explained in detail in section 6.3.3 below, UNICEF has also been very active in providing capacity support to government counterparts. While this has been well received, it has suffered from a lack of coordination and a clear capacity building strategy. There is also a lack of any strategic partnership to support and coordinate external C4D capacity development. While these existed when the C4D function was housed within a single unit, when the restructuring took place the partnerships were stopped.

**Benchmark 5 – ECO has developed a wide range of materials detailing best practices, innovations and learning, but has not been actively disseminating these among national partners.** These materials include manuals, guides and tools that detail best practices and innovations in C4D. Many are locally contextualized and translated into local languages. While a few partners were able to indicate specific documents and reports that UNICEF have produced, most were not and thought that UNICEF needed to improve how it shared and disseminated its learning on C4D. As one informant noted, “UNICEF has such expertise and knowledge on C4D. We want to learn from their experience.” Given its role in promoting C4D, UNICEF should look at ways in which it can help to support the sharing and learning of its experience. This will be a way to build a strong network of C4D practitioners.

**Across the five C4D benchmarks UNICEF Ethiopia’s performance is mixed.** While the CO is making good progress in all areas, there remains room for improvement. This indicates that the quality of C4D implementation is variable across the country programme. Key areas for improvement are: ensuring a more systematic and consistent use of evidence in the design and implementation of C4D interventions; approaching capacity development in a more joined up and coordinated way and ensuring that C4D best practices and innovations are actively disseminated externally.

### 3.3.3 Lessons learnt from building the C4D capacity of partners

The following section looks at what lessons can be drawn from UNICEF Ethiopia’s efforts to build the C4D capacity of its government and NGO partners.

**The limits of partner capacity are considered a major barrier to effective design and implementation of C4D initiatives.** Given that UNICEF works through partners, their capacity to engage with and implement C4D activities is central to the success of C4D programming. Current levels of capacity are considered low. First, there is a general lack of awareness of what C4D is among partners, particularly government counterparts. Some informants highlighted a conflation between C4D, public relations and material development, others expressed concern that government do not understand
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the importance of participation and ensuring the communication strategies are evidence based. These issues were also raised during the MTR process and in a number of other internal documents. Second, human resources are limited and turn-over and staff retention is a challenge.

A range of strategies have been used to strengthen partner's C4D capacity, including training, technical assistance and system development. A wide range of activities have been delivered to build the capacity of government counterparts and implementing agencies. The support has been provided to a diverse range of partners, including: media professionals, government officials both in the central ministries and the regional bureaus, religious leaders, youth centres and school clubs etc. and covers all Sections.

The nature of the support falls into one of three categories: training, short term technical assistance and system development. Of the 31 capacity building activities that were delivered in the past 4 years, 61% (19) were training, 19% (6) were short term technical assistance and 19% (6) were for system development.

Training is the dominant capacity development strategy. Some has been exclusively C4D focused (e.g. the Oromia region Bureau of Labour and Social Affairs (2014) and Bureau of Women, Children and Youth (2015)), other training has had a wider focus, but a specific C4D module(s) (e.g. training of media practitioners on SBCC and nutrition reporting, and health). Some of the training has used the training of trainers approach (e.g. Health section supported IRT ToT national health communication training in 2014 and Quarterly Polio Communication Network Review and Training meetings have taken place since 2013).

The technical support that UNICEF has provided to partners has been similarly varied. It has included support to the FMOH and the nutrition coordination unit on planning, design and implementation of Social and Behaviour Change Communication, support to the Ministry of Health in developing WASH communication guidelines, and support to the production of SBCC packages for humanitarian emergencies. The PCN also supports Regional Health Bureaus (Afar, Benshangul Gumuz, Gambella, Somali) and Zonal Health Offices in every zone in Somali Region.

The support to systems development has generally been narrow in scope and focused exclusively on supporting the development of national communication strategies such as the National Health Promotion and Communication Strategy for the Ministry of Health and the National Communication strategy for social norm transformation to advance women and youth participation in development for the MOWCA. That said we did find evidence of wider systems work having taken place. For example, UNICEF establish coordination mechanisms for integrated approaches to sub-national C4D planning and implementation in nine regional government, and also, in agreement with the Ministry of Finance and Planning and Bureaus of Finance and Planning at district level, developed district level cross-sectoral C4D frameworks in eight UNICEF priority regions. However, both of these initiatives ended following the restructuring of C4D and the significant reduction in C4D resources for cross-section initiatives.

There is concern that the balance between capacity development strategies is not appropriate for building long term sustainable capacity among partners. Reflecting on the balance of capacity support currently provided by ECO, a number of informants noted that they didn’t think UNICEF had the emphasis right. There was a sense that too many resources were being put into training individuals on C4D who quickly move onto different roles. Because most of the training is one-off, this means capacity
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gaps reappear after a few years. It was argued that more focus and resources should be put into system development such as the articulation of C4D strategies for the different sectors / Ministries. The example of UNICEF’s work around the National Health Communication strategy was held up as a good example of more sustainable capacity support.\textsuperscript{123}

**The capacity support provided by UNICEF is well received by partners, but there is a demand for more.** Interviews with partners indicated that they are satisfied with the capacity support offered by UNICEF. Partners spoke of the added value that UNICEF brought to the process. One partner spoke of UNICEF making a significant contribution to strengthening the capacity of health extension workers and the health communication strategy,\textsuperscript{124} another of the engagement that UNICEF provided around the development of the communication strategy on social norms.\textsuperscript{125} A number of partners however emphasised the need for further support and training.\textsuperscript{126} For example, MoWCA indicated that while the support UNICEF has provided on social norms has been well received there is a need for “more training for more people” at federal and regional levels as capacity continues to be constrained.\textsuperscript{127} The need and demand for C4D capacity development among government counterparts has been recognised internally. Developing a capacity development strategy for government counterparts for example, was a main action agreed at the C4D staff retreat in 2013.\textsuperscript{128}

**There absence of strategic partnerships to support C4D capacity development is an impediment to UNICEF meeting the partner’s demand for support.** As discussed in Section 3.1.7, ECO currently has no formal partnership that it can leverage to support external C4D capacity development. While there have been efforts to establish these in the past, they have not come to fruition. Given the challenges that the ECO is facing in meeting demand from partner, re-establishing such arrangement could be a useful way of scaling up capacity.

**UNICEF’s efforts to build partner capacity are not sufficiently joined-up.** It is clear that there are many capacity development activities being undertaken across all sections. The challenge is that, to date, these are fragmented and uncoordinated. This point was raised by a number of different stakeholders. For example one informant noted that “while efforts to build counterpart capacity are included in the annual workplan, it is not necessarily guided by an overarching or joined-up strategy.”\textsuperscript{129} Another noted how the lack of coordination was a symptom of how the C4D function is structured: “capacity development is planned according to the Sections, while previously it was coordinated and systematic. We’re not joined up in our approach”.\textsuperscript{130} While the restructuring of C4D did try to pre-empt this and ensure the PMU C4D Specialist has a capacity development role, this is obviously not working as it should. While it may not be possible to design and roll out a comprehensive programme of support for C4D across government, a strategy for more joined up working and coordination would be beneficial. Doing this may for example lead to opportunities where C4D training could be run jointly for multiple ministries, or where a standard C4D training manual is developed that all Sections could use.\textsuperscript{131}

**Improvement in this areas required C4D capacity development for counterparts to become a priority, but it is unclear whether there is an appetite for this.** While there is consistent reference to counterpart capacity development being a priority for the ECO, the fragmented way in which it has been
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undertaken to date raises questions. Moreover, we found a clear scepticism among ECO staff. It was felt that commitment to building capacity is patchy at best. It varies between the Sections depending on the value that the section Chief places on C4D.\textsuperscript{132} For example, the results of our country level survey indicated that building counterpart capacity is not a major priority for the ECO over the next five years. Given that UNICEF does not implement C4D strategies itself and it is the government that does this, government capacity is a key potential bottleneck to the future success of C4D.

### 3.4. Evaluability of C4D programmes

This section presents our findings on the evaluability of C4D interventions. The purpose of this section is to look at what potential there is for assessing the impact of C4D interventions in the future. The framework that has been used to assess evaluability has two parts. First, whether it is possible in principle to evaluate the impact of a C4D intervention. To make this assessment we look at whether there is a clear logic to the intervention, whether it is clear what behaviors are being changed, what the contribution of C4D activities are to this and how the behavior change will impact on the lives of women and children. The second part of the assessment involves looking at whether it is possible to evaluate the intervention in practice; this involves looking at what monitoring data is being collected on behavior change, and the quality of the data, and assessing whether it is good enough to form the basis of an evaluation.

The assessment of evaluability has been applied at two levels. Our first unit of analysis was the ECO Results Framework as a whole. Here we analysed whether it would be possible to assess the aggregate effects of C4D programming across the entire country programme. Our second unit of analysis were two programmes with significant C4D components. These were selected based on the identification of Sections with a strong C4D basis, and within them interventions that were either high-profile or innovative.

The findings presented in this section have been informed by a range of data sources, including an in-depth review of the results framework, AWPs and for each of the C4D interventions review of design and reporting documents. These were supplemented with interviews with key informants. In the case of one of the sampled interventions we visited one of the implementation sites during our field visit.

**Key findings:**

- Based on the way that C4D was positioned in the Results Framework, it would not be possible to assess the contribution of C4D programming to specific Sector/Section results in the 2012-15 country programme. The lack of clarity around the causal logic linking C4D activities to outputs to outcomes presents a major problem. The indicators are low quality and often do not measure the results that they are proxies for. Moreover, many are process indicators measuring scale and reach, rather than changes in behaviour. Baseline data has not been collected for C4D relevant results.

- The evaluability of the two sampled C4D interventions is more positive. We judged both to be evaluable ‘in principle’ and ‘in practice’. There was considerably greater clarity in the theories underpinning both interventions, and the role that C4D results and activities play in this. In both cases it was possible to see how C4D activities were being used to bring about specific behaviour changes. Likewise, both programmes have or are in the process of contracting an external partner to collect data against the results framework.

Based on the way that C4D was positioned in the Results Framework, it would not be possible to assess the contribution of C4D programming to specific Sector/Section results in the 2012-15 country programme. To undertake the evaluability assessment, the unit of analysis was the results
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framework revised following the 2013 MTR. We then assessed the framework against a set of criteria detailed in the table 7 below. We judged that it was neither possible to evaluate the framework in principle nor in practice. As a result we rated the results framework as ‘red’ on both issues. The lack of clarity around the causal logic linking C4D activities to outputs to outcomes presents a major problem. It is currently not clear what the specific contribution of C4D activities are in the country programme and what results they are contributing to. This lack of clarity would make evaluation very challenging. Likewise, the data that is being collected is also a concern. The indicators are low quality and often do not measure the results that they are proxies for. Moreover, many are process indicators measuring scale and reach, rather than changes in behavior. Baseline data has not been collected for C4D relevant results.

The one part of the country programme where evaluability is stronger is Polio. As discussed previously, because of vertically integrated nature of the Polio programme in UNICEF, there is an extensive framework of polio C4D indicators, supported by an overall M&E framework. Global indicators such as ‘children missed due to refusals’ and over 30 local indicators, are reported on a biannual basis and during the polio outbreak on more than a quarterly basis to adhere to tight global and regional accountability for robust and data-supported/driven C4D programmes. Given this, it is therefore easier to evaluate the contribution of C4D to the Polio focused results in the country programme.

The evaluability of the two sampled C4D programmes is more positive. We selected two programmes with significant C4D components and, again, looked at principle and practice. The selected programmes were an Urban WASH programme being implemented by World Vision Ethiopia and overseen by the WASH Section, and Child Marriage programme in Amhara region overseen by Child Protection Section.

As Table 7 below indicates, our assessment of evaluability of both programmes was much more positive than the results framework for the country programme. In both programmes there was considerably greater clarity in the theory underpinning the intervention, and the role that C4D results and activities play in this. In both cases it was possible to how C4D activities were being used to bring about specific behaviour changes. We judged both programmes to be evaluable in principle and gave them ‘green’ ratings.

Both programmes have or are in the process of contracting an external partner to collect data against the results framework. In the case of the WV programme this was IRC Netherlands, for the ECM programme the partner had yet to be contracted. In both cases data will be collected at baseline, midline and endline. In the case of the WV programme, IRC were specifically tasked with conducting a baseline household survey that looked at key hygiene and sanitation behaviours and practices.

In the case of the WV project we felt there was sufficient evidence to conclude the programme would be evaluable in practice and assigned it a ‘green’ rating. In the case of the ECM programme, because the M&E contractor is not in place yet and details around the data collection are still missing, we felt there was still scope for improvement and assigned it an ‘amber’ rating.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluability question and rating</th>
<th>CO result framework</th>
<th>Urban WASH</th>
<th>ECM – Amhara region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is it possible in principle to evaluate the contribution of C4D to the impact of the intervention?</strong></td>
<td><strong>RED</strong> - Our review of the revised results framework has indicated that it would not be possible in principle to conduct an evaluation of UNICEF’s overall efforts around C4D.</td>
<td><strong>GREEN</strong> - Our review of the results framework for the UNICEF ECO / WV Ethiopia Partnership Agreement is that C4D components of the Urban WASH programme would in principle be evaluable.</td>
<td><strong>GREEN</strong> - The evaluability assessment was undertaken based on the Results Framework for the Ending Child Marriage Programme in Amhara Region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green:</strong> there is a clear underlying logic to the design documentation, and the specific contribution of C4D is clearly articulated. In principle it is possible to evaluate the intervention</td>
<td>First, the C4D results are often not clearly articulated. While it is clear that some results imply behaviour change, what the specific behaviour is that is sought is not explicitly spelled out. If these behaviour changes are not clearly articulated, they cannot be measured and therefore evaluated.</td>
<td>First, the results framework details a clear underlying theory of change to the intervention in which the role of C4D activities and behaviour change are clear. For example, output 3.1 details a set of C4D activities such as contextually appropriate marketing messages which clearly link to the outcome ‘increase the sustainable use of sanitation and hygiene facilities, services and products at household and community level.’</td>
<td>Our review of the Results Framework has indicated that it would in principle be possible to evaluate it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amber:</strong> There are gaps in the intervention logic and the contribution of C4D is not completely clear. Some improvements are needed before it would be possible to evaluate</td>
<td>Second, the causal logic in how C4D activities contribute to C4D results which in turn lead to wider development outcomes is not always clear. There is no clear theory of change for how C4D contributes to results.</td>
<td>Second, there is a relatively clear articulation of what behaviour change is being sought. There is room for improvement however, as the behaviour change that is sought around MHM is not clearly articulated, only handwashing.</td>
<td>There is a clear causal logic between outcome which articulate a changed behaviour, outputs which detail the changes in knowledge and skills that will support this and specific C4D activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Red:</strong> Both programme logic and specific contribution of C4D is unclear, significant improvements needed before it would be in principle, possible to evaluate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is it possible in practice to evaluate the contribution of C4D to the impact of the intervention?</strong></td>
<td><strong>RED</strong> - Our review of the monitoring data and data collection tools has indicated that it would not in practice be possible to evaluate UNICEF’s overall efforts around C4D.</td>
<td><strong>GREEN</strong> - Our review of the monitoring data and data collection tools has indicated that it would be possible to evaluate the C4D components of the Urban WASH programme.</td>
<td><strong>AMBER</strong> - At present it is difficult to judge the extent to which the programme will in practice be evaluable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green:</strong> High quality data is collected on specific C4D activities and results. Data is appropriate disaggregated, and baselines are available. It would be possible, in practice to evaluate C4D</td>
<td>First, there is an absence of behaviour change data being collected. Very few of the indicators that have been identified as C4D actually measure a behaviour change. Most are process indicators that track outputs.</td>
<td>First the Indicators are clear and measurable. Third, they are linked to specific data collection tools, which are of high quality.</td>
<td>Indicators have been identified, and in general they are good quality. Although a number need to be more clearly articulated. For example one states % increase in KAP of the community, without clearly specifying what the knowledge, attitudes and practices are.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amber:</strong> Gaps in data quality and/or questions about the quality data means that the country office requires some improvements in its data collection before it would be possible in practice to evaluate</td>
<td>Second, most of the indicators have no baseline data and therefore it is not possible to estimate the extent of change that has taken place.</td>
<td>Second, they will be conducted by independent evaluation partner. They will be conducting HH surveys at baseline and endline to monitor changes in behavior, which should be attributable to individual C4D interventions</td>
<td>Nor are details at the time of writing available at present on the data collection tools that will be used, so it is not possible to assess their quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Red:</strong> Significant questions about data quality and coverage. Significant improvements needed before it would be possible to in practice evaluate at country office level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UNICEF has recruited an external partner to conduct baseline, midline and endline data collection.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Conclusions

4.1. C4D Capacity Development

UNICEF Ethiopia has made a substantial investment in developing the C4D capacity of a small cadre of staff (C4D specialists and focal points). Following the repositioning of C4D in 2013 there was a clear commitment from senior management that building staff C4D capacity was a priority. If Sections were to be given greater accountability for delivering C4D results, they needed the capacity to deliver on this. The key strategy for doing this was to send 14 staff on the Communication for Development course at Ohio University.

The evaluation found that the Ohio course was both relevant to the learning needs of participants and effective in building their capacity. Participants gained new knowledge on C4D and changed their practices. Areas for improvement however remain. Most notably, refining C4D Specialist’s skills in advocating for and influencing others on C4D. This is a central part of the job of a C4D specialists and an area where existing staff need more support.

A key challenge facing the ECO is how it improves the C4D knowledge and skills of other programme staff. The scale of C4D related activities across the country programme is significant, and the demand for support is beyond what six C4D specialists and seven focal points can provide. At present, there is a lack of basic awareness and understanding of C4D among programme staff in the ECO. This poses a barrier to higher quality C4D programming.

In terms of building wider organisational capacity to support C4D, UNICEF Ethiopia have had mixed success. While ECO has increased the number of C4D technical experts, as discussed above, they are stretched given the high demand for their services across the country office. The pressure on regional focal points is particularly acute. Given the importance of the regions in Ethiopia this is problematic. There is a need to rethink how best to resource C4D support in the regions. The pressure on C4D resources in Child Protection also seems significant given the scale of strategic communication related activities within this Section.

While UNICEF Ethiopia has been fortunate to have a string of Representatives and Deputy Representatives that have valued C4D this will need to continue for the momentum that exists around C4D to be sustained and the overarching organisational support for C4D to continue. Efforts also need to be made to ensure all Section Chiefs share a similar commitment to C4D. Given the importance of Section Chiefs in setting the directions and vision for their units work, this is an important area for consideration.

4.2. Integration of C4D

C4D initially had a high profile in the 2012-15 country programme document and associated results framework. At the start of the country programme C4D had both its own PCR and intermediary results. The repositioning of C4D in 2013 however, led to C4D being embedded in Section results. This made it more difficult to see and understand the contribution that C4D plays in the Ethiopia country programme. The lack of clear C4D results has affected C4D specialists’ ability to effectively advocate for C4D and budgeting around C4D activities. For example, the level of financial allocations currently going to C4D is largely insufficient to ensure high quality C4D programming.

That said, the restructuring of the C4D function has helped bring C4D advice closer to where it is needed and to ensure the support that is provided is more tailored and focused to specific Section needs. On balance, we would argue that the new structure is the right one for UNICEF Ethiopia and it addresses many of the problems inherent in the previous structure. The challenge however is, within this new structure, to deepen C4D’s integration in Section’s planning and resourcing.
C4D is widespread across the ECO country programme. C4D interventions are being implemented to varying levels across each of the Sections. Despite the level of activity, the quality of C4D programming is patchy. Evidence is not always being used to inform communication messages and channels, and there is minimal participation of communities. These are hallmarks of good C4D. The reasons for this are numerous, but two central issues are: capacity and resources. For the scale of the operations and the demand that is placed on C4D the number of staff with sufficient skills in communication methods, theories and principles is too limited. The issue of adequate resourcing, as discussed above, is also problematic. The level of resources allocated to C4D is too limited to ensure quality.

4.3. Implementation of C4D

Experiences of implementing C4D
There has been a significant amount of activity around C4D in UNICEF Ethiopia. Other than education, where C4D activities seem to have been more limited, the implementation of C4D interventions has been a key part of most Sections’ work. Child protection is notable for its focus on C4D. Despite this progress, there have been challenges. Key among these has been the implementation of cross-sector initiatives. Difficulties around securing buy-in and support from Sections, resources and encouraging coordination in planning and implementation have stalled progress in this area. While the ECO had the foresight to see that the model of embedding C4D Specialist in the Sections could lead to a siloed way of working and so created the PMU C4D specialist to support cross-Section working, more needs to be done to empower this role to make the coordination function work more effectively.

Performance against the global C4D benchmarks
Performance across the benchmarks is mixed. Key areas for improvement are: ensuring a more systematic and consistent use of evidence in the design and implementation of C4D interventions; approaching capacity development in a more joined up and coordinated way and ensuring that C4D best practices and innovations are actively disseminated externally.

Lessons learnt from building the C4D capacity of partners
Partner’s C4D capacity is a major barrier to the effective design and implementation of C4D initiatives. Government counterparts in particular seem to lack a basic understanding of what C4D is. In recognition of this UNICEF has deployed a range of strategies including training, short term technical assistance and systems development, to build capacity. While these have been well received by partners, there is a demand for more. The balance between the different capacity development strategies also needs to be reviewed. There is currently a preponderance towards delivering one-off training. It is questionable whether this will create sustainable capacity. There also needs to be more coordination in how UNICEF delivers C4D capacity development. Currently it is led by individual Sections and is fragmented. This has resulted in overlaps in trainings and inefficiencies. While it is unlikely that a comprehensive programme of C4D capacity development will be rolled out across all of government, a more joined up approach is needed. The absence of any long term partnerships to support partner capacity development is also a gap. While such partnership existed when C4D was a separate unit they have since been stopped.

4.4. Evaluability of C4D

The evaluability of UNICEF’s country programme is low. It would not be possible given the current arrangements to assess the contribution of C4D programming to specific Sector/Section results in the 2012-15 country programme. This is because there is a lack of clarity in the results framework as to how C4D activities link to outputs and outcomes and data on behaviour changes are not systematically collected. Our assessment of two specific C4D programmes is more positive. Both have good evaluability and could be evaluated in the future to see how C4D interventions are contributing to behaviour change.
and how this is in turn impacting upon the lives of women and children. This suggests that in the future, were UNICEF to want to evaluate the impacts of its C4D work, the unit of analysis should be the individual intervention, and the role that C4D strategies plays in that, rather than the contribution of C4D to overall sector/Section results in the country programme.
5. Recommendations

5.1. C4D capacity development

1. **UNICEF Ethiopia should develop a clear strategy and plan for building C4D capacity in the country office.** This should mobilise a range of capacity development strategies, such as training, mentoring and stretch assignments, to ensure all programme staff have a solid foundation in C4D methods, theories and principles. This should be complemented with more sector specific support provided by the C4D specialists who have attended the Ohio training. Currently, there is no systematic way in which past participants of the Ohio course pass on their new knowledge and skills to colleagues. Before designing these activities, ECO should liaise with ESARO regional C4D adviser as there could be a case for the RO leading the design of a regional C4D capacity support, which could be taken by individual COs and tailored, to their context.

2. **UNICEF Ethiopia should assess the demand for C4D support in each Section and region come-up with realistic staffing arrangement, which ensures adequate support both within UNICEF, and to counter parts.** The nature and number of C4D programs and the number of government partners varies across sections and as such so does the required level of C4D support. ECO needs to recognise this in how it structures its staffing in C4D. As part of this, UNICEF should consider replacing regional (sub-national) C4D focal points with full time project officers. The scope of work expected of regional C4D focal points is too great given their other technical responsibilities. Yet C4D capacity at the regional level is crucial to facilitating coordination between sectors around C4D. Recognizing that this recommendation has resource implications and may not be possible to implement in full, one option could be to focus on regions where the scale of C4D related work is greatest and focus on strengthening capacity there.

5.2. Integration of C4D

3. **Ensure greater resource allocation for C4D.** Current funding for C4D is insufficient to meet programmatic needs. This should be addressed in two ways:
   - **Put in place processes that ensure C4D Specialists have the opportunity to input into all proposals that have a significant C4D component.** The current way in which C4D specialists engage with the proposal process is ad hoc and piecemeal. This leads to situation where C4D activities are under resourced which undermines the quality of delivery. The C4D specialists should have the opportunity to input into all proposals that have a C4D component and be empowered to escalate concerns when their recommendations for resourcing are not being heard.
   - **Ensure that the current guidance on financial allocations to C4D is being followed.** Linked to recommendation 3, the under resourcing of C4D requires the existing guidance on allocating resources to C4D activities when developing proposals to be followed. This should be used by C4D specialists when reviewing proposals and serve as a quality assurance tool.

4. **Senior management (Representative and Deputy Representative) and Section Chiefs need to support the PMU C4D Specialist in coordinating cross-cutting C4D initiatives.** The implementation of cross-sector C4D initiatives has been challenging, because of limited support and funding from Sections and problems in coordinating planning and implementation. Resolving these problems will require Section Chiefs to show genuine support for cross-sector initiatives and commit to resourcing them adequately. It will also require the Representative and Deputy...
Representative to see the value of cross-sector C4D initiatives and to drive cross-sector working forward among Section Chiefs.

5.3. Implementation of C4D

5. UNICEF Ethiopia should redouble its efforts to ensure C4D initiatives are grounded in evidence. While research and evaluations are being used to inform C4D interventions, it is not being done systematically. Ensuring communication strategies are evidence based is central to effective C4D, therefore this needs to be done as standard practice. While there may not always be time to conduct in-depth detailed research, the C4D team have experience both conducting in-depth and relatively light touch evidence exercises. There needs to be clear signalling from Section Chiefs that this is a priority and is not a step that can be skipped.

6. Continue to document best practices, innovations and learning on C4D, but ensure these are communicated externally. UNICEF Ethiopia has significant experience implementing C4D and it is viewed by partners as the main source of expertise on C4D domestically. As part of its efforts to build the capacity of others and improve the implementation of C4D more effort needs to be put into actively sharing learning, best practices, guides and toolkits.

7. UNICEF Ethiopia should map out all of the current capacity development activities that are currently being delivered across the country programme and identify opportunities for joint working and synergies. UNICEF is delivering a wide range of C4D capacity development activities to partners, but each Section is doing this in isolation. As a result there is duplication of efforts and opportunities for cost-efficiencies are missed. Mapping out all of the existing C4D capacity development activities would help identify areas of overlap and synergies. This should form the basis for overarching C4D capacity development strategy. One likely result of this could also be the development of a core ECO C4D training manual that Sections can use and adapt.

8. UNICEF Ethiopia should consider establishing long term partnerships to support C4D capacity development. Linked to recommendation 8, to help better coordinate the C4D capacity development efforts, consideration should be given to working with a limited number of organisations which could provide support across the country office. These partners could work across Sections in delivering C4D capacity development services and help create efficiencies. There have been discussions within the ECO about establishing such a partnership in the past, but these were stopped following the C4D restructuring. These need to be renewed.

5.4. Evaluability of C4D

9. UNICEF Ethiopia should ensure that C4D results are presented clearly in the results framework for the new CPD. This should include: a clear causal logic in how C4D activities link to Section results at output and outcome level, a clear articulation of specific behavior change results where relevant, clear indicators and baseline data collection.

10. To build up its evidence base on what works in C4D, UNICEF should conduct a portfolio evaluation that looks across a samples of specific C4D programmes in Ethiopia. Given the challenges that the country office has had to date in clearly positioning C4D in the results framework, in the future, were an evaluation of the impact of C4D on women and children to be commissioned, it may be better to take a collection of individual programmes as the unit of analysis. In advance of the evaluation, we would suggest conducting an assessment of all the programmes included in the sample should be conducted to check their evaluability.
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1. Background

Communication for development (C4D) is the application of the principles of effective communication to further development objectives. In UNICEF, C4D is defined as a “systematic, planned and evidence-based strategic process to promote positive and measurable individual behaviour and social change that is an integral part of development programmes, policy advocacy and humanitarian work”.

C4D operates through dialogue and consultation with, and participation of children, their families and communities. It privileges local contexts and relies on a mix of communication tools, channels and approaches. In UNICEF, C4D is not part of public relations or corporate communications. Rather, it is a cross-cutting programme implementation strategy firmly grounded within the human-rights based approach to programming (HRBAP).

During the 2006-2013 Medium-Term Strategic Plan period, C4D was operationalized as a cross-cutting strategy in its own right. The 2014-2017 Strategic Plan positions C4D as inherent to the implementation strategy of capacity development. C4D is part and parcel of all areas of UNICEF’s work as many of the targets of UNICEF’s strategic plans are strongly dependent on behavioural and social change for their impact, scale and sustainability. C4D is used widely in emergency response and the on-going response to the ebola epidemic has made C4D / social mobilization a key responsibility for UNICEF.

C4D has evolved from earlier approaches to development communication that used more top down ‘diffusion’ type models. These included “Information, Education and Communication” (IEC) used within UNICEF since the 1950s, “Project Support Communication” employed in UNICEF during the 1970s and “Programme Communication” used in the 1980s. Since the 1990s, based on the notion of participatory development, the emphasis has shifted to multi-directional communication methods, mix of channels, importance of dialogue/trust/mutual understanding, amplifying the voices of poor people and empowerment.

In 2008, the Mid-Term Review of the 2006-2013 Mid-Term Strategic Plan (MTSP) found that 38 of the 52 Key Result Areas were strongly dependent on social and behavior change and positioned C4D as a cross-cutting strategy to achieve these. It thus formerly revitalized UNICEF’s communication capacity and C4D became part of the re-formulated Division of Policy and Practice. A C4D Technical Unit was established at UNICEF Headquarters in 2008 to ensure more effective institutionalization of C4D within the organisation. Since 2010, country offices have begun reporting on C4D as a key performance indicator and C4D also resonates with UNICEF’s current focus on equity, social norms

and Monitoring Results for Equity Systems (MoRES). The latter in particular is used at country-level to ensure that country office priorities include a behavioural and social change agenda.

Over the past years, UNICEF’s C4D efforts at global level have focused on selected ‘flagship areas.’ These have included (1) Accelerated Young Child Survival & Development (ACSD) to achieve health related MDGs – particularly in Africa, the Middle East and Asia, with focus on essential family practices related to four life-saving, low cost interventions – promotion of oral rehydration therapy (ORT) to address diarrhea, exclusive breastfeeding (EBF) for the first six months, hand-washing with soap (HWS) and use of insecticide treated nets (ITNs) for malaria prevention; and (2) Ending Violence Against Children and Creating a Culture of Peace using a Life Cycle Approach – particularly in Latin America and the Caribbean, Eastern and Southern Africa, and the Middle East. At the country level, the scope of C4D programming has been much wider, with important C4D investments made across all areas of UNICEF’s work. UNICEF response to the recent Ebola crisis has depended heavily on the use of C4D, especially in organizing programme response in the affected countries.

**C4D Strategies, Capacity Development and Implementation Quality Benchmarks**

Following its inception in 2008, the C4D Technical Unit led the development of two frameworks to lay a comprehensive foundation for organizing and enhancing the C4D function and work within UNICEF. The two frameworks are the **UNICEF C4D Strategic Framework 2008-2011** and the **UNICEF C4D Capability Development Framework (CDF)**. Both frameworks have provided direction and served as a reference for C4D related action at all levels, including programmatic and capacity development priorities. In 2009, an organisational **Position Paper on C4D** further clarified the role and contribution of C4D to UNICEF’s development and humanitarian programming. The proposed evaluation will draw heavily on all three documents.

Both the UNICEF C4D Strategic Framework and Position Paper on C4D have highlighted that staff members from all areas in the organisation need to be adequately equipped with customized knowledge and tools to promote C4D in the development to drive behaviour and social change to advance the rights of children and their communities, and to demonstrate UNICEF’s leadership in this area. The C4D Capability Development Framework (CDF) has elaborated on this further, identifying and providing guidance for the development of key competencies in C4D. Informed by a series of capacity assessments between 2006 and 2008, the framework has responded to a strong need among UNICEF staff members to enhance C4D related knowledge and skills in research, design and evaluation, as well as to create an enabling environment for allocation of resources.

In 2010, the Office of the Executive Director allocated $1.5 million from thematic funds for capacity development in C4D which has enabled the development of various organisational learning platforms and resources; information and network mechanisms; as well as resource packs in areas such as for communicating with children, and research, monitoring and evaluation. Particular effort has gone into developing and running **UNICEF’s learning programme on Communication for Development (C4D)** in partnership with Ohio University (Ohio Course). The course aimed to “build a critical mass of development professionals in UNICEF who are equipped with relevant knowledge, skills and tools to address socio-cultural determinants of UNICEF programmes and humanitarian actions through the use of C4D”. Launched in April 2011, the course has provided competency-based blended learning opportunity to an average of 65 UNICEF staff members annually in 2011, 2012, 2013 and 2014. The participants were mainly UNICEF staff members responsible for the C4D components of programmes, either as C4D Specialists (42%) and External Relations/Communications Officers (20%), or as Programme Specialists from Health, Nutrition, WASH, ADAP, Child Protection, Education, Planning, M&E and Emergencies (28%).
A complementary initiative is the launch of the **UNICEF learning course entitled “Advances in Social Norms”** implemented through University of Pennsylvania (UPenn Course) starting in 2011 as a collaborative effort between Human Resources Division and Programme Division. The course developed in partnership with the University of Pennsylvania, USA aimed at providing UNICEF and partnering UN staff with the necessary knowledge, understanding, conceptual and practical tools, to address social norms and achieve social change for children in a variety of environments and cultures. The course examines social norms in the context of societal factors that drive inequities and fuel behaviours and practices that result in discrimination and deprivations and provides participants with tools that can effectively address social norms within the framework of human rights approach to programming. Communication for effective social change is one of the five main inter-linked themes of the learning course. The learning course has been offered annually since 2011 and it has evolved over time based on participant feedback. A total of 260 UNICEF staff from various programme areas have participated in the course.

Over the past years, C4D capacity building has been integrated in organisational priorities, processes and documents such as Situation Analysis, PPPM, CPDs, MoRES; wider partnerships and collaborations with UN and other agencies; increased focus on information knowledge management (IKM) and creation of a C4D community of practice; as well as competency development of UNICEF staff through a range of training and learning offerings beyond the Ohio course.

In addition, UNICEF has made significant investments in recent years in gathering and disseminating evidence and lessons from C4D programming in various contexts, including through collaboration with global partners and leaders in this area of work. This work has culminated in formulating a number of **benchmarks** for assessing the quality of C4D programme implementation.

### Benchmarks to Gauge the Quality of C4D Implementation

Six benchmarks have been developed to guide C4D implementation in the field and to serve as self-assessment checks. Information gleaned from the benchmarks is intended to feed into strategic planning for C4D.

1. **C4D strategies are integrated within the country programme structure and results framework; and sectorial/cross-sectorial plans with budget allocations.**
2. **New or existing C4D task forces/working groups/committees of multi-sectorial stakeholders (governmental, non-governmental and academic) are established and functioning to plan, coordinate and strengthen C4D activities.**
3. **C4D plans/interventions are informed by, use and monitor data and evidence on behavioural and socio-cultural factors as well as media and communication contexts.**
4. **Participatory processes are used to engage community representatives and members (girls, boys, men and women especially those from marginalized/excluded groups) into sector programmes/interventions.**
5. **Plans/initiatives/ongoing programmes to strengthen C4D capacities of UNICEF staff, partners and counterparts are established at national and sub-national levels.**
6. **C4D best practices, impact assessments, tools, resources, innovations and lessons learned are documented and disseminated among key audiences.\(^{134}\)**

While the benchmarks serve as a basis for planning and assessing quality of C4D programming, the measurement and assessment of outcomes from C4D interventions is a challenging undertaking as it requires measuring sectoral results to which C4D contributes. This also requires sector specific focus and use of specific outcome and impact indicators. Considerable work has taken place in providing guidance for monitoring and evaluation C4D initiatives. A major initiative in this respect is the United Nations Inter-agency Resource Pack on Research, Monitoring and Evaluation in

---

C4D (2011) to which UNICEF made significant contributions. Based on an extensive literature review and consultations, the resource pack provides good examples of research, monitoring, and evaluation in C4D within the UN context including a focus on impact assessment. There is a need for UNICEF to examine the extent to which programmes are sound in terms of their results-based orientation and their M&E strength in C4d to determine their feasibility for impact evaluations in the coming years.

2. Evaluating C4D Capacity and Action in UNICEF

A corporate decision was made in 2013 to externally evaluate C4D in UNICEF and to include this topic in the corporate evaluation plan. Subsequently a consultative process followed to scope the evaluation including an assessment of what could be evaluated given data, time and budget limitations to produce a report that would be forward looking and useful to strengthen UNICEF’s C4D capacity, field level actions and results. Through this process, it was determined that the evaluation will focus on 3 main components:

a) C4D capacity development including the adequacy of C4D approach/strategies and their integration in country programmes; outcomes of the key learning initiatives especially the C4D and social norms course; and establishment of organisational systems, structures, processes and the relevant policies, guidance, tools required for mainstreaming C4D in all relevant areas of UNICEF’s work. The evaluation will also document UNICEF’s role and comparative advantage in undertaking external capacity development and propose the way forward for strengthening C4D partnerships at all levels.

b) UNICEF action at the field level – in development as well as emergency contexts – for mainstreaming C4D in UNICEF programmes, i.e. effective C4D programming. This component will be assessed to a large extent based on the 6 benchmarks listed above for assessing C4D implementation quality at the field level.

c) The evaluation will not explicitly assess the outcomes of C4D interventions but will include an assessment of the evaluability of results (outcomes and impact) flowing from C4D interventions and outline options for evaluation of such results in the coming years. Assessing results from C4D interventions requires a much broader and ambitious evaluation with focus on sector specific data. Such evaluation could be considered during the implementation of the second half of the Strategic Plan.

Evaluation Objectives and use

UNICEF is regarded as one of the lead agencies in promoting and using C4D as a cross-cutting programme strategy to realize the MDGs and children’s rights. In recent years, especially since 2009, UNICEF has made significant investments on its own institutional capacity development and in addition it has also played an important role in international and national level capacity development while working with a variety of partners and stakeholders. As C4D is still evolving in UNICEF, there is a need to assess the outcomes of the capacity development efforts and experience gained in terms of effective C4D programming in recent years. The findings of the evaluation will generate credible and forward looking evidence which will guide UNICEF’s future C4D work and partnerships in implementing the 2014-2017 Strategic Plan (SP) and country programmes. The evidence from the evaluation and its recommendations will feed into the mid-term review of the 2014-17 Strategic Plan and in the formulation of an updated C4D strategy / framework and related guidance. The evaluation will also help determine UNICEF’s particular comparative advantage so as to inform UNICEF’s engagement in the wider development communication community, and effectively position itself for C4D related contributions to advance the post 2015 sustainable development agenda and children’s rights in the coming years.

The purpose of the evaluation is to generate credible and useful evidence regarding the requirements for successful implementation of C4D approaches in order to guide and strengthen UNICEF’s future action and results in this area.
The main objectives of the evaluation are as follows:

- Assess the relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of UNICEF’s capacity development strategies and interventions relating to C4D in terms of a) developing individual knowledge and competences and b) enhanced institutional capacities; and identify the factors driving or constraining effectiveness;

- Assess the extent to which and how appropriately C4D functions have been integrated into UNICEF offices and programmes (“mainstreamed”); the extent to which UNICEF has achieved adequate and consistent coverage of C4D capacity in relation to programme requirements; and the extent to which the implementation of C4D approaches has been supported or constrained by available capacities;

- Assess how relevant C4D related planning and implementation (including through use of proposed benchmarks) has been to the country/programme needs/context and beneficiary needs and demands; how far they have taken account of cross-cutting issues, notably gender equality; and identify factors driving or constraining the relevance of C4D-related planning and programming;

- Review C4D related performance monitoring, knowledge management and assess the evaluability of results (outcomes, impact) achieved through programmes using C4D interventions and the likely sustainability of those results;

- Based on evidence gathered, provide clear conclusions and recommendations for policy and management decisions to further institutionalize C4D in UNICEF and strengthen its contribution to country programme results within the context of UNICEF’s overall commitment to equity.

3. Evaluation Scope

The evaluation will cover the period from 2010 to 2014 with greater focus on the past 3 years. It will be forward-looking (formative) in nature, i.e. suggesting avenues for sustaining gains, identifying new opportunities and addressing challenges in fully institutionalising and mainstreaming C4D in UNICEF’s work at all level. The evaluation questions will be organized around the evaluation criteria of effectiveness, relevance/appropriateness, efficiency and sustainability and also address specific cross-cutting issues, giving specific attention to gender equality. The main evaluation questions are as follows:

- How coherent and appropriate is UNICEF’s organisational C4D capacity development framework (2011-14)? How appropriate are specific strategies and interventions including the learning programme implemented through Ohio University and the Social Norms Course (UPenn Course)? Are they relevant to all sectors? How adequate is UNICEF’s global strategy / guidance on C4D including cross-cutting aspects related to human rights, gender equality and equity and their integration in the sectoral strategies?

- To what extent have the results (goals and objectives) of UNICEF’s organisational C4D capacity development framework been realized and what conditions / factors have led to the achievement of results in terms of capacity strengthening? How far have C4D capacity development initiatives - including the learning programme implemented through Ohio University and the Social Norms Course – been relevant, efficient and effective?
- How far has C4D been integrated into UNICEF’s systems, structures and procedures at each level? Is the level of integration and coverage sufficient and consistent enough to meet programming requirements for countries in various settings including middle income countries and those in emergencies?
- How efficient are the C4D capacity development interventions by using cost effective options in design / implementation? Are there other efficiency issues (including processes involved, quality of outputs) that compromise C4D capacity development results and their sustainability and scale up? Are there any factors – technical, institutional, financial -- that undermine the sustainability of results achieved from capacity development interventions?
- What has been the experience of implementing C4D approaches at the country level especially in countries which have invested relatively heavily in both C4D capacity development and programme components (to be assessed based on a selection of selected country case studies and focusing on 3-4 sectors that will be identified during the inception phase)? What are the pathways to effective C4D programming at the country level including those related to the principles of participation and empowerment?
- To what extent have the benchmarks for C4D implementation been applied? How sound and strong is M&E work and What conclusions can be drawn regarding the quality of C4D programming and the potential for assessing C4D intervention impact in various settings?
- What is UNICEF’s experience and what key lessons can be drawn from the use of various strategies and interventions for strengthening C4D capacity of counterparts at the national, regional, global levels?
- What conclusions, lessons and recommendations can be drawn for the future, to the extent required, (a) for better capacity development; (b) for stronger and systematic “mainstreaming” of C4D; (c) for improved implementation; (d) for stronger planning, monitoring and management of C4D activities; and (e) for conducting rigorous outcome and impact evaluations of results to which C4D interventions have contributed.

The evaluation questions will be further detailed through the consultation during the inception phase of the evaluation.

4. Evaluation Approach and Methodology

Conceptual framework and benchmarks:

The evaluation scope covers an examination of the both what and how (i.e., the theory as well as the practice) aspects of C4D capacity and programming in UNICEF. Assessing the effectiveness of C4D capacity development will require looking at appropriate approaches to assessing capacity development (focusing both on process and results); UNICEF’s capability development framework; and use of relevant capacity development benchmarks. The evaluation will consider the pathways to change / results chain in C4D capacity development framework and assess the extent to which the planned results are realised. An explicit design for assessing the Ohio University learning programme and the Social Norms Course (UPenn Course) will be formulated during the inception phase which will consider the objectives of the course, process used and results achieved.

As a starting point, the evaluation will consider the framework / theory of change used for C4D capacity development in UNICEF and assess its adequacy. The evaluation will also consider other relevant frameworks and develop a broad-
based conceptual framework which will be applied in assessing C4D capacity development in UNICEF. It is envisaged that the evaluation will need to adopt a broad-based view of capacity development which considers several levels: a) the enhancement of individual/group-level skills, knowledge, competencies; b) the establishment, at each organisational level, of necessary organisational structures, processes and systems and the relevant policies, guidance, tools; c) the provision of adequate resources and resource mobilisation strategies.

The second main component of the evaluation concerns examination of mainstreaming of C4D at all levels of the organisation in various contexts and results in terms of effective programme implementation. The starting point for evaluating this component will be to consider the 6 benchmarks that have been proposed for assessing success in C4D implementation at the field level. These benchmarks will be adjusted or expanded with additional benchmarks and indicators that might be identified based on further literature review and consultation during the inception phase. Effective C4D programming will consider the use of RBM and HRBAP, and equity principles; and aspects related to integration of C4D in various programme areas and the potential for generating C4D results (outputs and potential outcomes).

The third component of the evaluation, assessment of the evaluability of C4D results and their sustainability will be based on a review of recent literature and example of relevant literature and its application to C4D. The main parts of an evaluability assessment include the conceptual thinking and programme theory of change; clarity of strategies and interventions; adequacy of the results framework; use of appropriate indicators for programme/results monitoring, and the provisions made for qualitative and quantitative data including allocation of adequate technical and financial resources.

**Phases of the evaluation:**

- Preparation and team recruitment
- Inception phase (detailed scoping and methodology, evaluation framework/indicator development, data collection tools)
- Data collection (interviews, surveys, visits to case study countries)
- Analyses and reporting
  - Country case study reports (4-5, to be determined during the inception phase)
  - Main Evaluation Report (Main Volume with Annexes)
- Dissemination and utilization

**Data sources:**

---

135 For instance, a recent World Bank publication *Guide to Evaluating Capacity Development Results* makes the following proposition “Capacity development entails the purposeful use of knowledge and information to achieve capacity outcomes. These outcomes enable local agents of change to trigger or advance positive changes that contribute to the achievement of a particular development goal. Understanding the “program theory” or “program logic” underlying a capacity development intervention is a critical early step for discovering or telling a capacity development results story.” (World Bank, 2012: p. 12)
During the inception phase, a detailed evaluation matrix will be developed which will specify relevant indicators and data sources that will be used for gathering information at each organisational level. Data collection will occur in two stages. In the first phase data will be collected through desk reviews, interviews (at HQ and RO levels) and a brief questionnaire to UNICEF country offices to gauge the depth of C4D programming and the extent to which the CO is involved in learning and capacity development initiatives and C4D programming. This phase will be used to identify countries (4-5) which will be included for short case study field visits and countries (20-25 countries) which will be included for extensive desk review and analysis. The inception report will provide a clear justification for the countries to be sampled.

During the second phase, it is envisaged that data collection will involve the following main sources:

a) Interviews with headquarters and regional staff and counterparts in partner agencies including the 2 universities which are involved in the C4D learning programme.

b) An in-depth desk-review of key programme documents, a detailed questionnaire-based survey of and follow up phone interviews with selected staff of 20-25 country offices which will be sampled based on an appropriate sampling strategy which allows assessment of C4D capacity development and effective programming in various country/programme contexts.

c) Short field visits to 4-5 countries for in-depth assessment of C4D programming and how capacity development has contributed to effective programming. The country case studies (4-5 countries) will allow an assessment of the extent to which C4D capacity development and other inputs have translated into effective C4D programming at the country level. Data collection at the field level will involve review of programme documents and annual reports, key informant interviews, focus group discussions with service providers including implementing counterparts and observation visits to selected project sites to assess the local level implementation of key C4D initiatives.

d) In addition, a short survey based on emerging findings may be administered to test how far findings are meaningful more widely across the organisation and how far they may be generalized.

The methods suggested above are indicative. In the inception report, the evaluation team will have the flexibility to suggest innovative data collection and analytical methods that can be adapted to conduct the evaluation.

Analysis and reporting:

Data analysis and reporting will take place in 3 stages. The first stage will be the analysis of data from the desk review, interviews (HQ and ROs) and survey data and drawing relevant findings and conclusions. The second phase will involve analysis of data gathered from the case study countries and preparation of brief country-specific reports. The third phase will involve synthesis of the findings from the entire exercise including those coming from the analysis of data from 20-25 desk review countries and formulation of the main evaluation report which responds to evaluation objectives and questions.

5. Management Arrangements

**Evaluation Management Structure:** The evaluation will be conducted by an external evaluation team recruited by UNICEF’s Evaluation Office in New York. The Evaluation Team will operate under the supervision of a dual-tiered
evaluation management and oversight structure. Direct supervision is provided by a Senior Evaluation Officer at UNICEF’s Evaluation Office (EO), supported by an Evaluation Specialist. The EO will be responsible for the day-to-day implementation of the evaluation and management of the evaluation budget; ensure the quality and independence of the evaluation and guarantee its alignment with UNEG Norms and Standards and Ethical Guidelines; ensure the evaluation findings and conclusions are relevant and recommendations are implementable; and contribute to the dissemination of the evaluation findings and follow-up on the management response.

The advisory organ for the evaluation is the Evaluation Advisory Group (EAG), bringing together a mix of UNICEF managers and advisors as well as outside experts (TBD). The EAG will have the following role: a) contribute to the conceptualization, preparation, and design of the evaluation including providing feedback on the terms of reference, participating in the selection of countries for desk review, and providing feedback and comments on the inception report. b) provide comments and substantive feedback to ensure the quality – from a technical point of view - of the draft and final evaluation reports; c) assist in identifying UNICEF staff and external stakeholders to be consulted during the evaluation process; d) participate in review meetings organised by the EO and with the evaluation team as required; e) play a key role in learning and knowledge sharing from the evaluation results, contributing to disseminating the findings of the evaluation and follow-up on the implementation of the management response.

Evaluation Team

The evaluation will be conducted by engaging a committed and well-qualified team which possesses evaluation as well C4D subject matter expertise and related competencies required for a global evaluation. It is envisaged that the team will have the following profile:

One (1) senior-level Team Leader (P5 Level) who has the following qualifications:

- A strong team leadership and management track record, as well as interpersonal and communication skills to help ensure that the evaluation is understood and used;
- Extensive evaluation expertise (at least 12 years) with strong mixed-methods evaluation skills and flexibility in using non-traditional and innovative evaluation methods;
- A strong commitment to delivering timely and high-quality results, i.e. credible evaluations that are used;
- Extensive technical and practical development expertise, and familiarity with UNICEF’s country-level operations;
- In-depth knowledge of the UN’s human rights, gender equality and equity agendas;
- Solid understanding of communication for development as a practice area;
- Specific evaluation experience in the communication for development area is strongly desired, but is secondary to a strong mixed-method evaluation background so long as the C4D expertise of the team members (see below) is harnessed to boost the team’s collective understanding of issues relating to development communication;
- Commitment and willingness to work in challenging environments and independently, with limited regular supervision;
- Good communication, advocacy and people skills; ability to communicate with various stakeholders and to express concisely and clearly ideas and concepts in written and oral form;
- Language proficiency: Fluency in English is mandatory; good command of French and/or Spanish.

The Team Leader will be responsible for undertaking the evaluation from start to finish and for effectively managing the evaluation team, for the bulk of data collection and analysis, as well as report drafting in English.

One (1) Evaluation Expert (P4 Level) with the following credentials:
Significant experience in evaluation, applied research or M&E with exposure to communication for development programmes (at least 8 years relevant experience) and/or to evaluation of capacity development initiatives.

Hands-on experience in collecting and analyzing quantitative and qualitative data;

Familiarity with UNICEF’s programming and advocacy work (would be an asset);

Commitment and willingness to work in a challenging environment and ability to produce quality work under limited guidance and supervision;

Good communication, advocacy and people skills; ability to communicate with various stakeholders and to express ideas and concepts concisely and clearly in written and oral form;

Language proficiency: Fluency in English is mandatory; good command of French and/or Spanish is desirable. The evaluation expert will play a major role in data collection and analysis, and will make significant contributions to report writing.

Two (2) Analysts (P1/2 Level, part-time involvement) who have the following qualifications:

- **Research Analyst**: At least 3 years of progressively responsible experience in both qualitative and quantitative data analysis methods;
- Experience in supporting senior evaluator in ensuring use of consistent interview protocols, templates for recording and reporting on interviews, standard case study report formats and a comparative table of findings;
- Familiarity with communication for development.
- **Data & Systems Analyst**: At least 3 years of progressively responsible experience in IT systems and data management;
- Expertise in handling collaborate teamwork software, in database management and knowledge management for evaluation;
- Commitment and willingness to handle back-office support, assisting the team with logistics and other administrative matters, is also expected.

The team on the whole is expected to be balanced with respect to gender, origin (developed/developing countries) and linguistic capacity (English/French/Spanish must be covered). The evaluation team should demonstrate a firm grasp of the ethical issues associated with working with children and of the recognition that the safety and welfare of rights-holders is paramount.

**Deliverables**

The evaluation is expected to be completed between July 2015 and June 2016.

The main deliverables include the following:

- An inception report (20-30 pages plus annexes);
- Country case study reports on effective C4D programming (4-5 reports; 20-25 pages each);
- An evaluation report (60-70 pages plus annexes) including an Executive Summary (5 pages);
- An evaluation brief on key findings, conclusions and recommendations (4 pages) for broad distribution;
- A PPT presentation of key findings, conclusions and recommendations.
### 6. Timeframe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Milestone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan-February 2015</td>
<td>Finalization of TOR; Issuance of call for Expressions of interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2015</td>
<td>Issuance of Request for Proposals to selected firms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2015</td>
<td>Recruitment of evaluation team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August/September 2015</td>
<td>Inception phase; Report finalized by early October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October – January 2016</td>
<td>Data collection and analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Review of C4D training and learning programmes, as well as strategies and systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Desk review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Short country case studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February – April 2016</td>
<td>Drafting of the evaluation report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May/June 2016</td>
<td>Draft review and revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End June 2016</td>
<td>Final report submission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 4 UNICEF’s theory of change for C4D capacity and action
### Annex 5 Evaluation matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus area A. CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT</th>
<th>Evaluation questions and sub-questions</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data sources</th>
<th>Data collection and analysis methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| EQ 1. How coherent and appropriate is UNICEF’s organisational C4D capacity development framework? | 1.1 How well does the CD framework respond to UNICEF’s C4D capacity needs? | • Alignment between CD framework and outcomes of the 2006 and 2008 capacity needs assessments | • CD Framework; 2006 and 2008 capacity needs assessments  
• Stakeholders at HQ: C4D Section, OLDS | • Document review  
• Key informant Interviews (KIIIs) |
| | 1.2 To what extent does the CD framework provide a clear vision and strategic direction to C4D capacity development efforts? | • CD framework underpinned by clear theory of change  
• CD framework includes clear and measurable goals and objectives  
• Components of CD framework aligned and support each other | • CD Framework  
• Stakeholders at HQ: C4D Section, OLDS  
• Stakeholders at RO: regional C4D advisors  
• Stakeholders at CO: C4D staff | • Document review  
• KIIs |
| | 1.3 To what extent has the CD framework evolved in response to changing needs / demands and learning? | • Revision of CD Framework in response to internal and external needs/demands  
• Revision of CD Framework in response to learning | • CD Framework; C4D strengthening initiative; C4D Vision and Policy 2014-17  
• Stakeholders at HQ: C4D Section, OLDS  
• Stakeholders at RO: regional C4D advisors | • Document review  
• KIIs |

| EQ 2. How effective has UNICEF’s technical guidance on C4D been in providing support and direction to those involved in C4D programming? How effectively does it integrate cross-cutting issues such as human rights, gender equality and equity? | 2.1 To what extent does the technical guidance provide a comprehensive package of support on C4D? | • Number, sector, geography of C4D technical guidance produced  
• Evidence of gaps in coverage (sector, issue, geography etc) | • Technical guidance reports / document  
• Stakeholders at RO: regional C4D advisors  
• Stakeholders at CO: C4D advisors, technical advisors involved in programmes with C4D components | • Document review  
• KIIs  
• Survey C4D staff |

---

136 UNICEF does not have a single strategy or framework for C4D capacity development, however the Terms of Reference highlight the following documents as key: UNICEF C4D Strategic Framework 2008-2011; UNICEF C4D Capability Development Framework (CDF); Position Paper on C4D. During the inception phase it was confirmed with the C4D Section that these constitute the C4D capacity development framework.

137 The definition of Technical Guidance used in the evaluation is: written documentation such as: toolkits, guides, and manuals.
### EQ 3. To what extent have the overall results (goals and objectives) of UNICEF’s organisational C4D capacity development framework been realized? What factors have supported / hindered the achievement of results in terms of capacity strengthening?

138 There is no formal overall goals and objectives for UNICEF’s organisational capacity development framework. The evaluation team therefore extracted the outcomes from the C4D Strategic and Plan for Action 2008-2012 that are capacity development focused, and has assumed these are the best representation of what the goals and objectives of UNICEF’s C4D capacity development efforts were. This understanding was discussed and validated with staff from the C4D Section and the EAG. The evaluation team have identified five overarching objectives. These are represented as sub-evaluation questions in the evaluation matrix. They are also reflected in the theory of change as the five outcomes under capacity development.

---

**2.2 To what extent is the guidance used and has it contributed to changes in practice? Why / Why not?**
- Evidence that technical guidance being read/used
- Evidence of technical guidance contributing to improved knowledge and skills
- Evidence that technical guidance contributing to changes in practice
- Barriers and enablers of use and changes to practice

**Stakeholders at RO:** regional C4D advisors

**Stakeholders at CO:** C4D advisors, technical advisors involved in programmes with C4D components

- KII
- Survey of C4D staff

**2.3 Has the guidance been integrated with other capacity development initiatives such as training?**
- Extent to which technical guidance referenced in material from other capacity development interventions

**Stakeholders at HQ:** C4D Section, OLDS

**External stakeholders:** Designers of CD initiatives

**Stakeholders at RO:** Regional C4D advisors

**Stakeholders at CO:** C4D advisors

- Document review (using checklist)
- KII

**2.4 How effectively does the technical guidance integrate cross-cutting issues such as human rights, gender equality and equity?**
- Level of integration of human rights in technical guidance documents
- Level of integration of gender equality in technical guidance documents
- Level of integration of participatory approaches into technical documentation
- Level of integration of approaches to towards the inclusion of people with disabilities

**Technical guidance reports / documents**

**Document review using template for assessing integration of cross-cutting issues**
### 3.1 To what extent have staff at regional and country levels improved their knowledge and skills to design and implement C4D programmes, and to what extent do they put these into practice? What have been the enablers / barriers to this?

- Improvement in knowledge and skills to design and implement C4D programmes
- Evidence of skills being put into practice
- Barriers / enablers of improvements in knowledge, skills and practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders at RO:</th>
<th>Regional C4D advisor / focal point, past participants of C4D CD initiatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders at CO:</td>
<td>Section Chiefs, C4D advisors/focal points, technical leads/specialists, Deputy Country Representative, communication specialists, facilitators / trainers of C4D CD initiative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| KIIs | Survey of C4D staff |

### 3.2 To what extent have networks and relationships between staff at global, regional and country level and external experts / partners been established that provide support / facilitate the sharing of learning on C4D? What have been the enablers / barriers to this?

- Accountabilities and responsibilities across different levels established and understood
- Oversight, support and learning taking place between HQ, RO and CO
- Strength, diversity and effectiveness of relationships with external experts / partners at HQ, RO and CO levels
- Barriers / enablers of support and learning between levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders at HQ:</th>
<th>C4D Section, Sector sections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders at RO:</td>
<td>Regional C4D advisor / focal points,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders at CO:</td>
<td>C4D advisors/focal points, national partners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| KIIs | Survey of C4D staff |

### 3.3 To what extent do core organisational policies and processes at the global level support the integration of C4D in programmes?

- Level of integration of C4D in core UNICEF policies and processes (eg MORES, guidance on SitAnalysis, guidance on CPDs, UNDAF etc)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders at HQ:</th>
<th>Division Directors, Associate Directors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders at RO:</td>
<td>Regional and Deputy Regional Director, Regional C4D advisor / focal point, Chief of Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder at CO:</td>
<td>Country and Deputy Country Representative, Section Chiefs, C4D advisors/focal points, technical leads/specialists, Directors of communications, communication specialists</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KIIs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.4 To what extent have C4D champions been created among senior managers at the global, regional and country level?

- Senior managers see value of C4D
- Senior managers publicly communicate support for C4D
- Senior managers allocate resources to C4D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders at HQ:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder at RO:</td>
<td>Regional and Deputy Regional Director, Regional C4D advisor / focal point, Chief of Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder at CO:</td>
<td>Country and Deputy Country Representative, Section Chiefs, C4D advisors/focal points, technical leads/specialists, Directors of communications, communication specialists</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| KIIs | Survey of C4D staff |
### EQ 4. To what extent were the C4D capacity development initiatives relevant?

**For each capacity development initiative:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>To what extent did the initiative respond to a defined need and demand?</strong></th>
<th><strong>Did the initiative engage the right people?</strong></th>
<th><strong>Was the structure of the initiative and the methods and approaches used appropriate to the audience and their learning needs?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Learning objectives of the initiative responded to a clear need within UNICEF</td>
<td>- Clear set of criteria for participant selection</td>
<td>- Learning methods aligned with learning needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Initiative relevant to participant’s contexts</td>
<td>- Alignment of past participants with selection criteria</td>
<td>- Mix of learning methods used to accommodate different learning styles and to support practical application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Initiative has sufficient focus on practical application</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Capacity Development Course Material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Course planning documents eg needs assessment, concept notes, programme structure</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Stakeholders at <strong>HQ:</strong> C4D Section, Sector sections, Human resources /OLDS, Facilitators/trainers on C4D capacity development courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Stakeholders at <strong>HQ:</strong> C4D Section, Human resources /OLDS, <strong>External</strong> stakeholders: Facilitators/trainers on C4D CD courses; managers of C4D CD initiatives</td>
<td>- Stakeholders at <strong>RO:</strong> Regional C4D advisor / focal point, Past participants of C4D capacity development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Stakeholders at <strong>RO:</strong> Regional C4D advisor / focal point, Past participants of C4D capacity development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Stakeholders at <strong>CO:</strong> C4D advisors/focal points, Past Participants of C4D capacity development</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Stakeholders at <strong>CO:</strong> C4D advisors/focal points, Past Participants of C4D CD initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

139 The core C4D capacity development interventions include: the UNICEF-Ohio University Learning Programme on C4D, University of Pennsylvania course on Social Norms, 3-5 in-country and on-the-job learning workshops, C4D webinar series and C4D knowledge platforms and web-based resources.
**EQ 5. To what extent have the C4D capacity development initiatives been effective?**

**For Ohio and Upenn courses, in-country workshops and webinars:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent have the CD initiatives led to new knowledge and skills being acquired?</td>
<td>• Change in level of knowledge and skills between 2010 and 2015&lt;br&gt;• Contribution of CD initiatives to change in skills and knowledge</td>
<td>• Post-CD course / workshop evaluations&lt;br&gt;• Stakeholders at HQ: C4D Section, Human resources /OLDS&lt;br&gt;• Stakeholders at RO: Regional C4D advisor / focal point, Chief of Communications; Past Participants of C4D capacity development&lt;br&gt;• Stakeholders at CO: C4D advisors/focal points, Past Participants of C4D capacity development&lt;br&gt;• Document review&lt;br&gt;• KIs&lt;br&gt;• Survey of C4D staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent has the CD initiatives led to new knowledge and skills being applied? What factors have supported or hindered successful application?</td>
<td>• Change in level of practical application of C4D knowledge and skills between 2010 and 2015&lt;br&gt;• Contribution of CD initiatives to change in skills and knowledge&lt;br&gt;• Barriers / enablers to practical application</td>
<td>• Stakeholders at RO: Regional C4D advisor / focal point, Past Participants of C4D capacity development&lt;br&gt;• Stakeholders at CO: C4D advisors/focal points, Past Participants of C4D CD initiatives&lt;br&gt;• Survey to C4D staff&lt;br&gt;• KIs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In what ways has the CD initiatives influenced the quality of C4D delivery? What factors have supported or hindered this?</td>
<td>• Perception of improved capacity influencing the quality of different C4D strategies (BCC, Social mobilisation, Social change communication, advocacy) and sectors (health, nutrition etc.)&lt;br&gt;• Barriers / enablers to improved capacity contributing to better quality C4D strategies</td>
<td>• Stakeholders at CO: Country and Deputy Country Representative, Section Chiefs, C4D advisors/focal points, technical leads/specialists, Directors of communications, communication specialists, facilitators / trainers on C4D capacity development course, National partners&lt;br&gt;• KIs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**For the International knowledge Management (C4D facebook page, C4D intranet site, Network meetings, Newsletter):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent are the knowledge platforms used?</td>
<td>• Web hits and downloads from facebook page and intranet site&lt;br&gt;• Attendees at Networks meetings&lt;br&gt;• Subscribers to Newsletter&lt;br&gt;• Perceived value of the platforms for knowledge</td>
<td>• Monitoring data from platforms&lt;br&gt;• Stakeholders at RO: C4D advisors/focal points, technical leads specialists&lt;br&gt;• Stakeholders in CO: C4D advisors/focal points, technical leads specialists&lt;br&gt;• Document review&lt;br&gt;• KIs&lt;br&gt;• Survey of C4D staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent have the knowledge platforms helped create an internal community of practice between C4D practitioners?</td>
<td>• Extent of new relationships formed as a result of attending networking events</td>
<td>• Stakeholders at RO: C4D advisors/focal points, technical leads specialists&lt;br&gt;• Stakeholders in CO: C4D advisors/focal points, technical leads specialists&lt;br&gt;• Survey of C4D staff&lt;br&gt;• KIs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### EQ 6. To what extent were concerns for economy and efficiency part of the design and implementation of the C4D capacity development interventions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Considerations</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Were issues of economy and efficiency considered as part of the design process? | - Consideration given to different implementation strategies and their relative costs as part of the design process of CD initiatives  
- Reach, quality and cost considered and effectively balanced as part of design of the CD initiatives | - Design Documents, concept notes, proposals  
- Stakeholders at HQ: Designers of the CD initiative  
- External stakeholders: Designers of CD initiative |
| Were economy and efficiency managed as part of the implementation process?  | - Synergies identified with other CD initiatives which reduce costs  
- Cost driver identified and actively managed during implementation | - Stakeholders at HQ: C4D Section, Human resources /OLDS  
- Stakeholders at CO: Section Chiefs, C4D advisors/focal points, technical leads/specialists, Directors of communications, communication specialists |
| Are there economy or efficiency issues that have / could compromise sustainability and scale up of the CD initiatives? | - Balance between cost, reach and learning quality of CD initiatives | - Budgets, Data on reach, data in effectiveness  
- Stakeholders at HQ: C4D Section, Human resources /OLDS  
- External stakeholders: Designers/managers of the CD initiative |

### EQ 7. What is UNICEF’s experience and what key lessons can be drawn from C4D capacity development initiatives of counterparts at the national, regional, global levels?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Considerations</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| What are the different strategies that have been used to strengthen C4D capacity among counterparts at the country level? | - Strategies used to strengthen C4D capacity among counterparts at CO level, grouped by type, sector and country | - CD course material / agendas; participants lists etc  
- Stakeholders at CO: C4D advisors/focal points, technical leads, national partners |
| What has been the experience of using these different strategies?         | - Positive experience of COs strengthening counterparts C4D capacity and reasons why  
- Challenges experienced by COs in strengthening counterparts C4D capacity and reasons why | - Stakeholders at CO: C4D advisors/focal points, technical leads, national partners |

### EQ 8. What are the factors that could undermine the sustainability of the results that have been achieved from the capacity development interventions?

- Subsequent use of networks to provide support on C4D
**No sub-question required**
- Technical factors undermining C4D gains
- Organisational factors undermining the sustainability of C4D capacity
- Financial factor undermining the sustainability of C4D capacity

- Stakeholders at **HQ**: C4D Section
- Stakeholders at **RO**: Regional C4D advisor / focal point
- Stakeholders at **CO**: C4D advisors/focal points, technical leads
- KII

---

### Focus area B. INTEGRATION

**EQ 9. How far has C4D been integrated into office structures, strategies, plans and resourcing at global, regional and country level?**

#### Global

**How integrated is C4D into the 2014-17 MTSP and associated reporting?**
- Level of integration of C4D in 2014-17 MTSP
- Level of reporting on C4D in Annual Report of the Executive Director

- 2014-17 MTSP; Annual Report of the Executive Director 2014 & 2015
- Stakeholders at **HQ**: Data, Research and Policy Division and C4D Section

- Document review using Integration Assessment Framework
- KII

**How has this changed since the last MTSP (2008-13) and what are the implications of these changes?**
- Level of integration of C4D in 2008-13 MTSP
- Level of reporting on C4D in Annual Report of the Executive Director
- Change in level of integration and reporting between two MTSP periods
- Reported implication of changes

- Stakeholders at **HQ**: Stakeholders from Data, Research and Policy Division and C4D Section
- Stakeholders at **RO**: regional C4D advisors
- Stakeholders at **RO**: Deputy Representative

- Document review using Integration Assessment Framework
- KII

**How has the integration of C4D into sector planning and reporting changed between 2010-15?**
- Change in the level of integration of C4D in sector strategies between 2010-2015
- Quality of the reporting on C4D

- Sectoral strategies, Annual Plans and reports
- Stakeholders at **HQ**: C4D Section, Data Research and Policy Division

- Document Review using Integration Assessment Framework
- KII

**How have staffing arrangements for C4D staff at the global level changed between 2010-15?**
- Change in the number and level of C4D staff at HQ level between 2010-2015 (disaggregated by Section)

- Data on staffing level (numbers and levels)
- Stakeholders at **HQ**: C4D Section, technical leads

- Document Review using Integration Assessment Framework
- KII

**How has funding for C4D changed at HQ level between 2010-15?**
- Changes in the level of C4D funding between 2010-15

- Resourcing plans, budgets
- Stakeholders at **HQ**: C4D section

- Document review using Integration Assessment Framework
- KII
### How has the integration of C4D into regional offices planning and reporting changed between 2010-15?

- Existence of strategy and / or plan
- Quality of strategy and/or plan
- Budget exists to support implementation of the strategy / plan
- Regional C4D strategies / plans
- Stakeholders at RO: C4D advisors
- Document Review using Integration Assessment Framework
- KII

### How have staffing arrangements for C4D staff at the regional level changed between 2010-15?

- Changes in the number and level of C4D staff across regional offices between 2010-15
- Data on staffing level (numbers and levels)
- Document review using Integration Assessment Framework

### To what extent is C4D integrated into the Situational Analysis, CPDs, and results frameworks at country level?

- Level of integration of C4D in Situational Analysis
- Level of integration of C4D in CPD
- Level of integration of C4D in Results Frameworks
- Situational Analysis; CPD, Results Framework
- Stakeholders at CO: C4D staff, Deputy Representative
- Document review using Integration Assessment Framework
- KII

### Are C4D strategies resourced?

- Resourcing exists to support planned C4D strategies
- Resource plans, budgets
- Stakeholders at CO: Section Chiefs, Deputy Representative, C4D advisors/focal points,
- Document review using Integration Assessment Framework
- KII

### To what extent is C4D reported on through Annual Reviews, Mid-Term Evaluations and Final Report?

- Level of integration of C4D in reporting
- Annual Reviews, Mid-Term evaluation and final reports
- Stakeholders at CO: Section Chiefs, Deputy Representative, C4D advisors/focal points,
- Document review using Integration Assessment Framework
- KII

### How is the C4D function set up / managed and resourced at country level?

- Structural configurations at country level
- Changes in staffing between 2010-15
- Stakeholders at CO: Country and Deputy Country Representative, Section Chiefs C4D advisors/focal points, Directors of communications, communication specialists,
- KII

### EQ 10. Is the level of integration and coverage sufficient and consistent enough to meet programming requirements for different types of countries?

#### Global

- Comparison between current capacity and formal roles and responsibilities on C4D
- Stakeholders at HQ: C4D Section, Sector sections, Human resources /OLDS, technical leads
- KII
### Regional

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Comparison between current capacity and demand/need for services</th>
<th>Stakeholders at RO: Regional and Deputy Regional Director, Regional C4D advisor / focal point, Chief of Communications; communication specialists</th>
<th>KIIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Is the level of investment that has been made at the regional level sufficient to meet the needs and demands on C4D from COs within the region? What are the enablers / barriers to integration of C4D in the RO? | • Comparison between current capacity and formal roles and responsibilities on C4D  
• Comparison between current capacity and demand/need for services  
• Enablers/barriers to integration | • Stakeholders at RO: Regional and Deputy Regional Director, Regional C4D advisor / focal point, Chief of Communications; communication specialists | • KIIs |

### Country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Comparison between current capacity and demand/need for services</th>
<th>Stakeholders at CO: Country and Deputy Country Representative, Section Chiefs C4D advisors/focal points, Directors of communications, communication specialists</th>
<th>KIIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Given current levels of integration, is the C4D function at country office level able to provide support in the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of C4D strategies? What are the enablers / barriers to integration of C4D in the CO? | • Comparison between current capacity and formal roles and responsibilities on C4D  
• Comparison between current capacity and demand/need for services  
• Enablers/barriers to integration | • Stakeholders at RO: C4D advisor | • KIIs |

### EQ 11. What has been the experience of implementing C4D approaches at the country level especially in countries which have invested relatively heavily in both C4D capacity development and C4D programming?

| In those countries that have invested heavily in C4D, what has worked and what has not? Why? | No indicator needed | Stakeholders at CO: Country and Deputy Country Representative, Section Chiefs C4D advisors/focal points, Directors of communications, communication specialists | KIIs |
| In what ways has investment in C4D capacity development influenced C4D implementation? | No indicators needed | Stakeholders at RO: C4D advisor | KIIs |

### EQ 12. To what extent have the benchmarks for C4D implementation been applied?

| Are there any common strengths and weaknesses in the implementation of benchmarks? | Utility of the benchmarks | Planning, Monitoring and Reporting, and evaluation documentation, Minutes from meetings, Agenda’s from meetings etc. | Document review using Benchmark Assessment Framework |
| KIIs |

EVALUATION OF UNICEF’S C4D CAPACITY AND ACTION: ETHIOPIA COUNTRY CASE STUDY
### Focus area C. EVALUABILITY

**EQ13. What is the potential for assessing C4D interventions impact in various settings in the future?**

**For a sample of C4D interventions from across different contexts:**

| Is it possible in principle to evaluate the contribution of C4D to the impact of the intervention? | Underlying logic (theory of change) of the programme clear  
Behaviour changes, shifts in social norms, social mobilisation and/or advocacy clearly articulated in the programme logic  
Causal logic clear on how the C4D intervention contributes to behaviour change / social norms outcomes clear | Design, monitoring and reporting, and evaluation documentation of an intervention  
Stakeholders at **CO**: C4D advisors/focal points, technical leads/specialists, national partners | Document review using Evaluability Assessment Framework  
KIIs |
|---|---|---|---|
| Is it possible in practice to evaluate the contribution of C4D to the impact of the intervention? | Specific data collected on the C4D activities and the behaviour changes and/or social norms that the programme aims to affect  
Data is robust and credible  
Data is disaggregated (sex, gender, age group, ethnicity)  
Availability of baseline data or feasible plans for collecting them and with good quality  
Appropriate capacity (staffing, skills, budget) in the programme | Design, monitoring and reporting, and evaluation documentation of an intervention  
Stakeholders at **CO**: C4D advisors/focal points, technical leads/specialists, national partners | Document review using Evaluability Assessment Framework  
KIIs |
management team to collect high quality data in the future
Annex 6 Country level survey

Itad Communication for Development Evaluation (C4D): Country level Survey

(This survey will be distributed online and will utilise functionalities to guide the respondents to the correct questions and provide rating scales when and where needed)

This survey is part of a global evaluation that is looking at UNICEF’s experience of building C4D capacity and implementing C4D approaches.

For the purposes of this evaluation C4D is understood as:

“A systematic, planned and evidence-based process to promote positive and measurable individual behaviour change, social change and political change that is an integral part of development programmes and humanitarian work. It uses research and consultative processes to promote human rights and equity, mobilize leadership and societies, enable citizen participation, build community resilience, influence norms and attitudes and support the behaviours of those who have an impact on the well-being of children,(women) their families and communities, especially the most marginalized or hard-to-reach.”

We kindly request your Country Office completes a single questionnaire and that this is coordinated by the Deputy Representative. The survey should reflect the CO’s response on C4D rather than that of a specific individual. If you have any questions, please contact Greg Gleed Gregory.gleed@itad.com

All data collection for this evaluation is being undertaken in line with the UNEG ethical guidelines for evaluations. Names of individual country offices will be kept to a minimum in the analysis of the results. Your answers will not be attributable to you and your name will not be quoted without your permission.

Questions

Please select your Country Office (CO) from the following list: (Dropdown menu)

1. Please tick all the Sections/programme areas in the CO:
   a. Health
   b. HIV and AIDS
   c. Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene
   d. Nutrition
   e. Education
   f. Child Protection
   g. Social Inclusion
   h. Humanitarian/Emergency
   i. Communications for Development
   j. Other programme areas not listed above (please specify)

2. What percentage of overall country programme expenditure has gone to C4D over the past 3 years (approx.)
   • 2013 (N/A, <1%, 2–5%, 5%-10%, 10%-20%, 20%-30%, 30%-40%, >50%)
   • 2014 (N/A, <1%, 2–5%, 5%-10%, 10%-20%, 20%-30%, 30%-40%, >50%)
   • 2015 (N/A, <1%, 2–5%, 5%-10%, 10%-20%, 20%-30%, 30%-40%, >50%)

3. Which of the following C4D capacity development courses have CO staff attended in the past 3-4 years? (select from the following list)
   a. The Ohio University course on Communications for Development
   b. The University of Pennsylvania course on Social Norms
   c. Regional level on-job learning workshops.
   d. Webinar series on C4D
   e. Other courses attended, but not covered above (Please Note)
   f. No current staff member has attended any courses in the past three years

For the courses that staff have attended, please indicate the number of staff who attended each course and the sector they work in.

140. http://www.unevaluation.org/
4. Please rate the contribution that each of the following C4D capacity development courses have played in improving C4D plans/initiatives within the country programme?
   a. The Ohio University course on Communications for Development (n/a, insignificant, somewhat significant, significant, essential)
   b. The University of Pennsylvania course on Social Norms (n/a, insignificant, somewhat significant, significant, essential)
   c. Regional level on-job learning workshops. (n/a, insignificant, somewhat significant, significant, essential)
   d. Webinar series on C4D (n/a, insignificant, somewhat significant, significant, essential)
   e. Other courses staff have attended, but not covered above (Please Note) (n/a, insignificant, somewhat significant, significant, essential)

5. Given your country programme needs, what would be the most useful type of C4D training UNICEF could offer moving forwards (select from the following list):
   a. Generic courses on C4D theories, methods and approaches
   b. Sector specific courses that focus on how to apply C4D in specific sectors
   c. Both generic and sector specific courses

If you indicated that sector specific course would be useful, please name up to 3 areas where sectoral training in C4D would be most useful.

6. Overall, how would you rate the level of investment the CO has made in developing UNICEF in-house C4D capacity over the last 3-4 years? (very low, low, medium, high, very high)

7. How would you rate the level of investment the CO has made in developing in-house C4D capacity over the last 3-4 years in specific Sections/programmes? [please only rate those section/programmes relevant to your CO]
   a. Health (very low, low, medium, high, very high)
   b. HIV and AIDS
   c. Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene
   d. Nutrition
   e. Education
   f. Child Protection
   g. Social Inclusion
   h. Humanitarian/Emergency
   i. Communications for Development
   j. Other programme areas not listed above (please specify)

8. In the CO’s opinion, overall, to what extent does the Country Office have the necessary C4D knowledge and skills among its staff to respond to the needs and demands of the country programme? (not at all, to a small extent, to a moderate extent, to a great extent)

9. In the CO’s opinion, to what extent does each Section/programme have the necessary knowledge and skills among their staff to effectively respond to the C4D needs and demands of the country programme? [please only rate those section/programmes relevant to your CO]
   a. Health (n/a, not at all, to a small extent, to a moderate extent, to a great extent)
   b. HIV and AIDS
   c. Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene
   d. Nutrition
   e. Education
   f. Child Protection
   g. Social Inclusion
10. In the CO’s opinion, to what extent do Country Office staff have the necessary knowledge and skills in the following C4D technical areas to respond to the needs and demands of the country programme?
   a. Advocate for and influence the C4D agenda within UNICEF and government counterparts (n/a, not at all, to a small extent, to a moderate extent, to a great extent)
   b. Design and plan evidence based C4D interventions
   c. Monitor and evaluate C4D interventions
   d. Manage and budget for C4D interventions

11. In the CO’s opinion, to what extent has the investment in building C4D capacity within the CO led to improvements in the quality of how C4D plans and initiatives are designed and implemented? (n/a, not at all, to a small extent, to a moderate extent, to a great extent). Please explain your answer and point to specific examples

12. In the CO’s opinion, to what extent does the Country Office understand its in-house capacity-needs in C4D across the country programme? (n/a, not at all, to a small extent, to a moderate extent, to a great extent)

13. In the CO’s opinion, to what extent does each Sections/programme understand their in-house capacity-needs in C4D? (n/a, not at all, to a small extent, to a moderate extent, to a great extent) [please only rate those sections/programmes relevant to your CO]
   a. Health
   b. HIV and AIDS
   c. Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene
   d. Nutrition
   e. Education
   f. Child Protection
   g. Social Inclusion
   h. Humanitarian/Emergency
   i. Communications for Development
   j. Other programme areas not listed above (please specify)

14. Does the CO have an overarching strategy on C4D in support of the current country programme and/or sector specific C4D strategies? (NB. This may or may not be a formal document (Yes, No) If yes, please provide details.

15. Please list the outcomes, outputs and associated indicators in the CO current Results Framework which have been identified as C4D results or results that C4D activities/interventions make a significant contribution to. If this list is extensive please indicate in the text below and send the documents in a separate email to Gregory.gleed@itad.com

16. To what extent does the CO’s most recent situation analysis include an analysis of the opportunities/enablers and barriers to achieving C4D objectives (behaviour and social norm change; empowerment and participation of children and communities) in support of sectoral outcomes, (not at all, to a small extent, to a moderate extent, to a great extent)

17. Has the CO conducted / commissioned any of the following in the past three years?:
   o Evaluations of C4D interventions / of programmes with significant C4D components
   o Research on barrier and enablers to behaviour and social norms change
   o Research on barriers and enablers to empowerment and participation of children and communities
   o Analysis of the communication context (Media reach, communication practices and networks, preference and content surveys/analysis).

   If yes, please list the name(s) and date(s) of these documents

18. To what extent are the C4D team/leads involved in the resource mobilisation strategies of the Country Programme? (n/a, not at all, to a small extent, to a moderate extent, to a great extent

19. Overall, to what extent are current levels of financial allocations for C4D sufficient to meet the demands and needs of the country programme? (not at all, to a small extent, to a moderate extent, to a great extent)
20. To what extent do the current levels of financial allocations for C4D meet the needs of each section/programme? [please only rate those sections/programme areas relevant to your CO]
   a. Health (N/A, not at all, to a small extent, to a moderate extent, to a great extent)
   b. HIV and AIDS
   c. Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene
   d. Nutrition
   e. Education
   f. Child Protection
   g. Social Inclusion
   h. Humanitarian/Emergency
   i. Communications for Development
   j. Other programme areas not listed above (please specify)

21. Overall, to what extent are current human resources (i.e. staff numbers) for C4D sufficient to meet the demands and needs of the country programme? (not at all, to a small extent, to a moderate extent, to a great extent)

22. To what extent do the current levels of human resources available for C4D work meet the needs of each section/programme: [please only rate those sections/programme areas relevant to your CO]
   a. Health (n/a, not at all, to a small extent, to a moderate extent, to a great extent)
   b. HIV and AIDS
   c. Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene
   d. Nutrition
   e. Education
   f. Child Protection
   g. Social Inclusion
   h. Humanitarian/Emergency
   i. Communications for Development
   j. Other programme areas not listed above (please specify)

23. Has the CO documented any innovations, best practices, or locally contextualised tools / guides in C4D in the last 5 years? (Yes, No)
   a. If yes, please list the titles of these documents

24. In the past 3-4 years has the CO delivered any C4D capacity support to government counterparts and/or implementing partners (e.g. training, mentoring, advisory support)? (Yes, No)
   a. If yes, please indicate for which sector, the form of capacity support provided (training, mentoring advising), and the target audience (i.e. NGO/CSO or government)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name / description of training</th>
<th>Target audience</th>
<th>Type of capacity support</th>
<th>Sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. If the CO is delivering C4D capacity support to government counterparts and implementing partners is this guided by a specific plan? (NB. This may or may not be a formal document) (Yes, No)

26. What level of priority will the CO expect to give to strengthening the C4D capacity of government and/or NGO/Civil Society Organisation (CSO) partners’ in the next three years? (Low, Moderate, high, very high)

27. Do any mechanisms exist at the country level (national or subnational) for planning, coordinating and strengthening C4D activities with government and other partners (e.g. ad hoc task forces, working groups, committees)? (Please list)
   Please describe the composition and purpose of this group(s), and the nature of UNICEF’s role within it/them?

28. Please indicate the CO’s level of satisfaction with the Regional Office’s role in the following areas [in those regions where there has not been a regional C4D adviser or focal point, please choose N/A]:
   a. Providing leadership and advocacy on C4D in the region (n/a, very unsatisfied, unsatisfied, satisfied, very satisfied)
b. Providing technical support to your CO in the design and implementation of C4D plans and programmes (n/a, very unsatisfied, unsatisfied, satisfied, very satisfied)
c. Designing regional specific C4D resources and training (n/a, very unsatisfied, unsatisfied, satisfied, very satisfied)
d. Sourcing and deploying regional C4D expertise to COs (n/a, very unsatisfied, unsatisfied, satisfied, very satisfied)
e. Facilitating exchange and sharing of C4D knowledge and practice in the region (n/a, very unsatisfied, unsatisfied, satisfied, very satisfied)

29. Please indicate the CO's level of satisfaction with NY HQ's role in the following areas:
   a. Providing overall strategic direction on C4D within UNICEF (very unsatisfied, unsatisfied, satisfied, very satisfied)
   b. Providing global leadership and advocacy on C4D (very unsatisfied, unsatisfied, satisfied, very satisfied)
   c. Providing global C4D training and learning opportunities for staff n/a, (very unsatisfied, unsatisfied, satisfied, very satisfied)
   d. Strengthening the evidence base on C4D; (very unsatisfied, unsatisfied, satisfied, very satisfied)
   e. Providing technical guidance on C4D; (very unsatisfied, unsatisfied, satisfied, very satisfied)
   f. Leading the development of global C4D tools and templates (very unsatisfied, unsatisfied, satisfied, very satisfied)
   g. Creating and managing platforms and process for C4D knowledge management, technical support and networking (very unsatisfied, unsatisfied, satisfied, very satisfied)

30. Please indicate what areas should the RO and HQ prioritise over the next three years in their role in supporting the CO in C4D

Thank you for completing this survey. This will be followed by interviews in person or by phone but if you have any additional comments or feedback please use the following box. (text box)
## Annex 7 Rating scale for the C4D global benchmarks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmarks</th>
<th>Performance Rating Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. New or existing mechanisms (task forces, working groups etc.) are      | **Red:** There is no evidence of any groups or task forces trying to coordinate C4D activity in the country;  
| established and functioning to plan, coordinate and strengthen C4D        | **Amber:** There is evidence of ad hoc task forces, working groups, and committees undertaking activities to strengthen C4D at the country level. UNICEF are involved in these;  
| activities.                                                              | **Yellow:** Nascent multi-Partner, government-led Planning & Coordination Mechanism for C4D exists at the National or Subnational Levels. UNICEF is playing a role in these;  
|                                                                           | **Green:** There is evidence of the following: An established Multi-Partner, government-led Planning & Coordination Mechanism for C4D at both National AND Subnational Levels; The mechanisms are considered an effective way of coordinating, planning and strengthening C4D activities; UNICEF plays an essential role in its functioning. |
| 2. C4D plans/interventions are informed by, use and monitor data and      | **Red:** There is no evidence C4D plans/interventions being informed by relevant data from monitoring, evaluation, behavioural analysis or analysis of the communications context.  
| evidence on behavioural and socio-cultural factors as well as media and   | **Amber:** There is evidence of C4D plans/interventions being informed by one of the following: monitoring data, evaluations, behavioural analysis, analysis of the communications context;  
| communication contexts                                                  | **Yellow:** There is evidence of C4D plans/interventions being informed by two of the following: monitoring data, evaluations, behavioural analysis, analysis of the communications context;  
|                                                                           | **Green:** There is evidence of plans / interventions being systematically informed by the following: Formative research being undertaken on prevailing behavioural and social norm barriers and opportunities.; Communication situation analyses have been conducted);  
|                                                                           | Formal Situation Analyses for CP has integrated a C4D component; Monitoring and evaluation data from existing and past C4D initiatives                                                                                                                             |
| 3. Participatory processes are used to engage community                    | **Red:** No evidence of the use of participatory process being used;  
| representatives and members into sector programmes/interventions        | **Amber:** Some evidence of participatory processes being used;  
|                                                                           | **Yellow:** evidence of participatory processes being used, but with room for improvement;  
|                                                                           | **Green:** High level of evidence of participatory approaches being used                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| 4. Plans/ initiatives/ ongoing programmes to strengthen C4D capacities    | **Red:** No evidence of plans/initiatives/ongoing programmes to strengthen capacity;  
| of UNICEF staff, partners at national and sub-national levels             | **Amber:** Some evidence of plans/initiatives/ongoing programmes to strengthen capacity, but these are primarily UNICEF focused;  
|                                                                           | **Yellow:** There is evidence of UNICEF and external focused capacity support, but with areas for improvement;  
|                                                                           | **Green:** There is evidence of the following: CO has formally included C4D in individual and Section Learning Plans and provided budget to cover this; CO has a Capacity Development plan for Government counterparts (including District authorities, programme managers, frontline workers) and implementing partners. These are funded and being implemented;  
|                                                                           | The CO has established strategic partnerships to coordinate and support external C4D Capacity Development.                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| 5. C4D best practices, impact assessments, tools, resources, innovations  | **Red:** No evidence of key resources being documented and shared among key stakeholders;  
| and lessons learned are documented and disseminated among key audiences.  | **Amber:** Some evidence of key resources being documented and shared among key stakeholders;  
|                                                                           | **Yellow:** evidence of key resources being documented and shared among key stakeholders, but with room for improvement;  
|                                                                           | **Green:** There is evidence of the following: Innovations and best practices in C4D have been documented and shared; There is documentation of C4D initiatives includes reporting on behaviour and/or social changes that were achieved; Locally contextualised C4D tools and guides have been developed and shared; Key audiences for C4D learning products have been identified and a communications plans exist |
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