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Preamble/What is Lihlombe Lekukhalela?

*Lihlombe Lekukhalela* (LL) is a community-driven child protection initiative, introduced around the year 2000, by the Government of Swaziland (*Ministry of Regional Development and Youth Affairs*)¹, UNICEF, NGOs and civil society in response to daily newspaper reports about the worsening situation of child abuse in the country, especially sexual and emotional abuse (UNICEF, 2005). Lihlombe Lekukhalela, a SiSwati term which means “a shoulder to cry on”, was coined by the youth during engagements at community level to break ground on the introduction of the child protectors’ initiative. The Lihlombe Lekukhalela community-based child protection initiative utilizes child protection committees to prevent violence, abuse and exploitation of children and to provide care and support to abuse survivors. The initiative was scaled-up substantially in the last five years, with approximately 10,000 LLs currently working in all four regions of Swaziland.

The objectives of the Lihlombe Lekukhalela community-based child protection initiative are to:

- Protect children from all forms of abuse as defined by Article 19 of the United Nations convention on the rights of the Child (UNCRC).
- Educate and sensitize communities to fulfil the rights of children, especially the orphaned and vulnerable children (OVC).
- Provide an easily accessible avenue at the community level for children to report cases of abuse which directly or indirectly affect them.
- Reduce the rate of child abuse, exploitation including secondary victimization of children by providing a shoulder-to-cry-on within communities and schools.

The roles of the Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers are to:

- Raise awareness among adult leaders and parents/guardians to act against child sexual abuse by explaining the psychological and physical damage which is caused by child abuse; and the subsequent damage to the social capital (good neighbourliness) of the good by child abuse.
- Recognize the signs of a child who has been abused and how to talk with and counsel the child and the family around the child in order to strengthen a supportive environment around the child and family.
- Reach children in and out of school with information and knowledge about sexual abuse and what to do to prevent, respond and report it.
- Refer/link abused children to the Royal Swaziland Police services, traditional leaders, social workers, teachers and other stakeholders for immediate attention.
- Meet as a group on a weekly basis to discuss issues, share experiences, learn from each other and prepare reports.

¹ Over the years, government ministries have evolved based on national priorities and a focus on comparative advantage, in 2014 the then Ministry of Regional Development and Youth Affairs is called the Ministry of Tinkhundla Administration and Development (MTAD). Luckily enough the government personnel (e.g. principal community development officer and other community development officers) with the institutional memory are still staff members within MTAD.
Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers are:

- Community members without a record of child abuse.
- Men, women and youth of integrity.
- Men and women with love for children.

Two studies were undertaken prior to the most recent one. The 2005 UNICEF Swaziland study revealed two major issues:

1. Physical abuse was the most common, followed by emotional and sexual abuse; the vast majority of abuse incidents were taking place in the home by male family members;
2. Children’s knowledge of the existence of Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers varied widely, there was lack of ownership and lack of supporting structures.

The 2011 UNICEF Swaziland evaluation (Keregero, 2011) revealed that children were generally aware of various types of violence, abuse and exploitation, but were not actually exposed to any of these. According to that same study, Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers still had to be trained on the Children’s Policy (2009), Social Development Policy (2010), New Guidelines and Bills (Children’s Protection and Welfare; ), and the referral system.

Having grown considerably, the programme was revised to determine whether its impact was as desired from the outset. In particular, the present study sought to examine the effectiveness, relevance, quality, timeliness and efficiency of the initiative, based on prior experience aimed at strengthening linkages between Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers and formal social welfare structures. The present document discusses the major outcomes of this review exercise and proposes some recommendations and conclusions.

Executive Summary: overview of the report

The study wanted to find out which children were reached by the Lihlombe Lekukhalela community-based child protection programme and whether children who are the most vulnerable to abuse, violence and exploitation were able to access it. Whether the Lihlombe Lekukhalela community-based child protection services were provided efficiently and effectively (did the children receive adequate services?) and whether the police, the social welfare offices, the schools and the Lihlombe Lekukhalela community-based child protection initiative work well together were also questions asked in the study. In addition, the study wanted to discover if the initiative can continue and how much support it receives from communities, civil society organisations (CSOs) and government institutions. Of course, there are always challenges, so finding out how important these are was part of the study’s objective.

In general, it was found that vulnerable children are aware of existing protection services as they willingly report abuse cases to Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers near them and they know the community members to go to in case of abuse. The children trust Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers and are well aware of their responsibilities.
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1. What is Likhombe Lekukhala (LL)?
Likhombe Lekukhalela (LL) is a community-based child protection initiative established in early 2000 by a group of people working in the area of child protection in Swaziland. Literally meaning “a shoulder to cry on”, the Likhombe Lekukhalela child protection initiative reaches out to children through child protection committees to prevent violence, abuse and exploitation of children and to provide care and support to abuse survivors. The initiative was scaled-up substantially in the last five years, with approximately 10,000 Likhombe Lekukhalela volunteers currently working in all four regions of Swaziland, according to UNICEF.

2. How well do Likhombe Lekukhalela volunteers function?
Several studies (2005; 2011) have been undertaken since the initiative was established. These noted the following:

1. The majority of children were able to identify various forms of abuse
2. Only a minority knew someone who had been abused and only a very small minority had personally experienced abuse
3. Physical abuse was the most common, followed by emotional and sexual abuse
4. Abuse incidents in general took place in the home and were perpetrated largely by male family members
5. Children’s knowledge of the existence of Likhombe Lekukhalela volunteers varied widely
6. Community members did not always feel they “owned” the initiative
7. Few abused children had been identified and referred to service providers
8. Even fewer abused children had received proper follow-up services
9. Likhombe Lekukhalela volunteers needed to be trained on the Children’s Policy, Social Development Policy, New Guidelines and Bills and the referral system
10. The children often received support when it was too late already

2.1 Evaluation
The previous studies have identified a number of concerns (see above). It was thus felt that a follow-up evaluation was needed.

2.2 Methodology (data collection instruments/participants/etc.)
The 2011 study combined two major types of methods: qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods. Qualitative techniques included interviews with key informants to understand how and why people react, what their motivations and aspirations are. Quantitative techniques collect numerical data: how many children were reached by the Likhombe Lekukhalela community-based child protection services, where they live, what types of violence or abuse they were subjected to, etc. In general, the study looked at what had been achieved by the Likhombe Lekukhalela community-based child protection initiative so far.

The respondents to study were persons who had any knowledge about the Likhombe Lekukhalela community-based child protection initiative (about 20 key informants or KIs), all individuals responsible for providing service and support to Likhombe Lekukhalela volunteers and vulnerable children in communities (service providers: teachers, police officers, health staff, social welfare
personnel, staff of faith-based organisations (FBOs) and Inner Council (Bandlancane) members) and all Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers operating in rural and urban settings consisting of towns, wards, communities, tinkhundla and chiefdoms.

For purposes of this evaluation, the sample size of 400 Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers was selected and distributed equally among the selected eight chiefdoms (rural areas) and two wards (urban areas). Given that women constituted the majority of Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers operating in communities, it was decided that, as far as possible, the sample size in each area should include 5% male and 95% female respondents. Table 1 shows the sample size and distribution in the selected research locations. Within each chiefdom or ward, the Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers were identified in a snowballing manner until the requisite number was attained.

Table 1. Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers sample size and distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region/Inkhundla/Chiefdom</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Implementing NGO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers Actively Involved</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manzini (LaMghabi – Luhlebo)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>SCSWD² &amp; SWAGAA³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hhohho (Motshane – Ekupheleni)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>SCSWD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiselweni (Hosea – Ensingizini)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>SCSWD and WUS⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lubombo (Siphofaneni – Ndzangu)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>SCSWD and WUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manzini City (Zakhele)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>AMICAALL⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers Not Actively Involved</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manzini (Mhlambanyatsi – Lundzi/Mpuluzi)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>MTAD⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hhohho (Timpisini – Timpisini)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>SCSWD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiselweni (Nkwene – Buseleni)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>MTAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lubombo (Dvokodvweni – Malindza)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>MTAD and WUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manzini City (Ngwane Park)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>AMICAALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentages</strong></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² Save the Children Swaziland (SCSWD)
³ Swaziland Action Group Against Abuse (SWAGAA)
⁴ World University Services – Swaziland chapter
⁵ Alliance of Mayors and Municipal Leaders on HIV/AIDS in Africa (AMICAALL)
⁶ Ministry of Tinkhundla Administration and Development (MTAD).
Table 2 shows the different data collection techniques that were used:

**Table 2. Instruments for data collection**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Respondent Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Semi-structured interview schedule*</td>
<td>Key informants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Critical incident interview schedule*</td>
<td>Selected service providers and Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Structured personal interview schedule*</td>
<td>Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Focus group discussion guide*</td>
<td>Community members and leaders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All the data collection instruments were available in siSwati too.

3. Results/findings

The findings are presented in terms of: distribution of Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers by selected demographic characteristics, coverage and accessibility, effectiveness and efficiency, linkages, sustainability and ownership, and challenges encountered.

3.1 What, where, who? (Selected demographic characteristics)

![Gender of Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers](image1)

*Figure 1 Gender of Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers*

![Number of households supervised](image2)

*Figure 2 Number of households supervised by Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers*
Most Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers have been working more than 4 years, which indicated they have the necessary experience to identify the role of Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers in the protection of vulnerable children.

Most Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers supervised more than 10 households. Even though the implementing partners might assume that each Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteer supervises an estimated maximum of five households, the majority of Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers actually supervised more. This means they have a higher workload, they need to travel far to see the children and this has an impact on their performance.

3.2 Can children open up to Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers? (coverage and accessibility)
Approximately 75% of Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers and community members feel that vulnerable children in communities are easily reachable by child protection services.

Most Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers said they could reach all the vulnerable children under their care.

In general, Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers noted that it was easy to identify vulnerable children, that Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers were motivated to help these children and that community members could also depend on umphakatsi for assistance.

In general, the Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers noted that some children could not report abuse because they feel ashamed and embarrassed, they are intimidated, threatened and victimized.

Organisations do not always follow up properly, some communities are inaccessible or do not support the Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers. Some parents and guardians feel that child abuse is a family secret (tibi tendlu) and should not be spoken about.

Most people feel that vulnerable children know about protection services as they are willing to report abuse cases to Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers, they also know which community members can help when there is an abuse case and which community members they can talk to and “cry on their shoulders”. Vulnerable children trust Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers and know what their responsibilities are. Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers go to people’s homes and the schools to talk to the children and explain what Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers do/can do.
But, children do not often seek protection!

Figure 7 Percentage of children who requested protection services from ihlombe lekukhalela volunteers

The children requested protection against abuse, exploitation and violence. Keregero’s 2011 study does not specify which particular instances are reported.

Figure 8 Frequency of request of protection services, by children, from Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers

In general, human and physical resources were seen as adequate. However, financial resources are lacking.

Figure 9 Availability of human resources
3.3 Are the services well managed? (Effectiveness and efficiency)

- Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers were able to get enough staff members and supervisors to help the children. In addition, Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers were able to get the knowledge, skills and attitudes they need to assist children; they link with other support organisations too. They still need to do more to get enough funding and facilities to help vulnerable children.
Table 3. Opinions regarding effectiveness-related achievements of the Lihlombe Lekukhalela community-based child protection initiative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent of agreement regarding Lihlombe Lekukhalela community-based child protection initiative having:</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Mobilized adequate funding to meet the needs of children.</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mobilized adequate staffing to meet the needs of children.</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Mobilized back-up facilities to meet the needs of children.</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Put in place adequate supervision to meet the needs of children.</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Laid out well-defined responsibilities.</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Facilitated development of good plans.</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Developed appropriate linkage with support organisations.</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Developed capacity to produce desired outcomes.</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Attained its objectives/solve targeted problems.</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>1.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Matched its activities with objectives/problems.</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Enabled Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers to acquire appropriate knowledge.</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>1.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Enabled Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers to acquire appropriate skills.</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Enabled Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers to acquire positive attitude toward the job.</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>1.278</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1 = Disagree, 2 = Slightly disagree, 3 = Slightly agree, 4 = Moderately agree, 5 = Agree.

- Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers assisted in having less sexual abuse incidences. Parents changed their attitude too: instead of physically abusing them, they now talk to them. Children are less overworked. Orphans are no longer seen as inferior, disadvantaged children, but rather as ordinary children. People in the community are showing respect to authority and report when children are being treated badly. In many instances, local authorities and community members are acting quickly when child abuse is reported and are reaching out to organisations that can lend a hand in those matters.
In general, community members feel that Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers are good for the community. Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers provide a safe and peaceful environment for children in the community. They help people change their abusive and violent behaviour. They show how people’s problems can be handled confidentially. This gives children confidence. Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers have learned to listen more than to speak.

### Table 4. Opinions regarding efficiency-related achievements of the Lihlombe Lekukhalela community-based child protection initiative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent of agreement regarding Lihlombe Lekukhalela community-based child protection initiative having:</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Utilised time well for the intended purposes.</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Utilised effort well for the intended purposes.</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ensured that Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers perform tasks satisfactorily.</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ensured that partners perform tasks satisfactorily.</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>1.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Matched inputs with outputs.</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ensured timely service delivery.</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Provided quality service at minimum cost.</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>1.637</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1 = Disagree, 2 = Slightly disagree, 3 = Slightly agree, 4 = Moderately agree, 5 = Agree.

According to the study, Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers and their partners do their tasks well, use their efforts appropriately and for the objectives stated. They help the children in time. But, the services of the Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers are not always given at a minimum cost and, as stated above, they are not always able to find back-up facilities and adequate funding to meet the needs of children.

### 3.4 How do Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers link to other social welfare services? (Linkages)

- Most people agree that there are good links between the Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers and the police (94%), teachers/schools (94%), bandlancane (92%), health staff (88%), social welfare (73%) and faith-based organisations (58%).
- Most Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers use the following support institutions: police (86%), teachers/schools (84%), bandlancane (80%), health staff (79%) and social welfare staff (72%).
Most Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers feel that the links and coordination between Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers and health staff (81%), teachers/schools (77%), police (73%), bandlan cane (71%) and social welfare staff (65%) work well.

However, most Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers do not work with faith-based organisations and/or are not happy with how these link to them.

Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers do not always know “who to contact”, for “what purpose” and “how promptly” to contact other organisations. The actual collaboration with other organisations, whether the organisations follow the procedures, rules and regulations and whether the organisations are trustworthy are all part of the questions raised.

3.5 What about the future? (Sustainability and ownership)

Table 5. Opinions regarding consequences of Lihlombe Lekukhalela community-based child protection service provision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent of agreement regarding consequences of Lihlombe Lekukhalela community-based child protection service provision</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Child protection services will be maintained after expiry of Lihlombe Lekukhalela community-based child protection initiative.</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>1.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lihlombe Lekukhalela community-based child protection services will become permanent feature of normal service delivery in community.</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>1.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lihlombe Lekukhalela community-based child protection services have been well integrated into the community.</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Lihlombe Lekukhalela community-based child protection services are being well utilized in the community.</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lihlombe Lekukhalela community-based child protection services have enhanced existing relationships.</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Lihlombe Lekukhalela community-based child protection services have aided development of new partnerships.</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>1.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Lihlombe Lekukhalela community-based child protection services can survive on local community resources.</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. There is adequate community awareness of Lihlombe Lekukhalela services.</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>0.799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. There is adequate trust between Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers and children.</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>0.624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. There is adequate trust between Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers and police.</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. There is adequate trust between Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers and social welfare staff.</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>0.968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. There is adequate trust between Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers and teachers/schools.</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>0.953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. There is adequate trust between Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers and health staff.</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>0.740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. There is adequate trust between Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers and faith-based organisations.</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. There is adequate trust between Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers and local leaders.</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1 = Disagree, 2= Slightly agree, 3 = Moderately agree, 4 = Agree.

- **Community members and Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers indicated that the following points showed that the initiative could be sustainable over time:**
  - Acceptance and utilisation of child protection services;
  - Appreciation of the rights and safety of children;
  - Evolution of community solidarity against abuse, violence and exploitation of vulnerable children;
  - Establishment of neighbourhood care points (NCPs) and pre-schools;
  - Evolution of a culture of reporting any form of abuse;
  - Increased spirit of helping the needy;
  - Change in attitude towards abuse, violence and exploitation of vulnerable children; involvement in agricultural projects and feeding schemes;
  - Structures for supporting welfare of children;
  - Involvement in informal savings schemes (commonly called stokvel) operations;
  - Established legacy through teachings offered to children;
  - Institutionalization of community awareness events; and increased involvement of community police.

- **Community members and Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers said the following could become part of daily community services:**
  - “Knowledge and advice shared with children”;
  - “Opportunities and structures for awareness creation”;
  - “Community structures for caring for vulnerable children”;
  - “Rich community experience obtained from successful operations of the Lihlombe Lekukhalela community-based child protection initiative”;
  - “Established networks between community and child protection service providers”;
  - “Culturally compatible and home-grown child protection service as exemplified by the Lihlombe Lekukhalela community-based child protection initiative itself”;
  - “The NCP concept and feeding scheme”;
  - “Skills training in the community”;
  - “Spirit of helping the needy”;
Monthly meetings; timely visits by health staff and integration of LL services in schools”.

Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers feel that the following consequences of the Lihlombe Lekukhalela community-based child protection initiative will help the Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers services stay in the community:

- Adequate trust between Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers and children, health staff, police, teachers/schools, social welfare staff, local leaders and faith-based organisations;
- Adequate community awareness of Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers services;
- Integration of Lihlombe Lekukhalela community-based child protection services into the community;
- Utilisation of Lihlombe Lekukhalela community-based child protection services in the community; prospects of Lihlombe Lekukhalela community-based child protection services becoming permanent feature of normal service delivery in community;
- Enhancement of existing relationships;
- Development of new partnerships and prospects for child protection services being maintained after expiry of Lihlombe Lekukhalela community-based child protection initiative.

Community support, reporting of abuse, working together, community members seeking Lihlombe Lekukhalela community-based child protection services, support from parents, declining incidents of abuse of children and recognition of Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers work are all elements that show that the community “owns” the Lihlombe Lekukhalela community-based child protection initiative.

Table 6. Opinions of respondents on aspects of ownership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents’ opinions</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Community is committed to maintenance of Lihlombe Lekukhalela community-based child protection initiative</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers collaborate with social welfare staff and other service providers</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Community can support Lihlombe Lekukhalela community-based child protection services using own resources</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>73.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Community has a succession plan for Lihlombe Lekukhalela community-based child protection services</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Community has a phase-out plan for Lihlombe Lekukhalela community-based child protection services</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>59.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In general, communities are seen as committed to the maintenance of the Lihlombe Lekukhalela community-based child protection initiative and Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers collaborate with social welfare staff and other organisations.

Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers do not think communities can support Lihlombe Lekukhalela community-based child protection services using their own resources or have succession and phase-out plans for Lihlombe Lekukhalela community-based child protection services. This means that they feel the survival of the Lihlombe Lekukhalela community-based child protection initiative is being threatened.

People hope that communities will continue to serve the needs of vulnerable children because more people know how to handle the situation of vulnerable children, people understand the Lihlombe Lekukhalela community-based child protection initiative, people see the protection of vulnerable children as God’s work, and some Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers and community members now use their own resources to support the protection of children.

Community members suggested some ways of ensuring a sense of community ownership of the Lihlombe Lekukhalela community-based child protection initiative: creation of a community fund to be managed by the community itself rather than bandlancape, provision of a small salary for Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers from the community fund and establishment of agricultural projects.

People understand what Lihlombe Lekukhalela community-based child protection stands for and have adopted the “shoulder to cry on” ideas and ideals, probably because the initiative comes from the community, shows compatibility (fitting the values and experiences of Swazis), complexity (it is easy to understand and use) and communicability (it gives results that are easily observed and described).

4. Is it all “smooth sailing”? (Challenges)

Some challenges to the continued implementation of Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers exist. These are:

- Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers being volunteers;
- Linkages between Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers and service providers needing reinforcement;
- Experiences of the Lihlombe Lekukhalela community-based child protection initiative having to be documented,
- Resistance existing among some community members,
- Defence of family secrets commonly termed “tibi tendlu”,
- Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers’ workloads being too heavy,
- Inability of communities to support Lihlombe Lekukhalela community-based child protection services using their own resources,
- Lack of phase-out and succession plans,
- Inadequate financial resources and inability of children to avail themselves of services.

5. Conclusions

Based on the findings emerging from the evaluation, the following conclusions can be drawn:

- There are Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers throughout the country.
Their activity varies from region to region and within tinkhundla.

There are places that are well served;

There are also others that have inadequate services for vulnerable children.

In areas that are well served, all the children that are most vulnerable to abuse, violence and exploitation are easily reachable by child protection services.

In this context, therefore, the Lihlombe Lekukhalela community-based child protection initiative is accessible. However, because vulnerable children do not always seek assistance on their own, full access is not yet attained.

There are adequate human and physical resources for the Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers, but more money should be set aside for the protection of vulnerable children.

The Lihlombe Lekukhalela community-based child protection initiative has given Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers the necessary knowledge, skills and attitudes.

The Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers can solve identified problems because they have clear duties and responsibilities.

They have been able to grow, to develop capacity and to link with other organisations.

There is now adequate supervision to meet the needs of children.

Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers can help people to make good plans and find staff to meet the needs of children.

However, the Lihlombe Lekukhalela community-based child protection initiative has not been able to find back-up facilities and adequate funding to meet vulnerable children’s needs.

Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers and their partners do a good job and use their time and efforts as they should to assist vulnerable children.

But, the Lihlombe Lekukhalela community-based child protection initiative has not been able to give good services at minimum cost.

The linkages between Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteer and police, social welfare offices, members of the inner council (advisory body to the community chief) commonly referred to as bandlancane, faith-based organisations and schools exist at varying levels.

This has to be improved so that everything runs smoothly and children get help from the correct organisations.

Whether or not these links work well depends on the situation and who is involved, on knowing “who to contact”, for “what purpose” and “how promptly”.

It also depends on how much collaboration exists among the organisations and how determined people are to follow procedures and standards.

It is also important to find out if people are interested and are personally satisfied by the links, and if the organisations and their staff are visible and honest.

Communities know how to help Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers. They also know that the LLs can ensure that local people are involved in child protection.

It will be difficult for communities to sustain the Lihlombe Lekukhalela community-based child protection initiative based only on their local resources. This means that civil society organisations, government and other external partners need to help.
Communities want to keep the Lihlombe Lekukhalela community-based child protection initiative going and want to work together with other organisations.

Communities understand the “shoulder to cry on” idea because it is local, goes hand in hand with Swazi values, is easily understood and can be explained to other people.

Communities cannot yet use their own resources to support Lihlombe Lekukhalela community-based child protection services and know that Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers cannot survive on local community resources only.

There are no clear plans on how LLs can continue to exist.

There are some points that need to be changed so that the Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers can keep doing their work.

- Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers should not be volunteers only, there should be good links between LLs and other organisations, the Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers’ experiences need to be written down.
- Some “resistant” community members should be convinced of the good of Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers and of the bad influence of the family secrets comely termed “tibi tendlu” idea.
- Plans for the future should be prepared so that communities can assist Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers with their own resources, money needs to be found and children need to be encouraged further to get help when they need it.

6. Recommendations for the future/lessons learned

- Additional financial resources should be provided for Lihlombe Lekukhalela volunteers, for communities and for children in order to ensure adequate child protection services within the communities.
- Some of these funds should come from the communities themselves. Therefore, communities need to be trained on budgeting and planning.
- Even though many communities understand the values of the volunteer-based child protection services, some members remain reluctant to accept the volunteers within the community. Further awareness building campaigns need to be set up.
- Follow-up research in different areas would be valuable. This could include looking at how state