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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BCC</td>
<td>Behaviour Change Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4D</td>
<td>Communication for Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCPD</td>
<td>Common Country Programme Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Country Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COAR</td>
<td>Country Office Annual Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>Child Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPAP</td>
<td>Country Programme Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPD</td>
<td>Country Programme Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRC</td>
<td>Convention on the Rights of the Child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSD</td>
<td>Child Survival and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPO</td>
<td>Detailed Project Outline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAPRO</td>
<td>East Asia and Pacific Regional Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOV</td>
<td>Government of Viet Nam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCMC</td>
<td>Ho Chi Minh City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ</td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBCC</td>
<td>Integrated Behaviour Change Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEC</td>
<td>Information, Education and Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR</td>
<td>Intermediary Result (now changed to Output)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAP</td>
<td>Knowledge, Attitude and Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARD</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOET</td>
<td>Ministry of Education and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOH</td>
<td>Ministry of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOLISA</td>
<td>Ministry of Labour, Invalids and Social Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTR</td>
<td>Mid-term Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYHQ</td>
<td>New York Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR</td>
<td>Programme Component Result (now changed to Outcome)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM&amp;E</td>
<td>Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO</td>
<td>Project Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAM</td>
<td>Results Assessment Matrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>Regional Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITAN</td>
<td>Situation Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPG</td>
<td>Social Policy and Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>UN Population Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAC</td>
<td>Violence against Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCO</td>
<td>Viet Nam Country Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASH</td>
<td>Water, Sanitation and Hygiene</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 Viet Nam.

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

Capacity development

The assessment of capacity development looks at UNICEF Viet Nam’s efforts to build its internal capacity on C4D through accessing global support (e.g. the C4D courses at the University of Ohio and University of Pennsylvania (social norms)) 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 organizational capacity to implement C4D.

- From 2012 onwards, UNICEF Viet Nam did some small-scale development of the C4D capacity of its staff (i.e. the Ohio and UPenn courses and a 2012 VCO C4D training) by sending 1 staff member to each U.S.A. course and organising a one-week training for all staff in-country. These courses and workshops were appropriate for the needs and demands of participants and to the strategy of the country office at the time. This was because in 2012 C4D was gaining greater prominence in the CO
so investing in staff capacity in C4D was very much in line with a vision of a restructured and integrated C4D function.

- These C4D trainings/workshops had some effect on strengthening staff capacity in C4D and on passing on skills to colleagues and counterparts, despite being relatively small-scale. But lack of follow-up through subsequent training means gains are unlikely to have been sustained.
- The C4D architecture in the Viet Nam office has undergone several changes over a short time-period. Human resources on C4D were halved (from four to two) during the second half of 2015 and are currently stretched. But the focal point structure, if implemented as planned - including training for these focal point staff members – could be a solution to the problem of resource limitations. In addition, a relatively new P4 C4D Specialist in Myanmar, who is providing support to the Myanmar, Viet Nam and Lao PDR COs under a cost-share arrangement, and outsourced consultancies currently help.
- Senior managers tend to be supportive of C4D and prioritise investments in capacity building but resources for capacity building are limited.

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.

- C4D gained a relatively high profile in the process leading up to the 2012-16 country programme with the elaboration of a C4D strategy, and the boosting of staffing levels as well as C4D becoming a unit in its own right. However, not having visible outputs and results in the country programme document makes the monitoring of C4D activities and the systematic documentation of the role of C4D difficult. C4D also does not have a clear profile in the overall VCO Results Framework.
- As a consequence of the downsizing of the C4D unit in 2015, staff and processes are currently stretched and new processes are needed which ensure better cross-cutting working methods to enable C4D to better support programmatic sections. The proposed focal point structure may help to address some of the current resource and capacity limitations to integrating C4D across the CP.
- The C4D structure of the VCO is at present in a transitional phase. Substantial change is being planned for the next country programme beginning in 2017. The current limitations to integrating C4D across the CP point to the need for a structure which will allow for a clear orientation and standard operating procedures on when and how C4D interventions should be requested or offered and the roles of the different parties in these inter-sectoral processes for effective integration of C4D into programming.
- Financial allocations to C4D have not been adequate. Three factors have contributed to this: the lack of access for C4D staff in systematically contributing to and reviewing funding proposals; the lack of clarity around C4D results; and donor reluctance to fund initiatives labelled C4D.

Implementation
The evaluation assessed implementation from three different angles. First, it looked across the five sectors of UNICEF Viet Nam’s work and summarised the progress that they have 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.

- C4D activities are widespread across the VCO country programme. C4D interventions are a key part of all programmatic Sections’ work – yet often are not explicitly acknowledged in reports.
The reduction in the C4D unit from four to two staff has limited the support provided to the Section to design and implement C4D initiatives.

Across the five C4D benchmarks that are considered proxies for quality implementation, VCO performance has been mixed with minimal evidence to suggest that benchmarks 1, 3, 4 and 5 are being met and moderate evidence of progress towards benchmark 5. Key areas for improvement are better coordination across sectors at the national level, implementing more meaningful participatory processes to engage community representatives into Sector programmes, focussed training for UNICEF staff and partners, and better documentation and dissemination of best-practice.

The limits of partner capacity (mainly government) are a barrier to effective participatory C4D initiatives beyond basic top-down campaigns and IEC (Information, Education and Communication) strategies.

The capacity support provided by UNICEF is well received by partners, although trainings for counterparts have been largely ad hoc. There is a demand and need for more support and training as part of a capacity development strategy for counterparts.

**Evaluability**

Evaluability 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 behaviors are being changed, etc.) and whether it is possible to evaluate the intervention *in practice* (whether there is monitoring data being collected on behavior change, the quality of that data etc.) Evaluability was assessed at two levels: at the level of the VCO Results Framework as a whole and two interventions with significant C4D components.

Based on the way that C4D is positioned in the Results Framework, it would not be possible to assess the aggregate effects of C4D programming across the 2012-16 country programme. There are a number of challenges in the way the results framework is established in the VCO which means that it would be very challenging to evaluate the contribution of C4D to the overall VCO country programme by taking the Results Framework as the unit of analysis.

The evaluability of the C4D elements of the two sampled projects is similarly low. Although the internal logic in the project documents is clearer in these sampled projects than in the Results Framework, it would not be possible to evaluate the contribution of C4D to behaviour/social change in either project in principle. In both projects the C4D activities would also be difficult to evaluate in practice due to an absence of monitoring data and procedures, and lack of data collection on behaviour/social change. (The sub-projects analysed were Child-friendly Maternal Health Project in Ninh Thuan province (Ministry of Health), and the Child Friendly Social Protection Project in Ninh Thuan Province (Ministry of Labour, Invalids and Social Affairs)),

**Recommendations**

Based on the findings of the evaluation a number of recommendations have been proposed for UNICEF Viet Nam to take forward.

1. **UNICEF Viet Nam should draw up a targeted capacity development strategy for the different C4D stakeholders:** (i) C4D staff; (ii) C4D Focal Points (in the firmed up structure under development); (iii) Other UNICEF staff with focussed special emphasis on: senior management, Heads of Section, and Technical Specialists; and (iv) Government counterparts. Identifying training needs should be matched with mapping existing capacity.

---

1 The extent to which a C4D intervention can be evaluated in the future
2. **UNICEF Viet Nam and/or EAPRO and/or NYHQ should help provide C4D staff with further technical guidance in a number of sectors / issues.** Informants identified a number of sectors and issues where they would like UNICEF to develop additional C4D technical guidance. These include: evaluating C4D, planning social norms interventions, Child Protection and Social Policy.

3. **Coordination of C4D capacity development needs to be considered an important management function.** While some of the CO and counterpart capacity development training needs assessment (TNA) and planning can be handled by the VCO C4D staff, linking up with support from the Regional Office (EAPRO) will require senior management support. The new cost-share arrangement with a C4D specialist based in Myanmar to provide technical C4D oversight and support to three regional COs (Myanmar, Viet Nam and Lao PDR) will be a welcome boost to regional-based capacity-building.

4. **UNICEF VCO should consider establishing long term partnerships to support C4D capacity development.** To help coordinate the C4D capacity development efforts especially for government partners, consideration should be given to working with a national academy of further education such as Hanoi School of Public Health, Hanoi Medical University, and/or University of Labour and Social Affairs. Additional capacity building will still be needed and partnerships with a number of local organisations could help. These partners could work across sections in delivering C4D capacity development services and help create efficiencies.

5. **The VCO should consider putting in place Standard Operating Procedures for the role and entry points for the C4D staff in Section planning, implementation, monitoring and documentation.** Clear orientation is needed on when C4D interventions should be requested or offered and the roles of the different parties in these important processes for effective integration of C4D into programming. This should include C4D staff having an opportunity and an obligation to integrate C4D at all levels of the results framework where appropriate.

6. **VCO should move forward with plans for establishing formal C4D focal points in all the Sections.** It is important that this is not an ad hoc side-activity, but that C4D is prominently inserted into their job descriptions and that the focal points are annually assessed on their C4D function. Special C4D capacity building would be needed for them. They should also have monthly coordination meetings with the C4D Specialist and there should be an emphasis on a lot of peer-to-peer mutual coaching.

7. **VCO senior management needs to activate the C4D task force that has been discussed and planned since 2012, but never activated.** The role of the task force will be to coordinate the continued update of the C4D strategy, and its monitoring and cross-sector fertilisation in regular meetings between Deputy Director, Head of Communication, C4D staff and the emerging group of C4D sector-based focal points. The task force should be responsible for ensuring that Focal Points are actually nominated and sufficiently trained, and that the C4D SOP is developed and implemented.

8. **UNICEF should redouble its efforts to ensure C4D strategies 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, therefore this needs to be done as a matter of course.

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 results, clear indicators at output and
outcome levels, and baseline data collection as a basis for strong monitoring and results documentation.

10. UNICEF Viet Nam should capture behaviour/social change results better and build up its evidence base on what works in C4D. For this to happen, UNICEF Viet Nam should
a. conduct a portfolio evaluation that looks across a sample of specific C4D activities within programmes and projects.
b. ensure that C4D activities, outputs and outcomes are more visible by clearly positioning C4D in the results framework. To do this, senior management, PM&E and C4D should work together to map out how to make C4D more visible in the future.
1. Introduction

Communication 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 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 and action in C4D. 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 comprised five country case studies, in Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Kyrgyzstan, Nigeria and Viet Nam. These provided opportunities to look in more depth at how C4D capacity has been built, how C4D has been integrated into country offices (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 country case study report from Viet Nam.

The report is structured in five sections: Section 1 is the introduction and includes details of the purpose, objectives and scope of the evaluation, and the objectives and methodology for the country study. Section 2 provides background to UNICEF Viet Nam and the 2012–16 country programme. Section 3 presents the findings of the evaluation. This is divided into four sub-sections: C4D capacity development; the integration of C4D in the UNICEF Viet Nam country programme and CO; implementation of C4D; and the evaluability of C4D. Sections 4 and 5 present the conclusions and recommendations.

1.1. Purpose, objectives and scope of the Viet Nam case study

The purpose of the global evaluation of UNICEF’s capacity and action in C4D is to generate credible and useful evidence on the capacity 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 continue to guide UNICEF’s future C4D work and partnerships in implementing the 2014–17 Strategic Plan and country programmes. The evaluation will feed into the Mid-Term Review (MTR) of the 2014–17 Strategic Plan and into 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 it 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 within UNICEF. With this significant investment about to be made in C4D, this evaluation will help 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 is on the past four years (2011–15). The evaluation looks back past 2010, but this is only to help understand the historical roots of more recent events.

---

2 The current Viet Nam country programme runs 2012–16 so some of 2016 is also covered in this report.
The evaluation is formative and focuses 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.

1.1. Objectives and scope of the Viet Nam country case study

The Viet Nam country study is one of five country case studies. Each country case study had 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) enhance the CO’s overall C4D 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.

1.2. Country case study process and methodology

Preparation and planning: Prior to the country visit the evaluators reviewed core documentation of UNICEF Viet Nam (see Annex 1 for a list of references). A series of phone calls were also conducted with the chief of PME Unit and the C4D specialist to plan the country visit and discuss which two C4D programmes should be selected for the evaluability assessment. The criteria that were used to inform the selection were:

- Programmes that were relatively mature;
- Programmes where C4D was a prominent part of the intervention;
- Programmes 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 the Viet Nam Country Office (VCO). This was coordinated and signed off by the deputy representative and reflected the VCO’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 consultant travelled to Viet Nam from 27 February to 5 March 2016. In total the consultant had five working days in-country. During this time one-on-one interviews and group discussions were held. These were undertaken with both internal stakeholders and the reference group, including C4D specialists, section chiefs, technical specialists, the deputy representative, the representative, etc., and external stakeholders including implementation partners and government counterparts. See Annex 2 for a list of all of the interviews and group discussion participants.

---

3 The UNICEF VCO evaluation reference group was: Chief, Planning Monitoring and Evaluation (PM&E): Vu Manh Hong; PM&E Specialist: Nguyen Quynh Trang; C4D Specialist: Chu Huu Trang; C4D Officer: Tran Phuong Anh; Child Protection (CP) Officer, CP Section: Vu Thi Le Thanh.
All interviews and group discussions were structured using pre-prepared question guides. All questions linked back to overarching evaluation questions. Detailed written summaries were taken of all interviews/group discussions.

A field trip was also undertaken to interview, observe and assess UNICEF Viet Nam’s programme in Ninh Thuan province. The field visit focused on integrated behaviour change communication (IBCC) interventions carried out under the Ninh Thuan Provincial Child-Friendly Project, including the Ninh Thuan water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) component. Since 2007, the province has seen a lot of C4D interventions, including communication capacity building for stakeholders across all programmatic priorities. During the field trip the team had an opportunity to speak with local stakeholders, including provincial authorities and community members.

A debriefing was held with members of the VCO senior management and CO C4D staff 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 in CO strategies and structures and evaluability. In assessing the quality of C4D implementation, the 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 allowed for the team to make only a very brief visit to two C4D programmes being implemented in the field. This affected the team’s ability to make judgements on how C4D programmes are being implemented in practice.

2. Background

2.1. UNICEF in Viet Nam

The VCO is a medium-sized UNICEF office with just over 60 staff and an annual programme budget of $7.6 million per year. The country office is in Hanoi, with one sub-office in Ho Chi Minh City (HCMC).

There are four main programme sections in the VCO: Social Policy and Governance (SPG); Child Protection (CP); Child Survival and Development (CSD); and Education. The Communication and Public Advocacy Section incorporates External Communications and C4D. The VCO also has a section responsible for Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (PM&E) and a Programme Partnership Office, which works with private sector actors. UNICEF Viet Nam works primarily with government counterparts.

Alongside the current Country Programme Document (CPD) (2012–16), UNICEF’s work in Viet Nam is guided by the 2012–16 Common Country Programme Document (CCPD) of the UN Development Programme (UNDP), the UN Population Fund (UNFPA) and UNICEF, the 2012–16 One Plan of the UN system in Viet Nam, the 2012–16 UNICEF Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) and 16 Detailed

---

4 E.g Child Survival and Development (CSD) and CP, including a violence against children (VAC) campaign in 2014.
5 Since June 2015 the VCO has had one C4D specialist and one C4D officer. Reference to the two of them within this report is usually to ‘the VCO C4D staff’, for the sake of brevity and clarity.
6 Total planned VCO budget in workplans. The actual spent of total VCO budget may be slightly lower.
Project Outlines (DPOs). DPOs are the cornerstone of the Government of Viet Nam’s (GOV) management and implementation of official development assistance in Viet Nam. In order to operationalize the UN-wide 2012-2016 One Plan, the GOV develops DPOs with all UN agencies. UNICEF Viet Nam has developed a total of 16 DPOs with eight national agencies as well as eight provincial authorities.

2.2. Background to C4D in the Viet Nam programme

2.2.1 C4D and the current country programme (2012–16)

In the 2012–16 country programme, there is a cross-sectoral output on C4D where the in-house C4D technical support function sits. While there is no C4D-focused programme outcome or output in the country programme results structure, as such, there are C4D-focused and/or C4D-related annual targets or activities or indicators in the annual or multi-year workplans of four sections.

2.2.2 The structure of the C4D function in the country office

The structure of the C4D function in UNICEF Viet Nam has undergone several major changes over a relatively short period. Until recently, C4D was one of two cross-sectoral units in the VCO. It fell under the cross-sectoral programme component of the 2012–16 country programme. However, to ensure synergies between External Communications and C4D, particularly in contributing to VCO’s public advocacy, the C4D Unit has recently been incorporated into the Communications Section. This new structure comes into effect only in the next country programme, starting from 2017.

Prior to 2012, the VCO had three programme communication officers, who were integrated into the Health Section but also supported communications work in Nutrition, WASH and CP. In the lead-up to the 2012–16 country programme, it was decided to give added significance to communication and C4D, the latter of which was adopted as the new name of the technical approach. A senior UNICEF C4D specialist was invited to Viet Nam in 2011 to help the VCO design the role of C4D in the 2012–16 country programme.

This led to a separate C4D Unit being established in 2012 that reported to the deputy representative. The three programme communication officer positions were moved into the new unit and a new international position – a P4 – was established to lead the C4D Unit. Each project officer (PO) was assigned specific programmatic areas of responsibility. In addition, the unit had the support of one General Service staff member. The C4D Unit both was responsible for its own C4D initiatives and supported the programme sections and counterparts integrating C4D into their work. In 2012, the unit also received an injection of funds to the tune of $1.8 million. Besides the operating costs for C4D (salary, travel, training, etc.) the main C4D budget comes from programme budgets for C4D-related activities within sectoral programmes.

The MTR of the country programme in 2014 meant a significantly reduced budget (in fact the budget was almost halved in size). For the C4D Unit, this resulted in a contraction in its size. In 2015 the international position was replaced by a shared C4D specialist (P4) based in Myanmar (working on three countries) along with one of the three national POs. One of the remaining national POs was promoted to lead the C4D Unit, so there are now just two C4D staff members, supported by a shared C4D specialist (P4) based in Myanmar.

---

7 Viet Nam CCPA 2012–16.
8 The other was the sub-national coordination unit.
10 According to information provided by the former head of unit in a Skype interview.
11 Information provided in interviews with former and present VCO UNICEF C4D staff.
The next phase in the C4D Unit evolution came in early 2016 when plans were made to integrate it into the Communications Section along with External Communications. The vision is that, over time, C4D and External Communications will be merged to achieve the objective of working together within a single strategy. While in the short term the C4D Unit will have its own lead, there will be a gradual merging of the two units:

- 2016: The units will continue to work separately, but the C4D lead will report to the head of communications instead of to the deputy representative.
- 2017 (start of new country programme): According to new structure for 2017–21, the Communication and Public Advocacy Section will incorporate both C4D and External Communications.
- 2018–19: The VCO will develop an integrated Viet Nam version of the Global Communication and Public Advocacy Strategy, which will encompass an integrated External Communications and C4D.

### 2.2.3 C4D capacity development activities

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

1. Internal staff training;
2. Sending a staff member on the C4D course at Ohio University (henceforth ‘Ohio’) in 2012;
3. Sending staff on the Advances in Social Norms course at the University of Pennsylvania (henceforth ‘UPenn’) in 2013;
4. Regional sector-specific C4D workshops;
5. Informal and ad hoc forms of C4D capacity coaching and support in-country.

Table 1 provides details of this capacity support.

Table 1: Types of C4D capacity support provided between 2012 and 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of capacity support</th>
<th>Details of the capacity support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. VCO level C4D training</td>
<td>2012: a one-week C4D training course was organised by the C4D Unit and delivered for UNICEF staff by a senior UNICEF C4D consultant. This was an introductory course on C4D designed to provide programme staff with a basic grounding in C4D concepts and approaches, and applied practically to the VCO’s existing work plans. 38 staff attended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ohio</td>
<td>2012: Following the restructuring of C4D in 2011–12, 1 C4D staff member completed the Ohio course on C4D. Other C4D staff members have since applied, but the VCO has turned down the applicants because of lack of funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. UPenn</td>
<td>2013: The international C4D specialist (who left the VCO June 2015) attended the UPenn course.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4. Regional workshops on effective integration of C4D in specific sectors | 2015: Strengthening C4D towards improved results in education, Bangladesh. 1 C4D staff participated with 1 Education Section staff and 1 senior government manager (Ministry of Education and Training (MOET)).
2015: Regional workshop on C4D/communication approaches to address VAC, Bangkok. 1 C4D staff participated with 1 CP Section staff |
| 5. Informal and ad hoc C4D capacity coaching and support – in-country | VCO C4D staff 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 VCO.
VCO C4D staff systematically present and share documentation, information and materials coming from HQ and the regional office (RO) to relevant colleagues from the sectors – sometimes as part of the above events. |

---


13 Information shared in separate KIs with the current C4D specialist and C4D officer.
3. Findings

This section presents the findings of the Viet Nam case study in relation to the evaluation objectives and questions. 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 Viet Nam’s efforts to build its internal capacity on C4D through accessing global support and CO-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; senior champions of C4D exist who outline a vision and create space for investment in high quality C4D programming; and networks are formed between HQ, ROs and COs that facilitate technical support and the exchange of knowledge and learning around C4D. In assessing UNICEF Viet Nam’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 CO 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 (3.1.1) and effectiveness (3.1.2) and efficiency (3.1.3) of the internal capacity support that has been provided between 2012 and 2015 on C4D and whether it has changed individuals’ knowledge and practices. It then looks at technical guidance (3.1.4) and the extent to which organisation level capacities have been built. It first looks at what staff capacity has been created within the CO to support C4D (3.1.5); then the extent to which there are senior C4D champions in UNICEF Viet Nam (3.1.6); and finally the effectiveness of the support provided to the VCO by the RO and NYHQ on C4D (3.1.). The section finishes with reflection on the factors that could undermine the future sustainability of C4D capacity in UNICEF Viet Nam (3.1.8).

Key findings:

- The development of C4D capacity among its staff (i.e. the Ohio and UPenn courses and the 2012 VCO C4D training) was appropriate for the needs and demands of participants and to the strategy of the CO at the time. This was because in 2012 C4D was gaining greater prominence in the CO so investing in staff capacity in C4D was very much in line with a vision of a restructured and integrated C4D function.
- These C4D trainings/workshops had some effect in terms of strengthening staff capacity in C4D and passing on skills to colleagues and counterparts, despite being relatively small in scale. But lack of follow-up through subsequent training means changes in behaviour are unlikely to have been sustained.
- Human resources on C4D were halved during the second half of 2015 and are currently stretched, but the focal point structure, if implemented as planned – including training for these staff members, could be a solution to the problem of resource limitations. The relatively new P4 C4D specialist in Myanmar, who is providing support to the Myanmar, Viet Nam and Lao PDR COs under a cost-share arrangement and the outsourced consultant currently help.
- Representatives and deputy representatives tend to be supportive of C4D and prioritising investments in capacity building but resources for capacity building are limited.

---

14 This is detailed in the C4D Strategy and Plan for Action 2008–12.
15 The online survey was signed off by the deputy representative.
3.1.1 Relevance of capacity development in UNICEF Viet Nam

This section assesses the extent to which the C4D capacity development activities that have been accessed by UNICEF Viet Nam have been relevant to the needs of the CO and to the individual participants.

The Ohio and UPenn courses were well aligned with the needs of the CO, although, arguably, given the importance of C4D at the time, more staff should have been sent. The VCO sent staff on both the Ohio and UPenn courses at a time when C4D was gaining greater prominence in the CO. Although there was no formal C4D capacity building strategy and no formal capacity needs assessment, investing in staff capacity in C4D was very much in line with the VCO vision of a restructured and integrated C4D function. The new C4D Unit had recently been established and building its capacity to drive forward the agenda and support others across the country programme was key. Arguably, given that none of the C4D Unit staff came from a C4D background, more staff should have attended (only one staff member attended each course). However, informants noted that a good culture of sharing broadened the effect of the courses within the unit and more widely in the CO.

The one VCO staff member who attended the Ohio course felt it was highly relevant to their individual technical and learning needs. While only one staff member attended the Ohio course, they indicated that the course both covered the necessary technical issues for their job and also was structured in a way that supported effective learning. They noted, ‘Ohio... was extremely useful for strengthening my technical expertise. It covered the issues that I needed to know for my job and was also a good opportunity to reach out to colleagues working in similar portfolios across the globe for UNICEF, for networking, experience sharing, learning of best practices and all guided by experienced C4D facilitators and managers.’

The staff member who took part in the UPenn course left the VCO eight months before the evaluation visit, which meant it was not possible to make a judgement on the relevance of the course to their needs.

The VCO C4D introductory training in 2012 was well aligned with the needs of the VCO. It targeted the right individuals at the right time. The 2012 in-country C4D training (one-week introductory course for 38 VCO staff delivered by a senior C4D consultant) was scheduled to coincide with the start of the new country programme. Given the recent establishment of the C4D Unit and the formulation of a C4D strategy at the time, there was a strong demand for basic C4D knowledge and skills across the CO. The in-country training was well timed to meet this demand.

The participants in the VCO C4D workshop were all technical programme officers and heads of sections from across the CO. Again, considering the ambition to integrate C4D as a cross-cutting strategy across all programmatic sections, this composition of participants was appropriate. The involvement of section heads was particularly important given the key role they can play in both enabling (and blocking) the integration of C4D into programmatic work. Those who had attended the 2012 in-house workshop spoke positively about its content and indicated that it was well aligned with their needs at the time.

---

16 The international specialist came from a C4D background (a PhD in behaviour change communication and social mobilisation (BCC)) but had been working on HIV/AIDS prior to this position. The other three national staff worked in information, education and communication (IEC), BCC/C4D on WASH, Health and Nutrition and Communicable Diseases prior to joining the C4D Unit. None of the national staff had a direct degree-level educational background on C4D but they did on mass communications and anthropology.

17 KIs 3
18 KIs 4 and 5
3.1.2 Effectiveness of C4D capacity development in UNICEF Viet Nam

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

The 2012 in-country C4D workshop was effective in raising awareness and strengthening C4D knowledge, but the lack of any subsequent follow-up since then points to the need to now address C4D capacity gaps across the whole CO. The in-house C4D workshop for all staff in 2012 was an important event for the VCO and is often referred to as the first real eye-opener for a large number of the non-C4D staff. Many of the interviewees indicated that the workshop made an important contribution to their C4D knowledge. Following the workshop there is evidence to suggest that sectoral programmes better understood the potential of integration of C4D into their programmes, and planning/coordination was easier across the programmes, especially in Health, Nutrition, WASH and CP.\(^{19}\)

However, there has been no formal follow-up since the workshop. While informal capacity development activities have been undertaken, such as presentations to sections and on-the-job support, there has been no repeat of the workshop or other training events. Many of the technical staff and heads of units requested more regular and systematic capacity building. Several informants argued – independently from each other – that if the vision of the VCO is that C4D becomes the business of everyone, capacity needs to be scaled up across the whole CO. In this respect, while this workshop may have contributed to improved knowledge and changes in practice immediately after the workshop, the lack of follow-up means changes in behaviour are very unlikely to have been sustained.

The Ohio and UPenn courses strengthened the C4D knowledge of the two staff members who attended and had some tangible results in terms of skills passed on to colleagues and counterparts. The one member of the C4D Unit who was available to comment on the US courses said that the Ohio course had been effective in strengthening their knowledge. They commented that it had helped them ‘systematise’ their ‘learning and knowledge on C4D’ and locate their practices more in theory. In terms of how the Ohio course affected their C4D practice, they spoke about gaining enhanced monitoring and evaluation (M&E) and advocacy skills; ‘approaching the C4D planning process in a more structured way’ and having ‘greater confidence to advocate on C4D with colleagues’ after attending the course.\(^{20}\) Some practical results from both the Ohio and UPenn courses were evidenced in subsequent trainings given to team members through a learning session and various training workshops organised for national (Ministry of Labour, Invalids and Social Affairs (MOLISA), Ministry of Justice and Women’s Union) and provincial government counterparts utilising the Ohio and UPenn course concepts and materials.

3.1.3 Efficiency of UNICEF Viet Nam’s approach to C4D capacity development

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

The investment made in overseas courses (Ohio and UPenn) is considered by the VCO to have been worthwhile but in the future, in-country courses in C4D would be preferable. Although the Ohio and UPenn courses are relatively expensive (i.e. high overheads, long and residential courses), the VCO only

\(^{19}\) KIs 1 and 2

\(^{20}\) The full quotation is as follows: ‘My recognition [was enhanced] of different elements in the planning and implementation cycle… (e.g. baseline, secondary data, the importance of M&E in attributing to C4D impacts and the importance of C4D in programming and delivering results for children). And my confidence in advocating for C4D and my resources through the network of colleagues that I have been acquainted with are a daily support’ (KI 3).
had to pay for the travel and daily subsistence allowance for the two participants, not the courses
themselves, which were covered by UNICEF centrally. When considering the cost effectiveness of such
overseas courses, the VCO also noted that training opportunities on C4D within Viet Nam do not exist as a
specialisation and external learning is an investment in staff capacity and exposure to out-of-country office
C4D work, engagement with regional/global UNICEF practices and network building. It also means
representation of VCO C4D work to the external environment. Therefore the investment made was
considered cost-effective. Furthermore, as evaluators we observe that the investment was not large in
absolute terms (only two participants) and in relative terms was quite modest: with only two staff out of 67
total attending courses in the U.S.A, this represents only 2.98% of staff members. When comparing our five
case study countries, Viet Nam represents the lowest percentage out of the five: Bangladesh sent 6.8% of
its staff (16 out of 235) and Kyrgyzstan sent 5% (2.521 out of 50).

Moving forward, given the limited resources that Viet Nam has to allocate to C4D capacity development, it
should invest in more country-level workshops and training, similar to the workshop for 38 VCO staff that
was run in 2012. This is a more efficient approach to building the capacity of a larger number of staff in the
CO, and is a good method of exposing non-C4D staff to knowledge and skills. That said, if the need arises
for advanced C4D training for specialised staff, then Ohio and/or UPenn should not be discounted as an
option.

3.1.4 Use of C4D technical guidance

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

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 main ways
technical guidance is being used is as an aid when designing C4D initiatives. The reports that have had the
widest use are:

- Facilitating Community Participation through Communication, 2001;
- Behaviour Change Communications in Emergencies: A Toolkit, 2006;
- Ethical Reporting on and for Children: Bangladesh, 2010;
- World Breastfeeding Campaign, 2011;
- Creative Communication Pilot, 2010–20;
- Documentation of communication interventions for the measles and rubella vaccine launch campaign,
  2015 (report being finalised);
- VAC campaign assessment, 2015 (report being finalised).

C4D staff mentioned the need for further guidance with regard to a number of sectors/issues. Informants identified a number of sectors and issues where they would like UNICEF to develop additional
C4D technical guidance. These include evaluating C4D, planning social norms interventions, child protection
and social policy.

3.1.5 Human resources for C4D

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

---

21 Two people attended the full courses and one attended only the online version of Ohio.
Human resources on C4D are currently severely stretched but this is a transitional situation and remedies are foreseen. As described above, C4D staff numbers were cut by half in 2015. This means that staffing at present is not adequate to deliver expected results and so there is a consensus emerging in the CO that a focal point structure within the technical sections will have to be formalised to help with the C4D workload.\(^{22}\)

Key informants indicated that the planned C4D focal point structure would be positive as it would create an in-house network of staff with a sound understanding of and insight into effective integration of C4D into programmes. It was stressed by senior management that, for a focal point structure to make a difference in the new country programme,\(^{23}\) it will need to have a different role and nature than, for instance, the present gender focal points, who take stock of integration of gender only a couple of times a year. The C4D focal points will have C4D inserted into their job descriptions and will respond formally to this in their annual performance assessment. To match these requirements, significant capacity building will need to be made available. The role of the two core C4D staff may be strengthened to take up more of an advisory and support function to the focal point structure.\(^{24}\)

### 3.1.6 C4D champions

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

**Almost all senior managers are supporters of C4D.** The representative and deputy representative see the value in C4D and recognise the need to invest much more in capacity development in the future, for the success of the new country programme. While they are not necessarily champions of C4D, they are certainly supporters of it. Among section chiefs we identified three who are particularly vocal champions and allocate resources appropriately. For those who remain a little unconvinced, the common issue seems to be a lack of documented cases of C4D’s impact. For some technical specialists this is the key to unlocking their support. As a manager noted, ‘All our section chiefs are passionate about supporting the change needed for better lives for children in Viet Nam. So if they are not yet C4D champions it is because they have not yet been convinced of the potential C4D holds for their work!’\(^{25}\)

### 3.1.7 Support provided by the RO and NYHQ for C4D capacity development

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

**There is general satisfaction with HQ support to C4D.** As indicated in Table 2, the VCO is satisfied with NYHQ’s performance across all of its main C4D accountabilities. One informant stressed that, although NYHQ is far away, the C4D Unit responds very quickly and with concrete and practical advice that is easy to implement.\(^{26}\)

---

\(^{22}\) KIs 2 and 3  
\(^{23}\) KI 1  
\(^{24}\) KIs 1 and 2  
\(^{25}\) KI 11  
\(^{26}\) The VCO former head of the C4D Unit moved to work at the UNICEF C4D Unit in New York on leaving Viet Nam in June 2015.
Table 2: VCO’s satisfaction with HQ level support on C4D, taken from the country level survey

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

There is scope for improvement in how the East Asia and Pacific Regional Office (EAPRO) can support country offices such as the VCO. Because of the absence of a full-time dedicated C4D regional adviser, EAPRO’s performance against its core C4D accountabilities was perceived as poor by the VCO (see Table 3). This points to the need to consider enhancing the support for C4D in EAPRO.

At the time of the country visit a new cost-share arrangement was being put in place, with a C4D specialist based in Myanmar to provide technical C4D oversight and support to three regional COs (Myanmar, Viet Nam and Lao PDR). It is hoped this arrangement will plug the current gap that exists at the regional level and focus on greater sharing of best practices and experiences on C4D from within the region.27

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

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

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 that could undermine the sustainability of the capacity gains in C4D. To date, the VCO has not been able to focus as much as desired on building knowledge and skills of the broader staff; the focus has been on the small cadre of C4D staff. Their effectiveness is constrained by the weak understanding of C4D (beyond material production) in the wider CO. This was an issue raised consistently in key informant interviews (see above). 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 general C4D courses provided to the CO, 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.

27 The evaluators note that the VCO regards the C4D specialist (P4) stationed in Myanmar as a country level resource rather than regional or HQ support.
While there is recognition of the need for C4D capacity development, there has been no clear assessment of what the needs are and there is no clear plan for how these should be addressed. In a number of internal documents and in most key informant interviews conducted in Viet Nam, the need to build both counterpart and internal capacity on C4D is recognised. Senior management is aware and see this as an important priority to kick off the new programme in 2017. However, at the time of writing no plan had been developed. Likewise, there has not been a capacity needs assessment to understand training needs, except a C4D capacity assessment carried out for counterparts of the WASH sector (Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD), Ministry of Health (MOH), Ministry of Education and Training (MOET)) in 2014. Currently, all sections state that they have only a moderate understanding of their capacity needs but that they want to prioritise ways to use C4D to its fullest potential – a potential that most staff seem to be aware of but without having a clear understanding of what it would take to move beyond traditional IEC and BCC.

Staff turnover is a concern for sustainability. Current C4D staff have not trained others recently, and training has not been rolled out more broadly to programme staff, apart from in the 2012 workshop. This presents a risk. If the current C4D staff leave, the investment in C4D capacity development will leave with them – as happened with the international head of the C4D Unit (the only one who took part in the UPenn course), who left in June 2015. Arguably, the decision to maintain only Viet Nam nationals in the C4D Unit rather than internationals will mitigate this risk, as will the support provided by the shared C4D specialist stationed in Myanmar.

There is a lack of long-term in-country partnerships to support C4D capacity development. The VCO currently has no formal partnerships that it can leverage to support internal capacity development around C4D. It relies on global Long-Term Agreements, primarily with Cornell University in the US, and has been quite satisfied with this arrangement. Given the plans in the VCO to invest further in the building of staff C4D capacity (focal points and general programme sector staff), the arrangements and providers that would be most effective and useful in scaling up internal capacity are currently being discussed.
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29 Most informants from the technical sectors including KIs 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12
3.2. Integration of C4D into CO policies, processes and systems

The following section presents the findings on how far C4D has been integrated into UNICEF Viet Nam’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 and reporting (3.2.2). Following this are sections on the structure of the C4D function (3.2.3), how resources for C4D are mobilised (3.2.4) and its integration with external communications (3.2.5).

Key findings:

- Implementation of the C4D strategy has not been systematic and C4D does not have a clear profile in the overall VCO Results Framework.
- As a consequence of the downsizing of the C4D Unit in 2015, staff and processes are currently stretched and new processes are needed. The proposed focal point structure may help to address some of the current resource and capacity limitations to integrating C4D across the CP.
- The C4D structure of the VCO is at present in a transitional phase. Substantial change is being planned for the next country programme, beginning in 2017. The current limitations to integrating C4D across the CP point to the need for a structure which will allow for a clear orientation and standard operating procedures on when and how C4D interventions should be requested or offered and the roles of the different parties in these inter-sectoral processes for effective integration of C4D into programming.
- Financial allocations to C4D have not been adequate. Three factors have contributed to this: lack of (access for C4D staff in) systematic engagement in inputting to and reviewing funding proposals; lack of clarity around C4D results; and donor reluctance to fund C4D interventions.
3.2.1 C4D strategy

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

The 2012–16 C4D Strategy for UNICEF Viet Nam presented a good framework for operationalising C4D. Finalised in March 2012, the C4D Strategy is underpinned by the model developed by McKee et al. (2000) (see right)\(^{30}\). The strategy emphasises ‘the two-way communication process’, dialogue and community participation as its approach, not relying only on IEC tools and materials.

The three ‘key C4D outcomes’ defined in the strategy document\(^{31}\) are:

1. Strategic C4D interventions are used to leverage and accelerate sustainable results for children, especially those most disadvantaged, such as ethnic minority children and families;
2. UNICEF C4D leadership implements a limited number of flagship interventions that depend heavily on behaviour and social change;
3. C4D strategies are used for policy advocacy to end disparities among children by facilitating meaningful participation of children and community members.

More recently, a C4D concept note\(^{32}\) was produced in 2015 as part of the preparations for the new country programme 2017–21. This document identifies a number of C4D priority areas (programme components depend heavily on behaviour and social change) and includes an analysis of the bottlenecks/barriers to prevailing social norms, social and cultural practices, and beliefs in those areas. These include issues within CP (e.g. physical punishment), social protection (securing the wellbeing of children living with disabilities) and community level education programmes (securing good quality early schooling also for children from poor families). The concept note highlights how the C4D interventions at the national and provincial levels should be packaged around a life-cycle approach.

The C4D Strategy adopted in 2012 kick-started a period during which C4D had considerable profile in the VCO. The setting-up of the C4D Unit in 2012 to provide C4D technical support across all VCO programmes; the development of the office-wide C4D Strategy; and the participation of the C4D Unit in the quality assurance of annual/multi-year workplans (to ensure C4D as important interventions in the 16 programme workplans) are examples of how the CO has developed institutional C4D capacity through the integration of C4D into CO policies, processes and systems.

3.2.2 Integration of C4D in planning and reporting processes

This section looks at the extent to which C4D has been integrated into core planning processes and documents and the consistency and quality with which C4D has been reported on by UNICEF Viet Nam.


\(^{31}\) Quoted from the C4D Strategy 2011–16. Implications, Priorities and Actions for Results for Children in Viet Nam, p.3. UNICEF Viet Nam, March 2012.

\(^{32}\) Concept Note Positioning C4D in UNICEF Viet Nam’s Planning Process for CPD 2017–21, October 2015.
In terms of planning programme activities, each C4D staff member has responsibility to support specific national level programme sectors and the subnational programmes in eight priority provinces. In annual joint planning processes, the relevant C4D staff member and PO plans and the C4D staff support and coach their colleagues and partners in the implementation process. This happens at the request of programmes.

**C4D could be more clearly profiled in the overall VCO results structure.** C4D is visible in the Results Framework only at activity level with C4D-focused and/or C4D-related annual targets or indicators in the annual or multi-year workplans of the four main sectoral programmes. Similarly, it is invisible in the internal system for results tracking. The head of PM&E stressed that they have worked hard to strengthen the reporting system, making changes in both 2014 and 2015. However, PM&E is aware it needs better indicators not only for monitoring C4D but also in other areas and is eager to introduce clear C4D indicators in the Results Assessment Matrix (RAM) reporting.

**C4D is not directly mentioned in the 2010 SitAn, or in the 2015 Inception Report for the next SitAn but is covered by the bottleneck analysis.** Our review of the 2010 SitAn\(^{33}\) did not find a specific section on C4D or a detailed analysis of behaviour and social norms change barriers and opportunities for each results area, or a description of the barriers and enablers of behaviour and social norms change needed. However, the 2015 Inception Report suggests behaviour and social norms barriers and enablers analysis will have more emphasis and space in future. The conceptual framework section identifies them as a critical part of a rights-based approach.\(^{34}\) Furthermore, C4D is clearly mentioned in the outcome papers and in the Strategic Moment of Reflection as part of system-wide bottleneck analysis.

**VCO Annual Reports cover C4D substantially for the period 2010–15. The reporting does not, however, have a consistent focus on outcomes, but rather looks at activities and outputs.** The Annual Reports include a brief description of C4D as a strategy (along with capacity development, advocacy, partnership, etc.), and also an analysis by Programme Component Result (PCR) and Intermediary Result (IR).\(^{35}\) C4D can be found within the analysis of the different PCRs, although it varies a lot between PCRs. From the CO Annual Report (COAR) for 2012 onwards, there is a more systematic structure that helps in tracking C4D progress and reporting. Also, the links between PCRs and IRs and progress are clearer. COAR 2012 represents a new form of reporting on C4D because it is the first Annual Report after the CPPA 2012–16 and the C4D Strategy 2012–16 with a new C4D Unit. Across all years, however, there is a consistent focus on activity, sometimes output, reporting. As such, there is no reporting on what has been achieved as a result of C4D, only what has been done.

### 3.2.3 Structure of the C4D function and integration with External Communications

This section covers the strengths and weaknesses of how the C4D function is structured in UNICEF Viet Nam and explores the interaction between C4D and External Communications.

**In view of the downsizing of the C4D unit, staff are stretched and a new focal point structure and new inter-sectoral processes are needed.** Before the cuts in 2015, which saw the C4D team reduced from four staff to two, practically all sections were satisfied with the support they received from, and the collaboration they had with, the C4D staff, although the Education Section would have liked more proactive support from their C4D colleagues. Now this has become more challenging, given the reduction in human


\(^{34}\) Assessments of the enabling environment, structural and systematic barriers and bottlenecks to achieving positive results for children, as well as the social norms and other personal and environmental factors (including the cultural and religious beliefs and practices) that determine key behaviours at different levels... are key to the analysis.” A Situation Analysis of Children’s Rights in Viet Nam. Inception Report. By Transformation and Change Management Consulting Co. Ltd., October 2015.

\(^{35}\) C4D is a key implementation strategy of the UNICEF Strategic Plan 2014–17 and thus reported under the respective section on implementation strategy of the COARs (COARs).
resources in the C4D Unit, despite the support of the shared C4D specialist in Myanmar and some outsourced consultancy.

This points to the need for focal points as an opportunity to address the capacity gap. It also points to the need for clear orientation and standard operating procedures on when and how C4D interventions should be requested or offered and the roles of the different parties in these inter-sectoral processes for effective integration of C4D into programming. This should include C4D staff having an opportunity and an obligation to integrate C4D at all levels of the Results Framework, where appropriate. While acknowledging that the C4D structure of the VCO is at present in a transitional phase and substantial change is being planned for the next country programme, beginning in 2017, recommendations are included on how VCO can address the capacity and resources challenges (see Section 5 of this report).

C4D and External Communications have recently been merged. The two units will look for synergies while maintaining a clear division between the two different technical disciplines at least for the first couple of years. While collaboration around campaigns and production of IEC materials occurred before the merger, External Communications is now looking more to ‘document the ways in which UNICEF is generating development results and change in the field.’

This will help fill a gap in documenting and disseminating the results from C4D as well as address some of the fundraising challenges mentioned above. In terms of the bigger picture, although there is clearly a danger that C4D may be subsumed under External Communications rather than the two being equal partners in a complementary relationship, senior managers were of the opinion that the change should be viewed as a rearrangement rather than reduced attention to C4D. This means delivering C4D support within the communication continuum together with External Communications and using outsourced consultancies and the shared Myanmar-based international post in response to funding constraints.

### 3.2.4 Resource mobilisation for C4D

This section assesses whether C4D resources are sufficient for the needs of the country programme and explores the factors that 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 VCO indicated that the current level of financial allocations to C4D was largely insufficient 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 the sections had to make great fundraising efforts to ensure C4D activities were covered and that they needed to become even better at arguing why C4D is important and what the precise added value within the work of their section would be. Between 2012 and 2015 there was a decrease 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 5–10%; this decreased to 2–5% in 2015.

Three factors have contributed to inadequate financial allocations to C4D: 1) lack of systematic input of C4D staff in contributing to and reviewing funding proposals; 2) lack of clarity around expected C4D results; and 3) challenges in monitoring and demonstrating results. Sufficient resources allocated to C4D are central to ensuring quality implementation. As discussed above, at present this is not the case. A number of factors can explain this. First, funding for C4D activities sits within sections. The head of section is responsible for developing funding proposals. The problem at present is that, given the lack of formal

---
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37 The response to the desk review survey indicated that current financial allocations to C4D were only ‘to a small extent’ sufficient to meet the needs of the country programme.
38 Country level survey Q2 and Q19.
procedures for C4D to engage with sections’ resource mobilisation, C4D is rarely involved in this process. As a result, C4D activities are often under-budgeted or not included at all. 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’.  

The second factor is lack of clarity around C4D results in the CO Results Framework. Because C4D is a support function to the core section objectives, C4D rarely stands out in its own right. As a result, descriptions of the social and behaviour changes C4D interventions are to help achieve, and how, are often not sufficient.

The third factor is that, since C4D is not clearly described in the Results Framework, the results derived from C4D are not systematically monitored and documented. There is awareness among VCO senior management of the interconnected challenge between lack of well-documented results from C4D and constraints in mobilising funding for it. A clearer presentation in the Results Framework and a more systematic approach to monitoring C4D have been identified as priorities by senior management for the new 2017 country programme. As one informant remarked, ‘When we keep stressing that at the core, 70–80% of UNICEF’s work is C4D, how is it that we do not prioritise our ability to clearly describe – to ourselves, partners and donors alike – what it is C4D can do and how?’

### 3.3. Implementation of C4D

The following section presents the findings of the evaluation in relation to UNICEF Viet Nam’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 Viet Nam 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:**

- C4D interventions have been a key part of all sections’ work – yet are often not explicitly acknowledged in reports.
- The reduction in the C4D Unit from four to two staff has limited the support provided to design and implement C4D initiatives.
- Across the five C4D benchmarks that are considered proxies for quality implementation, VCO performance has been mixed with minimal evidence to suggest that benchmarks 1, 3, 4 and 5 are being met and moderate evidence of progress towards benchmark 5. Key areas for improvement are better coordination across sectors at the national level, implementing more meaningful participatory processes to engage community representatives into Sector programmes, focussed training for UNICEF staff and partners, and better documentation and dissemination of best-practice.
- The limits of partner capacity are a barrier to effective development and implementation of participatory C4D initiatives beyond basic IEC and BCC.

---
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3.3.1 **Experiences of implementing C4D approaches**

Table 4 presents the experiences, lessons and challenges each section has experienced in implementing C4D over the course of the 2012–16 country programme.

**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><strong>SPG</strong></td>
<td><strong>Progress in implementation:</strong> Advocacy work was supported through the application of strategic C4D. Increased advocacy to MOLISA and the World Bank for inclusion of C4D was carried out under the Opportunities Programme (Social Assistance System Strengthening Project) for the 2014–18 period in four provinces. This included the development of an evidence-based and budgeted C4D strategy. Capacity of key stakeholders, particularly MOLISA’s Social Protection Department, was also enhanced as part of the planning and implementation process. Work on the promotion of child participation to feed into policymaking was part of the effort to build capacity for elected officials on the Convention of the Rights of the Child (CRC) and its monitoring. Using a rights-based approach, children and young people from diverse groups built self-efficacy and provided their opinions and feedback in policymaking processes including the Youth Development Strategy (joint UN); the post-2015 agenda development; and the revised Child Law. <strong>Challenges to implementation:</strong> C4D has worked to support and strengthen the responsibility of duty bearers at community level. Responding to the immense need that persists is a challenge in the face of decreased funding owing to Viet Nam’s transition to being a lower-middle-income country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CSD</strong></td>
<td><strong>Progress in implementation:</strong> In 2015, cross-sectoral C4D efforts resulted in MOH’s agreement to develop an integrated C4D framework to promote a behaviour change for a reproductive, maternal, newborn and child health package as part of the global A Promise Renewed campaign. To build trust in vaccines to increase immunisation coverage, a rapid assessment on trust in routine immunisation for children under five and a communication action plan were implemented. To increase access to sustainable, quality and integrated nutrition services, exclusive breastfeeding and complementary feeding have been promoted through the 2012–14 Joint World Health Organization /UNICEF/Alive &amp; Thrive exclusive breastfeeding communication programme. In the area of WASH, C4D interventions contributed to specific results including institutional capacity building for MARD/National Centre for Rural Water Supply and Environmental Sanitation, and enhancing WASH partnerships with development partners (Denmark, the World Bank Water and Sanitation Program); international NGOs (SNV, Plan international, Lien Aid, Pathfinder, etc.); and the private sector (Unilever). <strong>Challenges to implementation:</strong> While the CSD programme wants to follow the C4D lead to move beyond IEC and BCC, more systematic capacity building of counterparts is needed to support this. The head of the National Centre for Health Education and Communication says ‘Currently in MOH C4D is quite new. We don’t have a full understanding of it. People focus more on BCC and IEC, or on social mobilisation. They need to see the benefit from combining all in a full, coordinated C4D approach.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CP</strong></td>
<td><strong>Progress in implementation:</strong> In each programme area in CP there is an element of C4D. Ending VAC was a key area for C4D planning and interventions. The National Month of Action for Children by MOLISA featured a #ENDViolence campaign to build nation-wide attention to the issue. A Children with Disabilities C4D Framework was developed with MOLISA’s National Coordination Committee for Disabilities to implement the Law on People with Disabilities, promoting social inclusion for children with disabilities through targeted communication strategies. Targeted mass media capacity development on rights-based reporting was implemented as part of the rollout of the framework. <strong>Challenges to implementation:</strong> Since the C4D staff cuts, the team has found it challenging to support CP because it is a specialised area. The CP team also expressed uncertainty about how much support they could reasonably expect from C4D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td><strong>Progress in implementation:</strong> C4D supported education programme interventions by strengthening the C4D capacity of MOET and provincial Departments of Education and Training. C4D approaches and...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
strategies have focused on influencing teachers, managers, parents and children to promote inclusive education and to link education programming to other sectoral programmes like in WASH, child protection and nutrition.

**Challenges to implementation:** The Education team expressed a desire for more interaction with the C4D Unit but recognised that it is ‘very pressed after the staff cut’. In view of this situation the Education Section has prioritised part of the job description of one of its technical staff to focus on C4D.

| Sub-national and cross-sectoral including Communicatio ns and Partnerships | Progress in implementation: C4D has focused its support at the subnational level on addressing child development through a coordinated approach bringing together different sectors to look at the child through a life-cycle approach. In 2013, C4D planning workshops were organised in all eight provinces for capacity development and designing of integrated C4D planning across all thematic areas. As a cross-sectoral function, C4D proactively engaged with Communications and Partnerships in provision of technical guidance in areas related to behaviour and social change communication. | Challenges to implementation: It would help C4D in its work at subnational level and across sectors to have clearer strategies and priorities. Monitoring, for example, is often carried out superficially and with too little time. For this area to be further strengthened, resources need to be prioritised. |

As illustrated in Table 4, C4D provides key cross-cutting support to sectoral programmes, and there are many and diverse C4D activities across a wide array of themes in UNICEF Viet Nam. Strong progress is clear but one or two challenges stand out – namely, decreased funding to C4D programmes owing to Viet Nam’s transition to a lower-middle-income country and staff cuts; meeting the substantial capacity needs of partners; and finding enough staff time for adequate monitoring of C4D activities.

### 3.3.2 Performance against the global C4D benchmarks

The following section reviews UNICEF Viet Nam’s performance against the C4D global benchmarks. These provide a proxy for the quality of C4D implementation. They were developed by the C4D Unit in New York and will become a voluntary means for COs to report on their performance in C4D. This evaluation is being used as an opportunity to pilot the benchmarks and test means of verification.

As outlined in Table 5 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 that contextualised the scale to the issue being measured. The detailed scales used can be found in Annex 5.

#### Table 5: Summary of VCO'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 C4D taskforces/working groups/committees of multi-sectoral stakeholders (governmental, non-governmental and academic) are established and functioning to plan, coordinate and strengthen C4D activities.</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>While an internal C4D strategy has been developed, no multi-sectoral taskforce or other structures have yet been established at national level. However, some mechanisms exist at subnational level.</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>Yellow</td>
<td>A range of research studies and evaluations have been undertaken over the past four years on C4D and a culture of ‘evidence, participation, and empowerment’ has taken root. 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 (girls, boys, men and women especially those from marginalised/excluded groups) into sector programmes/interventions.</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>UNICEF Viet Nam shared several powerful examples of programmes where participation was and is at the core of C4D activities. However, UNICEF Viet Nam acknowledges that achieving greater participation is a work in progress and mainly hindered by the government’s top-down information system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Plans/ initiatives/ongoing programmes to strengthen C4D capacities of UNICEF staff, partners (government and implementing partners (civil society)) at national and subnational levels.

Amber

The VCO has made some investment in strengthening the capacity of UNICEF internal staff and some ad hoc investment in furthering the capacity of government counterparts (as described in detail in the rest of this report).

5. C4D best practices, impact assessments, tools, resources, innovations and lessons learnt are documented and disseminated among key audiences.

Amber

The VCO has produced some best practice notes and guides on C4D. However, dissemination of these documents has not been systematic, and with reduced staff capacity it will be challenge to continue to produce documentation.

Benchmark 1: While an internal C4D strategy has been developed, no multi-sectoral taskforce or other structures have yet been established with government, non-governmental or academic stakeholders to strengthen C4D activities nationally. However, the C4D’s workflow on how the C4D Unit engages with programmes’ planning and implementing at national and subnational levels was agreed in 2013 (Management Retreat, 15–17 January 2013) and works well. Furthermore, at subnational level, mechanisms exist through C4D working groups under the provincial child-friendly project management unit in two provinces (Lao Cai and Gia Lai). This was introduced in provincial C4D planning workshops for all eight provinces although only two provinces established C4D working groups.

Benchmark 2: A range of research studies and evaluations have been undertaken over the past four years on C4D. For example:

- Knowledge, Attitude and Practices (KAP) study on the obtainment and use of a health insurance card for children under six years old in Dien Bien, Kon Tum, Ninh Thuan and Ho Chi Minh city, 2012;
- Rapid assessment about trust in immunisation for children under 12 months of age among parents and health workers, 2014;
- Social Assistance System Strengthening formative study, 2014;
- Formative research on maternal, newborn and child health, 2015. A culture of ‘evidence, participation, and empowerment’ appears to have taken root. However, the use of monitoring data is weak and evidence use does not seem to be systematic.

Benchmark 3: UNICEF Viet Nam shared several powerful examples of programmes where participation was and is at the core of C4D activities. For example, work on the promotion of child participation to feed into policymaking is part of the effort to build capacity of elected officials on the CRC and its monitoring. In Education, support to improve quality education for ethnic minority children involves sharing and exchange good practices and experiences on Mother Tongue-based Bilingual Education implementation with the participation of students, teachers, managers, community leaders and parents. Furthermore, one of the C4D team members (the C4D officer) is co-chair of the Child Participation Working Group, which provides technical guidance to office-wide CP-related planning and interventions.

However, the VCO acknowledges that achieving greater participation is a work in progress. The challenge of promoting true community participation is particularly acute in VAC programmes where the ideal is to promote a two-way communication model in which groups come together to work through their issues and then communicate their ideas and solutions back up to government. Part of the problem is that the UNICEF programme engages primarily with Viet Namese government ministries and perhaps not sufficiently with teachers, parents and children in deeper levels of participation; another issue is that government line ministries’ capacity for implementing participatory communications is still relatively low. As a recent document from the VCO explains, ‘Quality and effectiveness of communication planning and interventions

have long been hindered by the systematic characteristic of top-down and one-way government’s information provision.\(^\text{42}\)

**Benchmark 4:** The VCO has made some investment in strengthening the capacity of UNICEF internal staff and some *ad hoc* investment in furthering the capacity of government counterparts (as detailed throughout this report). Better planning and a more systematic and strategic approach are needed. Given that the C4D team is overburdened, they are not currently in a position to provide the coaching and training requested by government partners and UNICEF colleagues.

**Benchmark 5:** The VCO has produced some best practice notes and guides on C4D, for example:

- Integrated Behaviour Change Communication – Case Study, 2009;
- WASH Sanitation and Hygiene Promotion for H’mong Community in Ban Pho Commune, Lao Cai Province – Case Study, 2010;
- World Breastfeeding Campaign, 2011;
- Creative Communication Pilot, 2010–20;
- Documentation of communication interventions for the measles and rubella vaccine launch campaign, 2015;
- VAC Campaign Assessment, 2015.

Most were developed by the former head of the C4D Unit. However, dissemination has not been systematic, and with reduced staff capacity it will be challenge to continue to produce this kind of documentation.

**3.3.3 Lessons learnt from building the capacity of partners**

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

The limits of GOV partner capacity are a barrier to effective development of C4D initiatives beyond IEC and BCC. Given that UNICEF Viet Nam works primarily through GOV counterparts, its capacity to engage with and implement C4D activities is central to the success of C4D programming. Current levels of capacity are considered medium to low by the VCO.\(^\text{43}\) For example, a recent (2015) capacity assessment of MOLISA and various workshop reports demonstrated a great need for systematic capacity building in the area of C4D and a need for training manuals on C4D, for which a consultant was brought in.\(^\text{44}\)

---

\(^{42}\) UNICEF Viet Nam, Consultancy Notice C4D 2015–03, Terms of Reference with Guidance Notes, 2015.

\(^{43}\) Country level survey Q11.

\(^{44}\) UNICEF Viet Nam, Consultancy Notice C4D 2015–03, Terms of Reference with Guidance Notes, 2015. The brief was to ‘develop a set of comprehensive training manuals on general/most recommended C4D skills to address CP issues in general and emerging and priority CP issues including VAC (abuse, exploitation, bullying), early marriage taking into account the Social Ecological Model in C4D and the issue of embedded social norms’.
A range of strategies have been used to strengthen partners’ C4D capacity, including training, short-term technical assistance and system development, as presented in Table 6.45

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/description of training</th>
<th>Target audience</th>
<th>Type of support</th>
<th>Sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provincial C4D Orientation and Planning Workshop to address the changing context of HIV/AIDS-related stigma and discrimination facing children affected by AIDS (2 days, May 2012)</td>
<td>Provincial counterparts: managers and specialists of HCMC Department of Education</td>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>Education, HIV/AIDS stigma and discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4D Orientation Workshop to Education Managers (3 days, November 2012)</td>
<td>Managers and specialist of MOET</td>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial C4D Planning Workshop (2-day workshop, 8 workshops in 8 provinces, 2013)</td>
<td>Provincial counterparts: managers and specialist from different sectors: health, nutrition, WASH, education, CP</td>
<td>Orientation and planning</td>
<td>Cross-cutting, C4D planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4D Orientation, brainstorming and prioritising behaviour and social change interventions with a focus on the #ENDviolence Against Children Campaign (2 days, March 2014)</td>
<td>Managers and specialists of MOLISA</td>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>CP, VAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial C4D Orientation Workshop (2 days, August 2014)</td>
<td>Provincial counterparts: managers and specialist from CP, An Giang province</td>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>CP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The capacity support provided by UNICEF is well received by partners, but there is demand for a more strategic approach to capacity building. Interviews with partners indicated that they are satisfied with the capacity support offered by UNICEF, but they need more and, because most of the training is one-off, capacity gaps reappear after a few years. GOV approaches to communication have tended to emphasise short-term IEC/BCC activities, with less attention to more strategic, evidence-based strategies. Several informants stressed that the communication approach among government tends to be heavily reliant on IEC materials development, outreach and top-down messaging.46 Many government counterparts also struggle to distinguish between C4D, public relations and IEC material development. The view that C4D strategies are long term, evidence-based and participatory is not commonplace. As one government informant commented:

‘Currently in MOH C4D is quite new. We don’t have a full understanding of C4D... Generally, we focus more on BCC, IEC and social mobilisation... communication interventions are more short term and ad hoc when carried out by our department... We need to have long-term C4D plan integrated into our full programme strategy. But to do this we also need to have the full knowledge and understanding.’47

It was also argued that more focus and resources should be put into the development of C4D capacity building strategies.48 The department heads proposed that UNICEF, when visiting the VCO’s eight partner

---

45 Country level survey Q24.
46 KIs 1, 2 and 4 and see also discussion of government attitudes to participation in previous section (i.e. benchmark 3).
47 Group discussion G1 with National Centre for Health Communication and Education and MOH.
48 G1, KIs 1, 2 and 4
provinces, attach a trainer/coach to its ‘family-friendly’ integrated development programme. The trainer/coach could start out supporting the design of C4D components in UNICEF-supported programmes, and then support C4D implementation. Department heads suggested this would be much more effective than ad hoc training courses.

3.4. Evaluability of C4D

This section presents our findings on the evaluability of C4D strategies and interventions. The purpose is to look at what potential there is for assessing the impact of C4D interventions in the future. The framework used has two parts. First, it looks at 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 behaviours are being changed, what the contribution of C4D activities are to this and how the behaviour change will affect 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 are being collected on behaviour change, and the quality of the data, and assessing whether they are 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 VCO Results Framework as a whole. Here we assessed 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 interventions 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 and Annual Workplans and, for each of the C4D interventions, a 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 C4D is positioned in the Results Framework, it would not be possible to assess the aggregate effects of C4D programming across the 2012–16 country programme. There are a number of challenges in the way the Results Framework is established in the VCO, which means it would be very challenging to evaluate the contribution of C4D to the overall VCO country programme by taking the Results Framework as the unit of analysis.

- The evaluability of the C4D elements of the two sampled projects is similarly low. It would not be possible to evaluate the contribution of C4D to behaviour/social change in either project in principle. In both projects the C4D activities would also be difficult to evaluate in practice because of an absence of monitoring data and procedures and a lack of data collection on behaviour/social change.

Based on the way C4D was positioned in the Results Framework, it would not be possible to assess the aggregate effects of C4D programming across the 2012–16 country programme. To undertake the evaluability assessment, we took as our first unit of analysis the Results Framework revised following the 2012 CPAP. As detailed in Table 7, we judged that it was possible to evaluate the framework neither *in principle* nor *in practice*. As a result, we rated the results framework red on both issues. The VCO has a strong Results Framework at national level, with clear outcomes and impacts identified, and well-defined programmes in the subnational partner provinces. But there are a number of challenges in the way the Results Framework is established in the VCO.

---
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• Whereas the national level Results Framework is systematic and has an inner logic, there is a disconnect between the programmes implementing at the national and the subnational levels. The VCO is alert to this disconnect and has tried to address it and adjust procedures, but has not yet finished the process.
• C4D is referred to by many VCO team members as central to UNICEF generating change. But there are no C4D indicators at outcome or output level.
• C4D is relegated to the level of activities and sometimes sub-components of milestones.

The evaluable of the C4D elements of the two sampled projects is similarly low. The two projects selected for the evaluable assessment were the Child-Friendly Maternal Health Project in Ninh Thuan province (MOH) and the Child-Friendly Social Protection Project in Ninh Thuan province (Department of Labour, Invalids and Social Affairs), which are sub-projects of the same overall programme encompassing child protection, WASH, health, nutrition, education and injury prevention led by line ministries at provincial government level and implemented in conjunction with UNFPA. The evaluator made a brief half-day visit to these projects in Ninh Thuan as part of her country visit. As detailed in Table 7, the evaluation judged that it would not be possible to evaluate the contribution of C4D to behaviour/social change in either project in principle. In both projects the C4D activities would also be difficult to evaluate in practice owing to an absence of monitoring data and data collection tools on behaviour/social change. It should be noted, however, that a process evaluation of the C4D aspects of the Ninh Thuan sub-project activities was done in 2012, looking at the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of IBCC, but this was not an impact evaluation so did not look at whether or not C4D/IBCC had contributed to behaviour/social change.

3.4.1 Child-Friendly Maternal Health Project in Ninh Thuan province
As Table 7 indicates, our review of the programme documents for, as well as our visit to, this project shows the role of C4D activities to be relatively clear. ‘Support to enhanced communication for maternal, child health and nutrition’ includes the following activity: ‘Review and summarise existing materials… Document and disseminate … and finalise and disseminate guidelines based on formative research.’ There is reference to ‘implementing 4 early essential newborn care practices’. However, the specific behaviour changes being sought and the communication outputs designed to achieve that change are not clearly articulated. Before the behaviour change aspects of this project could in principle be evaluated, better articulation of outputs and outcomes as well as indicators would be needed. Our review of documentation revealed an absence of clear C4D indicators and monitoring tools. We also found no evidence of any data being collected on behaviour changes and it is not clear that there are staff available and sufficiently well trained to monitor and evaluate the C4D aspects of the project.

3.4.2 Child-Friendly Social Protection Project in Ninh Thuan province
As per Table 7 our review of the documentation as well as our visit to this project shows that the logic is clear to an extent and it is possible to at least implicitly see how C4D (in this project called IBCC) is contributing to the results chain, but there is insufficient clarity on exactly what behaviour change results are being sought in terms of child protection, which broadly tackles street children, child labour and birth registration using an integrated package of health worker and mass media-based channels. Before this project could be evaluated in principle, it would need to make clear how the lower level activities/outputs link through to higher level results/outcomes in terms of behaviour/social change or KAP. Our review of documentation revealed an absence of clear C4D indicators and monitoring tools, beyond the process evaluation mentioned above (2012). Although KAP studies were done back in 2008 at the outset of the programme there appears to be no data collection to monitor changes in KAP over time and to identify whether or not C4D has contributed to changing knowledge, attitudes or practices.

---
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Table 7: Results from the evaluability assessment of C4D in the 2012–16 results framework, and C4D activities in two other subnational projects, in Ninh Thuan province

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluability question and rating</th>
<th>CO Results Framework</th>
<th>Child-friendly Health Project, MOH</th>
<th>Child-Friendly Social Protection Project, Department of Labour, Invalids and Social Affairs</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 indicates that it would not be possible in principle to conduct an evaluation of UNICEF’s overall efforts around C4D. 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 spelt out. If these behaviour changes are not clearly articulated, they cannot be measured and therefore evaluated. 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. <strong>AMBER:</strong> We found the role of C4D activities to be relatively clear but the specific behaviour changes that are being sought and the communication outputs designed to achieve that change are not clearly articulated. Before this project could in principle be evaluated, better articulation of outputs and outcomes as well as indicators would be needed.</td>
<td><strong>AMBER:</strong> The logic of the programme is clear to an extent and it is possible to at least implicitly see how C4D is contributing to the results chain. However, there is insufficient clarity around exactly what behaviour change results are being sought. Before this programme could in principle be evaluated it would need improvement in terms of making clear how the lower level activities(outputs) link through to higher level OP results/outcomes.</td>
<td><strong>RED:</strong> The role of C4D in the 2012–16 results framework is relatively clear but the specific behaviour changes that are being sought and the communication outputs designed to achieve that change are not clearly articulated. Before this project could in principle be evaluated, better articulation of outputs and outcomes as well as indicators would be needed. <strong>AMBER:</strong> We found the role of C4D activities to be relatively clear but the specific behaviour changes that are being sought and the communication outputs designed to achieve that change are not clearly articulated. Before this project could in principle be evaluated, better articulation of outputs and outcomes as well as indicators would be needed. <strong>RED:</strong> The logic of the programme is clear to an extent and it is possible to at least implicitly see how C4D is contributing to the results chain. However, there is insufficient clarity around exactly what behaviour change results are being sought. Before this programme could in principle be evaluated it would need improvement in terms of making clear how the lower level activities(outputs) link through to higher level OP results/outcomes.</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></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, in principle, possible to evaluate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Red:</strong> Both programme logic and the specific contribution of C4D are 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 indicates that it would not in practice be possible to evaluate UNICEF’s overall efforts around C4D. 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. 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><strong>RED:</strong> Our review of documentation revealed an absence of clear C4D indicators and monitoring tools. We also found no evidence of any data being collected on behaviour changes and it is not clear that there are staff available and sufficiently well trained to monitor and evaluate the behaviour change aspects of the project.</td>
<td><strong>RED:</strong> Our review of documentation revealed an absence of clear C4D indicators and monitoring tools. We also found no evidence of any data being collected on behaviour changes following an initial KAP study at the outset of the wider programme back in 2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green:</strong> High quality data are collected on specific C4D activities and results. Data are appropriately disaggregated and baselines are available. It would be possible, in practice, to evaluate C4D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amber:</strong> Gaps in data quality and/or questions about the quality of data mean the CO requires some improvements in its data collection before it would be possible in practice to evaluate C4D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Red:</strong> Significant questions remain about data quality and coverage. Significant improvements are needed before it would be evaluable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Conclusions

The overall picture of C4D in UNICEF Viet Nam must be understood against the general background of decreased funding to almost all programmes owing to Viet Nam’s transition to a lower-middle-income country and consequent staff cuts and other savings having recently been made.

4.1. C4D Capacity development

UNICEF Viet Nam has made some investment in developing the C4D capacity of its C4D staff; following the repositioning of C4D in 2012 there was a clear commitment from senior management to building staff C4D capacity as a priority. The evaluation found the reach of the US-based courses was very limited – one person attended the Ohio course and one person the UPenn course. An in-country C4D workshop in 2012 was an effective way of raising awareness of a wider range of staff on C4D, but there has been no subsequent follow-up.

The C4D architecture in the VCO has undergone several changes over a short time period, so, in terms of building wider organisational capacity to support C4D, UNICEF Viet Nam’s key challenges relate to how it can stabilise C4D under the new management structure; how it can manage the down-sizing of the C4D Unit to only two staff members; and how it can still improve the C4D knowledge and skills of all programme staff. The scale of C4D-related activities across the country programme is significant, and the demand for support is beyond what the two remaining C4D staff members can cover. In view of the substantive role of C4D foreseen in the upcoming country programme (2017–21), it is positive that senior management are seriously considering plans for a focal point structure and for providing funding for further participation of staff in C4D capacity building courses. While UNICEF Viet Nam is fortunate to have key senior managers who are C4D champions, it is crucial that this continues in the future.

4.2. Integration of C4D

C4D gained a relatively high profile in the process leading up to the 2012–16 country programme, with the elaboration of a C4D Strategy and the boosting of staffing levels as well as C4D becoming a unit in its own right. However, not having visible outputs and results in the CPD makes the monitoring of C4D activities and the systematic documentation of the role of C4D difficult. This lack of clear documentation of C4D results has affected C4D staff and sections’ ability to effectively advocate for C4D and to effectively budget for C4D activities.

In the upcoming country programme (2017–21), C4D will be integrated with External Communications in a joint communication unit. There is a danger that C4D will be forgotten and subsumed under External Communications. On the other hand, the move could be positive and could strengthen the ability of External Communications to better document real results emerging from UNICEF’s work – including C4D – and could allow the C4D team to benefit from External Communications’ more strategic use of social media. At the same time, the VCO is starting to benefit from a C4D specialist stationed in Myanmar and there are plans to establish a firm and accountable C4D focal point structure in the sections; this is to be welcomed. Such a restructuring of the C4D function is likely to strengthen C4D by helping bring C4D advice closer to where it is needed, and to ensure the support provided is more tailored and focused to specific section needs. Increased support from C4D-knowledgeable sector advisers in the RO also remains an urgent need.

Resourcing challenges for C4D – as with almost all programmes in UNICEF Viet Nam – must be seen against the backdrop of the decreased funding environment owing to Viet Nam’s transition to a lower-middle-income country. The evaluation found that C4D activities are consistently being under-funded and that this is limiting the ability of C4D initiatives to contribute to sustainable behaviour change. When budget cuts are necessary, which is often the case, C4D activities are often reduced to the production of materials, with no time built into ensuring these are participatory and evidence-based. An area for further improvement is how...
C4D staff can be engaged (and encouraged to participate in) the development of funding proposals and concept notes. If behaviour change results were better captured and it were demonstrated more clearly that they were linked to C4D interventions, fundraising prospects might be improved. Currently the process is ad hoc and, partly as a result of this, the level of financial allocations to C4D is often suboptimal.

4.3. Implementation of C4D

C4D is widespread across the VCO country programme. C4D interventions are being implemented to varying levels across each of the four main sectoral programmes. Despite the level of activity, many recognise that the quality of C4D programming could be better. The reduction in the C4D Unit from four to two staff has limited the support provided to sections to design and implement C4D initiatives. Partners’ lack of C4D capacity is a barrier to the effective design and implementation of C4D initiatives and also to better scoring on the benchmarks – that is, most partnerships are with government departments and line ministries and there is a historical resistance to participatory communication methods within GOV. While efforts have been made to support government counterparts in building their C4D capacity, these have been largely ad hoc. Nevertheless, there is growing demand among government for more, longer-term, strategic C4D capacity support.

4.4. Evaluability of C4D

The evaluability of C4D when taking the overall country programme results structure as our unit of analysis is low. Based on the way C4D is/was positioned in the VCO’s Results Framework, it would be difficult to assess the effects of C4D programming across the 2012–16 country programme. Because it is a cross-cutting support function, C4D neither is highlighted as an outcome in its own right nor has its own indicators, despite the fact that many staff members are of the opinion that their programme’s success is/was largely because of the C4D approach.

Our conclusion about the evaluability of the specific C4D activities within two selected projects is similarly low (the sub-projects analysed were the Child-Friendly Maternal Health Project in Ninh Thuan province (MOH) and the Child-Friendly Social Protection Project in Ninh Thuan province (MOLISA)). While the logic of both projects is fairly clear, neither clearly articulates the specific behaviour changes being sought and neither is collecting robust monitoring data on behaviour, social or KAP changes and showing how these link to C4D activities.

5. Recommendations

5.1. C4D capacity development

1. **UNICEF Viet Nam should draw up a targeted capacity development strategy for the different C4D stakeholders:** 1) C4D staff; 2) C4D focal points (in the firmed-up structure under development); 3) other UNICEF staff, with separate focussed emphasis on senior management, heads of section and technical specialists; and 4) government counterparts. Identifying training needs should be matched with mapping existing capacity.

2. **UNICEF Viet Nam and/or EAPRO and/or NYHQ should help provide C4D staff with further technical guidance in relation to a number of sectors/issues.** Informants identified a number of sectors and issues where they would like UNICEF to develop additional C4D technical guidance. These include evaluating C4D, planning social norms interventions, CP and social policy.

3. **Coordination of C4D capacity development needs to be considered an important management function.** While C4D staff can handle some of the CO and counterpart capacity development training needs assessment and planning, linking up with support from EAPRO will require senior management support. The new cost-share arrangement with the C4D specialist based in Myanmar,
who is providing technical C4D oversight and support to three regional COs (Myanmar, Viet Nam and Lao PDR), will be a welcome boost to regional capacity building.

4. **UNICEF VCO should consider establishing long-term partnerships to support C4D capacity development.** To help coordinate C4D capacity development efforts, especially for government partners, consideration should be given to working with a national academy of further education such as Hanoi School of Public Health, Hanoi Medical University and/or University of Labour and Social Affairs. Additional capacity building will still be needed, and partnerships with a number of local organisations could help. These partners could work across sections in delivering C4D capacity development services and help create efficiencies.

5. **Integration of C4D**

5.1. The VCO should consider putting in place standard operating procedures for the role and entry points of the C4D staff in section planning, implementation, monitoring and documentation. Clear orientation is needed on when C4D interventions should be requested or offered and the roles of the different parties in these important processes for effective integration of C4D into programming. This should include C4D staff having an opportunity and an obligation to integrate C4D at all levels of the Results Framework where appropriate.

6. **VCO should move forward with plans for establishing formal C4D focal points in all the sections.** It is important that this is not an *ad hoc* side activity, but that C4D is prominently inserted into their job descriptions and that the focal points are annually assessed on their C4D function. Special C4D capacity building would be needed for them. They should also have monthly coordination meetings with the C4D specialist and there should be an emphasis on a lot of peer-to-peer mutual coaching.

7. **VCO senior management needs to activate the C4D taskforce that has been discussed and planned since 2012 but never activated.** The role of the taskforce will be to coordinate the continued updating of the C4D Strategy, its monitoring and its cross-sector fertilisation in regular meetings between the deputy representative, the head of communication, C4D staff and the emerging group of C4D sector-based focal points. The taskforce will also be responsible for ensuring that focal points are actually nominated and sufficiently trained, and that the C4D standard operating procedures are developed and implemented.

5.3. **Implementation of C4D**

8. **UNICEF should redouble its efforts to ensure C4D strategies 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, therefore this needs to be done as a matter of course.

5.4. **Evaluability of C4D**

9. **Ensure C4D results are presented clearly in the results framework for the new CPD.** This should include a clear causal logic as to how C4D activities link to results, clear indicators at output and outcome levels and baseline data collection as a basis for strong monitoring and results documentation.

10. **UNICEF Viet Nam should capture behaviour/social change results better and build up its evidence base on what works in C4D.** For this to happen, UNICEF Viet Nam should:
   a. Conduct a portfolio evaluation that looks across a sample of specific C4D activities within programmes and projects;
b. Ensure C4D activities, outputs and outcomes are more visible by clearly positioning C4D in the Results Framework. For this, senior management, PM&E and C4D should work together to map out how to make C4D more visible in the future.
ANNEXES

Annex 1 List of References

UNICEF Viet Nam, Concept Note C4D in 2017-2021 CPD, Oct 2015
UNICEF Viet Nam, Consultancy Notice C4D 2015-03, Terms of Reference with Guidance Notes, 2015
UNICEF Viet Nam, Annual Reports (COAR), 2010-2015
UNICEF Viet Nam, TOR C4D Working Group RMNCH, draft, 2014
UNICEF Viet Nam, Provincial C4D planning workshop: 2013, 2013
UNICEF Viet Nam, Ho Chi Min City (HCMC) C4D training 2012, 2012
UNICEF Viet Nam, IBCC process evaluation report Ninh Thuan Dien Bien, September 2012
UNICEF Viet Nam, C4D Strategy 2011-2016: Implications, priorities and actions for results for children in Viet Nam, March 2012
UNICEF Viet Nam, Office-wide C4D training 2012, 2012
UNICEF Viet Nam, Sub-national Workplan 2012-2016, 2012
UNICEF Viet Nam, COMBI Training 2010, 2011
UNICEF Viet Nam, Ninh Thuan – IBCC briefing, 2011
UNICEF Viet Nam, Planning & Monitoring Behaviour and Social Change Communications, 2011
UNICEF Viet Nam, Consolidated Programmes Plan of Action (CPPA) 2012-2016, 20 December 2011
UNICEF Viet Nam CPD Results Report, 14 May 2011
UNICEF Viet Nam, Report 2011 World Breastfeeding Week_Final (and annex), 2011
UNICEF Viet Nam, An Analysis of the Situation of Children in Viet Nam, 2010
UNICEF Viet Nam, Sanitation and Hygiene Promotion for H’mong Community in Ban Pho commune, Lao Cai Province of VIET NAM, 2010
UNICEF Viet Nam, Integrated Behaviour Change Communication: Experience of Ninh Thuan Province, Case Study #5 for the Inter-agency C4D Booklet, 2009
UNICEF Viet Nam, MNCH formative research, n.d.
UNICEF Viet Nam, C4D Change structure, n.d.
UNICEF Viet Nam, WASH C4D capacity assessment, (English), n.d.
UNICEF Viet Nam, Creative communication Pilot, final report, n.d.
UNICEF-Government of Viet Nam, Mid-Term Review (MTR), 2014, Report Final, 3 Feb. 2015
### Annex 2 List of stakeholders interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title &amp; Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youssouf Abdel-Jelil</td>
<td>Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesper Moller</td>
<td>Deputy Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce Patricia Bheeka</td>
<td>Chief, Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vijaya Ratnam-Raman</td>
<td>OIC, Chief Child Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mizuho Okimoto-Kaewtathip</td>
<td>OIC, Chief, Social policy &amp; Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Vigneault-Dubois</td>
<td>Chief, Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marianne Oehlers</td>
<td>Chief, Private Partnership/Programme Manager, HCMC office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vu Manh Hong</td>
<td>Chief of PM&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nguyen Quynh Trang</td>
<td>PM&amp;E Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chu Huu Trang</td>
<td>C4D Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tran Phuong Anh</td>
<td>C4D officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vu Thi Le Thanh</td>
<td>CP office, CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lalit Patra</td>
<td>WASH specialist, Team Leader WASH, CSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do Hong Phuong</td>
<td>Nutrition Policy Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nguyen Thi Y Duyen</td>
<td>CP specialist, CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Anh Lan</td>
<td>Inclusive Education Officer, EDU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nguyen Thi Van Anh</td>
<td>Social Policy Specialist, SPG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nguyen Thi Thanh Huong</td>
<td>Communication Specialist, Comunications</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### External Partners

- Emmanuel Eraly                     | Technical Officer, WHO                                    |
- Makiko Iijima                     | Technical officer, Expanded Programme on Immunization, WHO|

#### UNICEF Implementing Partners/Counterparts

**National level**

- Trinh Ngoc Quang | Deputy-Director, National Centre for Health Education, MOH
- Pham Thi Hai Ha | Deputy Director Children’s Department, MOLISA
- Vu Van Dzung     | Director, Center of counselling and communication services, MOLISA
- Nguyen Thi Kim Dung | Deputy Director of Law and Policy Department , Viet Nam’s Women Union (Mass organization)
- Nguyen Thanh Luan | Deputy-Director, National Centre for Rural Water Supply and Sanitation, MARD
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position/Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duong Tu Oanh</td>
<td>Officer, National Centre for Rural Water Supply and Sanitation, MARD- Directro of IEC department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nguyen Thuy Ai</td>
<td>Former head of IED Dept. &amp; 15 years with UNICEF coop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ninh Thuan Province</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nguyen Van Nhuong</td>
<td>Department of Education and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nguyen Nam</td>
<td>Director, Centre for Health Education, Department of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nguyen Thi Bich Tram</td>
<td>Centre for Health Education, Department of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vu Minh Tuyen</td>
<td>Deputy-Director, Department of Planning and Investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo Cong Ha</td>
<td>Department of Planning and Investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Vu Chuong</td>
<td>Department of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Thi Xua</td>
<td>Department of Labour Invalids and Social Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phuoc Chien Commune, Thuan Bac District, Ninh Thuan Province</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nguyen Van Thanh</td>
<td>Director, Commune Health Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nguyen Thi Ngoc Thuy</td>
<td>Health staff, Commune Health Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamaka Thi My</td>
<td>Health staff, Commune Health Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thanh Thi Tuong Vy</td>
<td>Health staff, Commune Health Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamaka Thi Dung</td>
<td>Health worker, Dong Thong village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamaka Thi Chien</td>
<td>Health worker, Tap La village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamaka Thi Phanh</td>
<td>Health worker, Ma Trai village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamaka Thi Dep</td>
<td>Health worker, Dau Suoi A village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinang Thi Huynh</td>
<td>Health worker, Dau Suoi B village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamaka Thi Grang</td>
<td>Mother of new-born baby</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 3 Terms of Reference

UNICEF Evaluation Office

Communication for Development:
An Evaluation of UNICEF’s Capacity and Action

Terms of Reference for an External Evaluation

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 organization. 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.
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(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 organizational **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 organization 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 organizational 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 (OUOIOhio 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.\(^{54}\)

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 organizational 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 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.

———

55 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)
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:

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 organizational 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 organization 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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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>Evaluation questions and sub-questions</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data sources</th>
<th>Data collection and analysis methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus area A. CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EQ 1. How coherent and appropriate is UNICEF’s organisational C4D capacity development framework?</strong>&lt;sup&gt;56&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 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 | • Document review  
  • Key informant Interviews (KII) |
| 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  
  • KII |
| 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  
  • KII |
| **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  
  • KII  
  • Survey C4D staff |
| 2.2 To what extent is the guidance used and has it | • Evidence that technical guidance being read/used | • Stakeholders at **RO**: regional C4D advisors | • KII  
  • Survey of C4D staff |

---

<sup>56</sup> 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.

<sup>57</sup> The definition of Technical Guidance used in the evaluation is: written documentation such as: toolkits, guides, and manuals.
## Evaluation of UNICEF’s C4D Capacity and Action: Viet Nam Country Case Study

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.

### Contributed to Changes in Practice? Why / Why Not?

- 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 CO: C4D advisors, technical advisors involved in programmes with C4D components

### 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
- Technical guidance reports / document; material from other CD initiatives
- 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)
- KIIs

### 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

### 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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.1 To What Extent Have Staff at Regional and Country Levels Improved Their Knowledge and Skills to Design and Implement C4D Programmes,</th>
<th>Improvement in knowledge and skills to design and implement C4D programmes</th>
<th>Stakeholders at RO: Regional C4D advisor / focal point, past participants of C4D CD initiatives</th>
<th>KIIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey of C4D staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

58 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.
and to what extent do they put these into practice? What have been the enablers / barriers to this?

- Evidence of skills being put into practice
- Barriers / enablers of improvements in knowledge, skills and practice
- Stakeholders at **CO**: Section Chiefs, C4D advisors/focal points, technical leads/specialists, Deputy Country Representative, communication specialists, facilitators / trainers of C4D CD initiative

### 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
- Stakeholders at **HQ**: C4D Section, Sector sections
- Stakeholders at **RO**: Regional C4D advisor / focal points,
- Stakeholders at **CO**: C4D advisors/focal points, national partners
- KIs
- 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)
- Core polices and process associated with planning and reporting including: PPPM, MORES, CPD templates and guidance etc.
- Stakeholders at **HQ**: C4D Section, Field Results Group, Data, Research and Policy Division
- Stakeholders at **RO**: Regional C4D advisor / focal Points,
- Stakeholder at **CO**: Section Chiefs, C4D advisors/focal points, Deputy Representatives
- Document Review
- KIs

### 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
- Stakeholders at **HQ**: Division Directors, Associate Directors
- Stakeholder at **RO**: Regional and Deputy Regional Director, Regional C4D advisor / focal point, Chief of Communications
- Stakeholder at **CO**: Country and Deputy Country Representative, Section Chiefs, C4D advisors/focal points, technical leads/specialists, Directors of communications, communication specialists
- KIs
- Survey of C4D staff
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQ 4. To what extent were the C4D capacity development initiatives relevant?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>For each capacity development initiative:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To what extent did the initiative respond to a defined need and demand?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning objectives of the initiative responded to a clear need within UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative relevant to participant’s contexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative has sufficient focus on practical application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Did the initiative engage the right people?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear set of criteria for participant selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment of past participants with selection criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Was the structure of the initiative and the methods and approaches used appropriate to the audience and their learning needs?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning methods aligned with learning needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mix of learning methods used to accommodate different learning styles and to support practical application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

59 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>To what extent have the CD initiatives led to new knowledge and skills being acquired?</th>
<th>• Change in level of knowledge and skills between 2010 and 2015&lt;br&gt;• Contribution of CD initiatives to change in skills and knowledge</th>
<th>• Post-CD course / workshop evaluations&lt;br&gt;• Stakeholders at <strong>HQ</strong>: C4D Section, Human resources /OLDS&lt;br&gt;• Stakeholders at <strong>RO</strong>: Regional C4D advisor / focal point, Chief of Communications; Past Participants of C4D capacity development&lt;br&gt;• Stakeholders at <strong>CO</strong>: C4D advisors/focal points, Past Participants of C4D capacity development</th>
<th>• Document review&lt;br&gt;• KIs&lt;br&gt;• Survey of C4D staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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 <strong>RO</strong>: Regional C4D advisor / focal point, Past Participants of C4D capacity development&lt;br&gt;• Stakeholders at <strong>CO</strong>: C4D advisors/focal points, Past Participants of C4D CD initiatives</td>
<td>• 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 <strong>CO</strong>: 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</td>
<td>• KIs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

| To what extent are the knowledge platforms used? | • Web hits and downloads from facebook page and intranet site<br>• Attendees at Networks meetings<br>• Subscribers to Newsletter<br>• Perceived value of the platforms for knowledge | • Monitoring data from platforms<br>• Stakeholders at **RO**: C4D advisors/focal points, technical leads specialists<br>• Stakeholders in **CO**: C4d advisors/focal points, technical leads specialists | • Document review<br>• KIs<br>• Survey of C4D staff |
### 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>Data Sources</th>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| To what extent have the knowledge platforms helped create an internal community of practice between C4D practitioners? | • Extent of new relationships formed as a result of attending networking events  
• Subsequent use of networks to provide support on C4D | • Stakeholders at RO: C4D advisors/focal points, technical leads specialists  
• Stakeholders in CO: C4D advisors/focal points, technical leads specialists  
• Survey of C4D staff  
• KIIs |
| 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  
• Document review  
• KIIs at HQ and externals |
| Were economy and efficiency managed as part of the implementation process? | • Synergies identified with other CD initiatives which reduce could 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  
• KIIs at HQ, and CO |
| 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  
• Document review  
• KIIs |
| 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? | | |
**EQ 8.** What are the factors that could undermine the sustainability of the results that have been achieved from the capacity development interventions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No sub-question required</th>
<th>Technical factors undermining C4D gains</th>
<th>Stakeholders at <strong>HQ:</strong> C4D Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organisational factors undermining the sustainability of C4D capacity</td>
<td>Stakeholders at <strong>RO:</strong> Regional C4D advisor / focal point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial factor undermining the sustainability of C4D capacity</td>
<td>Stakeholders at <strong>CO:</strong> C4D advisors/focal points, technical leads</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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
- Change in the level of integration of C4D in sector strategies between 2010-2015
- Quality of the reporting on C4D
- 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**

- Change in the number and levels
- Data on staffing level (numbers and levels)
- Document Review using
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How has funding for C4D changed at HQ level between 2010-15?</td>
<td>• Changes in the level of C4D funding between 2010-15</td>
<td>Stakeholders at <strong>HQ</strong>: C4D section, technical leads</td>
<td>Integration Assessment Framework • KII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How has the integration of C4D into regional offices planning and reporting changed between 2010-15?</td>
<td>• Existence of strategy and / or plan&lt;br&gt;• Quality of strategy and/or plan&lt;br&gt;• Budget exists to support implementation of the strategy / plan</td>
<td>Regional C4D strategies / plans&lt;br&gt;Stakeholders at <strong>RO</strong>: C4D advisors</td>
<td>Document Review using Integration Assessment Framework • KIIs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How have staffing arrangements for C4D staff at the regional level changed between 2010-15?</td>
<td>• Changes in the number and level of C4D staff across regional offices between 2010-15</td>
<td>Data on staffing level (numbers and levels)</td>
<td>Document review using Integration Assessment Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent is C4D integrated into the Situational Analysis, CPDs, and results frameworks at country level?</td>
<td>• Level of integration of C4D in Situational Analysis&lt;br&gt;• Level of integration of C4D in CPD&lt;br&gt;• Level of integration of C4D in Results Framework</td>
<td>Situational Analysis; CPD, Results Framework&lt;br&gt;Stakeholders at <strong>CO</strong>: C4D staff, Deputy Representative</td>
<td>Document review using Integration Assessment Framework • KIIs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are C4D strategies resourced?</td>
<td>• Resourcing exists to support planned C4D strategies</td>
<td>Resource plans, budgets&lt;br&gt;Stakeholders at <strong>CO</strong>: Section Chiefs, Deputy Representative, C4D advisors/focal points</td>
<td>Document review using Integration Assessment Framework • KIIs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent is C4D reported on through Annual Reviews, Mid-Term Evaluations and Final Report?</td>
<td>• Level of integration of C$D in reporting</td>
<td>Annual Reviews, Mid-Term evaluation and final reports&lt;br&gt;Stakeholders at <strong>CO</strong>: Section Chiefs, Deputy Representative, C4D advisors/focal points</td>
<td>Document review using Integration Assessment Framework • KIIs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 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.

- **KIs**

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

#### Global

**Does the C4D section have sufficient resources to setting standards, building partnerships, quality assure and provide capacity development?**

- Comparison between current capacity and formal roles and responsibilities on C4D
- Comparison between current capacity and demand/need for services

- Stakeholders at **HQ:** C4D Section, Sector sections, Human resources /OLDS, technical leads

- **KIs**

#### Regional

**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

- **KIs**

#### Country

**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 **CO:** Country and Deputy Country Representative, Section Chiefs C4D advisors/focal points, Directors of communications, communication specialists

- **KIs**

### 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

- **KIs**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>EQ 12. To what extent have the benchmarks for C4D implementation been applied?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>In what ways has investment in C4D capacity development influenced C4D implementation?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No indicators needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stakeholders at RO: C4D advisor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EQ 12. To what extent have the benchmarks for C4D implementation been applied?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Are there any common strengths and weaknesses in the implementation of benchmarks?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility of the benchmarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning, Monitoring and Reporting, and evaluation documentation, Minutes from meetings, Agenda’s from meetings etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder at CO: Country and Deputy Country Representative, Section Chiefs C4D advisors/focal points, Directors of communications, communication specialists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document review using Benchmark Assessment Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stakeholders at RO: C4D advisor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIIs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What are the factors which help explain implementation (or not) of the benchmarks?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling factors for the implementation of the benchmarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders at CO: C Country and Deputy Country Representative, Section Chiefs C4D advisors/focal points, Directors of communications, communication specialists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document review using Benchmark Assessment Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stakeholders at RO: C4D advisor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIIs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Based on the benchmarks, what conclusions can be drawn on the quality of C4D programming at country level?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of quality C4D programming based on observations using the benchmarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders at CO Country and Deputy Country Representative, Section Chiefs C4D advisors/focal points, Directors of communications, communication specialists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document review using Benchmark Assessment Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stakeholders at RO: C4D advisor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIIs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is it possible in principle to evaluate the contribution of C4D to the impact of the intervention?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Underlying logic (theory of change) of the programme clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour changes, shifts in social norms, social mobilisation and/or advocacy clearly articulated in the programme logic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causal logic clear on how the C4D intervention contributes to behaviour change /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design, monitoring and reporting, and evaluation documentation of an intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders at CO: C4D advisors/focal points, technical leads/specialists, national partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document review using Evaluability Assessment Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stakeholders at RO: C4D advisor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIIs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is it possible in practice to evaluate the contribution of C4D to the impact of the intervention?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 evaluations60. 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.)
   a. 2013 (N/A, <1%, 2-5%, 5%-10%, 10%-20%, 20%-30%, 30%-40%, >50%)
   b. 2014 (N/A, <1%, 2-5%, 5%-10%, 10%-20%, 20%-30%, 30%-40%, >50%)
   c. 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.

60 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
   h. Humanitarian/Emergency
   i. Communications for Development
   j. Other programme areas not listed above (please specify)

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? (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 established and functioning to plan, coordinate and strengthen C4D activities. |  - **Red**: There is no evidence of any groups or task forces trying to coordinate C4D activity in the country;  
  - **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;  
  - **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 evidence on behavioural and socio-cultural factors as well as media and communication contexts |  - **Red**: There is no evidence C4D plans/interventions being informed by relevant data from monitoring, evaluation, behavioural analysis or analysis of the communications context.  
  - **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;  
  - **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 representatives and members into sector programmes/interventions |  - **Red**: No evidence of the use of participatory process being used;  
  - **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 of UNICEF staff, partners at national and sub-national levels |  - **Red**: No evidence of plans/initiatives/ongoing programmes to strengthen capacity;  
  - **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 and lessons learned are documented and disseminated among key audiences. |  - **Red**: No evidence of key resources being documented and shared among key stakeholders;  
  - **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 document 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 |