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Annex 1 – Terms of Reference

1. STATEMENT OF WORK AND TERMS OF REFERENCE

2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

According to the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) a child should not be separated from his or her parents against their will, except when competent authorities determine that such separation is necessary for the best interests of the child and States Parties shall take all appropriate legislative, administrative, social and educational measures to protect the child from all forms of physical or mental violence, injury or abuse, neglect or negligent treatment, maltreatment or exploitation. Based on these and other provisions of the CRC the UNICEF’s 5 year programmatic priority in Kazakhstan is to establish an effective child protection system that adequately responds to the needs of the most neglected and exploited children.

According to UNICEF estimates, in Kazakhstan over 30,022 children are housed in state-run institutions being deprived of their right to grow up in loving family environment. Only 25% of these children are orphans, the rest have at least one parent. Often dubbed “social orphans,” these are children whose families are, for whatever reason, unable to care for them. In addition, a vast majority of 150,000 children with disabilities who live in Kazakhstan are also deprived of their basic right to healthy development. Due to the lack of a strong child protection system every day a number of children are exposed to violence, exploitation and abuse.

The situation of children living in state care institutions is disturbing. Many institutionalized children in Kazakhstan spend their entire infancy, childhood and adolescence in institutions, losing all contacts with their families. Children who leave the institutions at the age of 18 are more likely to be unemployed, poor, in trouble with the law, and they are more vulnerable to exploitation such as trafficking and sexual abuse. Kazakhstan has the highest rate of suicidal behavior among teenagers and youths, especially among girls in the age group of 15-19 years old. In 2009, 10 cases of child trafficking were officially registered by the Ministry of Internal Affairs, but the scope of the problem is much broader and was unexplored until recently.

In 2011-2014 the Government of Norway provided support to UNICEF in implementing the specific project activities on Strengthening the Ombudsman’s child protection system in Kazakhstan with the focus on two programmatic areas: 1) strengthening the Ombudsman Office’s capacities in child rights protection and monitoring and 2) supporting the Government in development of a national child protection mechanism.

The goal of the action was to develop a sustained and operational child protection mechanism that prevents and responds to child abuse, exploitation and family separation in line with international standards. The two key envisaged outcomes: 1) Child rights violations monitoring and complaints from regions are effectively attended by the Human Rights Ombudsman’s Office; 2) Developed practical model of local level integrated child protection mechanism is ready for national replication.

The action aimed to contribute to drafting and realization of the overarching key national policies related to child protection including “Strategy Kazakhstan-2050”: new political course of the established state”, Kazakhstan-2030 Development Strategy, Kazakhstan-2030 social development concept, 2010-2020 Concept of legal policy of the Republic of Kazakhstan, 2011-2020 National education development policy, 2011-2015 National health development strategy. Targeted legal acts under the action included the Family code of Kazakhstan, Law on special social services, Law on
National Preventive mechanism, Draft strategic paper on violence prevention, Regulation on Commission on Minors, Regulations on Infant Homes, Regulations on the status of social workers at Primary health Care level and others.

Direct coordination of implementation of the agreement on behalf of MFA of Norway was delegated to the Royal Norwegian Embassy in Astana and UNICEF Office in Kazakhstan. Overall, the programme implementation involved the following stakeholders with the assigned by the Government relevant to child protection authorities. The Ombudsman is the national human rights institution mandated to independently monitor implementation of human rights including those of children as well as to promote bringing human rights legislation into compliance with international norms and standards. The Ministry of Education and Science hosts the Committees on Children’s Rights Protection and Youth Policy, manages residential institutions for children left without parental care and family support services. The Ministry of Labour and Social Protection of Population oversees the delivery of social services and the development of an integrated child protection system. Ministry of Health oversees primary health care social workers responsible for work with vulnerable families. Ministry of Internal Affairs keeps records of vulnerable families and works on prevention of child delinquency. The national child protection programmes are implemented on local level by akimats.

The MFA of Norway and UNICEF joint interventions brought in a number of contributions to the child protection system reform in Kazakhstan that need to be evaluated in order to show the action results and draw lessons learned from the process to be used within the country and beyond.

Under the Norwegian Government supported programme between 2010-2013 the Human Rights Ombudsman jointly with UNICEF assessed the situation with violence against children in residential care institutions, in the communities and schools. The assessment results showed that 50% of children in institutions and 67% in school witnesses violence primarily coming from their peers. The findings helped to put the issue of violence against children high on the political agenda as well as to shape a model violence prevention and referral mechanism in East Kazakhstan region. The Ombudsman's Office worked with UNICEF on design of the independent child rights monitoring tools and testing of monitoring mechanisms for tackling down child rights violations in institutions.

The conducted under the project study on the child’s vulnerability in urban areas identified the main causes of child and youth vulnerability that include: conflict with a parent/caregiver, child abuse, family violence, divorce or death of a parent/caregiver, abandonment, death of a sibling or best friend, fight with/loss of a boyfriend/girlfriend, mocking by peers at school, institutionalization, sexual assault and poverty. Although the national statistics report only several cases of trafficking, the study identified 103 child victims of trafficking, 106 sexually exploited girls and sex workers between 11 and 23 years of age and 259 vulnerable children between 9 and 17 years of age. The borders between vulnerable children, sexually exploited or trafficked children are blurred. It was learned that the peri-urban areas supply children for trafficking and sexual exploitation to the large cities. In 2010, primarily, UNICEF in Kazakhstan conducted the mapping of the child protection system and provided possible scenarios in reforming the statutory services. In this regard 4 line ministries (Health, Social Protection, Education and Internal Affairs) with support from UNICEF adopted an action plan (5 steps) towards the establishment of an integrated child protection mechanism based on implementation of the Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan “On special social services” (2009). The “5 steps” strategy included establishment of interagency working groups (commissions) at the Ministry (national), regional and local levels which were supposed to promote training of social workers, particularly for carrying out the assessments for families, and create a system of comprehensive interagency planning for children.
The “5 steps” approach was one of the key outputs of the action supported by the Government of Norway which among others included: “Two oblasts have developed models of integrated child protection services” and “A model of prevention of institutionalization of children age 0-3 have reached 20% more family care solutions”. In 2011 the “5 steps” action plan started implementation in three pilot regions in Kazakhstan including Astana city, Karaganda and East Kazakhstan regions. The final meeting on implementation of the “5 steps” approach is planned for beginning of 2014.

The programme envisaged impact:

- Reduction in a number of children victims of in-country trafficking and child prostitution in targeted oblasts.
- 30% reduction in the placement of new children in state child care institutions, including children with disabilities, by strengthening preventative and family support mechanisms in targeted oblasts.
- Development of a local practical integrated child protection mechanism ready for national replication.
- Based on tested model, practical recommendations on introduction of modern child protection legislative framework are shared with the Government.
- Increased capacities of key state and non-state stakeholders engaged in the child protection system at the central and local level
- Children and youth participate in peer support and establishment of child protection system in their communities
- Knowledge on vulnerable children and their challenges was brought to the government’s attention.

Evaluation of the implemented action aimed at developing of a sustained and operational child protection mechanism that prevents and responds to child abuse, exploitation and family separation is initiated by UNICEF and the MFA of Norway to make an overall judgment about the effectiveness of the implemented programme components, identify the key lessons learned, inform the country office on transformed engagement in these areas and develop recommendations for strengthening the child protection programme in Kazakhstan.

Initial list of documents for desk review under the scope of work of the ToR for consultancy on the evaluation of the supported by the Government of Norway programme on developing a sustained and operational ombudsman’s child protection mechanism that prevents and responds to child abuse, exploitation and family separation in line with international standards

**Project documents** – Description of Action, logframe, donor reports

**Studies**
1. Modelling integrated child protection mechanism, CLC for UNICEF, 2010
2. Seven Reports from CLC, EveryChild and national consultant on implementing integrated child protection mechanism
3. Thematic study on the capacity of the child care and social protection systems to provide adequate support to the most vulnerable children and their families and prevent family separation in three countries of CEE/CIS, UNICEF, 2011
5. Report on vulnerabilities of children to risky behaviour, sexual exploitation and trafficking
6. Case management on local level, 2012
7. Assessment of implementation of the Law On Special Social Services in the Republic of Kazakhstan
8. Report on causes of child abandonment, NGO “Sem’ya”
10. Manuals on prevention of child abandonment and independent monitoring of child rights in institutions
11. Referral protocols for integrated delivery of specialised social services, 2013
14. Comments to the laws and national policy papers prepared by UNICEF staff and consultants
15. Torture and ill-treatment in the context of juvenile justice, 2013

Legislations
1. Law on Special Social Services
2. The concept of the de-institutionalisation of children deprived of parental care
3. Family Code
4. Law on domestic violence
5. Law on NPM
6. Draft strategic paper on violence prevention
7. Order of the Minister of Education on violence prevention
8. Regulations on psychological services in schools
9. Regulation on Commission on Minors
10. Regulations on Infant Homes
11. Regulations on the status of social workers at Primary health Care level

Evaluation specific standards
1. UNICEF-Adapted UNEG Evaluation Reports Standards, 2010
2. UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation

3. OVERALL PURPOSE OF THE ASSIGNMENT

Type of evaluation:
This is a summative evaluation.

The purpose of the evaluation is to:
1) make an overall judgment about the effectiveness of the joint UNICEF, Norwegian Government, State and Ombudsman programme aimed at developing a sustained and operational child protection mechanism that prevents and responds to child abuse, exploitation and family separation in line with international standards
2) show to what extent the execution of UNICEF key roles under this project at central and local levels contributed to the envisaged project outcomes and system change
3) identify which strategies have been the most efficient in meeting the goal of the action and what challenges hindered the process (barriers and bottlenecks).
4) summarize the lessons learned and identify good practices as an example for the country and beyond.

4. LOCATION
Astana, Karaganda (Karaganda and Temirtau cities) region, East Kazakhstan region (Ust-Kamenogorsk and Semey cities).
5. **SUPERVISOR**

The institution/consultant will be supervised and report to the UNICEF Child Protection Officer with regular de-briefing with the UNICEF M&E Officer, UNICEF Deputy Representative and UNICEF Representative about the progress of the consultancy. The institution/consultant will work on a daily basis with UNICEF Child Protection Section. The Child Protection Section will interact with the chosen institution/consultant in negotiation and communicating through e-mail correspondence while outside of Kazakhstan as well as support the consultant/s in the country.

UNICEF will agree with the MFA of Norway on the key objectives and tasks of the evaluation and content of the present Terms of Reference. The inception, interim and final report will be made available to the MFA of Norway for comments prior to the final release.

6. **SCOPE OF THE WORK**

**The key objectives include:**

1) Assessing the relevance and sustainability of interventions
2) Assessing effectiveness and efficiency of Kazakhstan’s Government, Norway’s Government and UNICEF’s contributions to development of mechanisms for the independent Ombudsman’s monitoring and complaint system, prevention and responding to child abuse, exploitation and family separation
3) Assessing the extent of application of Human Rights Based Approach and gender equality principles
4) Assessing the extent of applying the equity approach within the intervention
5) Identifying barriers and bottlenecks faced during implementation both on part of UNICEF and the Government
6) Identifying good practices and lessons learned in the current approaches for possible scale up in and outside the country
7) Developing recommendations for strengthening the reforms in the area of prevention and addressing child abuse, exploitation and family separation, informing programme directions and defining further funding needs.

**The evaluation will look at the following project outputs:**

1) Recommendations from the study on violence against children in public settings and the research on scale of in-country child trafficking and child prostitution provided to the government
2) Changes to the Family Code and other legal documents in Kazakhstan are made
3) Two oblasts have developed models of integrated child protection services
4) A mechanisms to identify, refer and respond to abuse and maltreatment of children
5) A model of prevention of institutionalization of children age 0-3 have reached 20% more family care solutions
6) An increased access of children to the Ombudsman’s Office.

**Geographical coverage:**

The evaluation will cover Astana city, East Kazakhstan and Karaganda regions. The project was directly linked to local authorities and NGOs with respect to protection of children from abuse and exploitation as well as development of family support services in East Kazakhstan region. During project implementation stage Karaganda and Astana also voluntarily joined the “5 steps” programme and implemented the 0-3 age child abandonment prevention programme. The advocacy and policy making work was conducted in capital city Astana based on lessons learnt from the 3 target oblasts.
**Evaluation intended users:**
Primary: Kazakhstan national and local authorities, UNICEF, MFA of Norway
Secondary: international and civil society organisations.

**Evaluability of the action proposed for evaluation:**
The proposed for evaluation action has a high evaluability potential in terms of benefits, utility, consequences and costs. It has been designed according to a logic model format required by the MFA of Norway (Goal Hierarchy). The intervention had a clearly stated goal (see above), envisaged impact, and indicators. A detailed plan of implementation was developed and reviewed in the course of programme implementation. The target population was defined at the planning stage according to the MFA of Norway proposal format.

**Potential limitations to the evaluation:**
Lack of disaggregated data and baseline data for some of the action components might present a significant constraint for assessing evaluation effectiveness. Staff turnover in management and implementing partners will limit the opportunity to reach key “organizational memory” human resources. Sensitivity of violence and vulnerability issues might bring a challenge for evaluators especially during data collection stage as respondents might not feel comfortable to talk openly. In addition interviews and focus group discussions with target groups in non-native language might establish an additional barrier between the interviewer and the respondent. Severe weather conditions during evaluation period might limit movement of the evaluator. The identified potential limitations should be closely considered during finalization of the evaluation methodology and data collection tools.

**Ethical considerations:**
The evaluation design and implementation should consider ethical safeguards where appropriate, including protection of confidentiality, dignity, rights and welfare of human subjects particularly children, and respect of the values of the local community. Please refer to UNEG ethical guidance for evaluation\(^1\) which outlines the ethical principles in part of evaluation intentionality, obligations of evaluators, obligations to participants and evaluation process and product. Throughout the process of evaluation, it shall be in compliance with the United Nations Evaluation Group norms and standards\(^2\).

Upon the evaluation mission, the consultant will provide recommendations on required adjustments to the ongoing interventions from a strategic, structural and implementation point of view with a view to bring tangible results for children in the area of child protection. The evaluation mission will present its findings to UNICEF and the main stakeholders (i.e. relevant ministries) in written form (report) in English language including an executive summary of the findings of the evaluation.

**Evaluation questions:**
The evaluation seeks to answer the following sample questions, which intend to provide guidance to this evaluation:

**Relevance:**
1) Are the interventions planned and executed under the project in accordance with the strategic documents of UNICEF and the Government of Kazakhstan as listed above.

\(^{1}\) [http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines](http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines)
2) How appropriate are the UNICEF strategies aimed at developing of a sustained and operational child protection mechanism that prevents and responds to child abuse, exploitation and family separation?

Effectiveness:

3) To what extent have the UNICEF’s interventions concerning the independent Ombudsman’s monitoring and complaint system, violence and child abandonment prevention helped to improve local and national child protection systems?

4) What are the barriers and bottlenecks that impeded the implementation? What were the strategies to mitigate them? Their results?

5) What were the changes made to the intended activities and how they affected the programme?

6) What and how the innovative child protection approaches were introduced and can be used as an example beyond Kazakhstan?

7) To what extent the developed materials, research, information, documentation and presentations contributed to the overall intervention goal?

Efficiency:

8) To what extent were the following UNICEF Core Roles particularly efficient to achieve the results?
   - The ‘Voice’ for children and adolescents
   - Monitoring and evaluation
   - Policy advice and technical assistance
   - Leveraging resources from the public and private sectors
   - Facilitating national dialogue towards child friendly social norms
   - Enabling knowledge exchange
   - Modeling

9) How efficiently were used the financial and human resources?

Sustainability:

10) To what extent the Government and the non-government sector involved in project implementation have the capacity to sustain the child protection system components established by the intervention?

11) Based on lessons learned what specific recommendations could be given to each key partner under the project that would contribute to the sustainability of the intervention?

12) What areas of child protection require further funding?

13) What would be the transformed engagement of UNICEF in part of exercising its Core Roles (see above) as related to project areas in the future given that the Kazakhstan is expected to reach the high income country status by 2020?

Equity, Human rights Bases Approach (HRBA) and Gender Equality:

14) To what extent the action contributed towards promoting equity, gender equality and HRBA?

15) To what extent has the action integrated gender equality into the design and implementation of the project?

**Evaluation approach**

UNICEF brings a human rights perspective and strives to mainstream gender issues in all its work for children, with the Convention on the Rights of the Child as a principal reference, and recognizes the mutually supportive relationship between the Convention and the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women. UNICEF recognizes that the empowerment of women is
especially important for the realization of the rights of girls and boys, and for the creation of healthy families and society.

The evaluation is a part of an organizational re-focus on equity and a process of strengthening reforms that target inequities affecting the most disadvantaged women and children in Kazakhstan. According to UNICEF, equity means that all children have an opportunity to survive, develop, and reach their full potential, without discrimination, bias, or favouritism. This interpretation is consistent with the Convention on the Rights of the Child, which guarantees the fundamental rights of every child, regardless of gender, race, religious beliefs, income, physical attributes, geographical location, or other status.

An equity-based approach to UNICEF’s evaluation seeks to understand whether the undertaken intervention managed to address the needs and uphold the rights of the specific groups of the most vulnerable women and children in Kazakhstan as well as the root causes of inequity. Equity-based evaluations should also generate knowledge and recommendations for UNICEF’s further focus in child protection. To ensure comprehensiveness of the evaluation and taking into account the multi-dimensional essence of equity the evaluation should use a mixed-methods approach.

Evaluation should contribute to the UNICEF ‘theory of change’ as related to the project area. UNICEF involvement in child protection reform in the country and in the region is guided by a ‘theory of change’ approach based on understanding that the progressive realization of child rights and reduction of equity gaps is best achieved through changes in systems at national/regional/local levels and that sustained UNICEF engagement through its core roles contributes to these system changes.

The “theory of change” template to guide the evaluation to be included in the evaluation report and will be shared additionally. The “theory of change” will specifically look at how UNICEF contributed to the changes in project area by executing its Core Roles according to the established priorities for the country office. There is consensus that the following Core Roles are indispensable for a sustainable UNICEF engagement and its universal presence in support of results and the realization of the rights of children everywhere:

- **The ‘Voice’ for children and adolescents** – advocating and communicating around key national policies, social issues, mindsets and attitudes;
- **Monitoring and evaluation** – assisting independent assessments of the functioning of the Child Rights guarantee systems, the progressive realisation of child rights and the reduction in equity gaps in child well-being;
- **Policy advice and technical assistance** – through well-designed UNICEF positions (based on local, regional, international best practices) on key issues, supporting the development of the normative frameworks related to specific national legislation, policy or programme as well as private sector standards that can improve equity;
- **Leveraging resources from the public and private sectors** – accompanying and redirecting reforms;
- **Facilitating national dialogue towards child friendly social norms** – bringing together government, private sector and civil society, as well as convening divergent forces to enhance public debate, participation and action around equity and child rights;
- **Enabling knowledge exchange** – fostering horizontal cooperation and exchange of experience among countries and regions on ‘what works’ for enhancing child well-being and equity.
- **Modeling/piloting** – demonstrating how system could meaningfully evolve to reduce equity gaps and children’s rights violations.
Methodology:
The evaluator will be requested to develop a detailed methodology in line with UNEG standards and norms and present UNICEF M&E and Child Protection staff for approval prior to the start of the actual research/evaluation.

The evaluation methodology and tasks for the evaluator include:

- **An in-depth analysis of existing information (desk review).** A number of documents were prepared in the course of implementation of the programme including research reports, situation assessments, mission reports, recommendations to legal acts, protocols, costing results. The key documents are listed below.

  Desk review should also include the review of available administrative data. Sources will include Transmonee database hosted at the UNICEF Regional Office, as well as National Statistical Office. Potential data gaps will need to be clearly identified and the implications are to be included into the analysis.

  Additionally, the key indicators on child protection are accessible through public database of the Ministry of Labor and Social Protection, Ministry of health, Multi-indicator cluster survey 2010-2011, Annual reports of the Ombudsman and Children’s Rights Protection Committee of the Ministry of education and science of the Republic of Kazakhstan, model programmes data, indicated below thematic reports.

  In the course of evaluation the evaluator should consider the reliability of available data. The data from model programme covers only indicators and results within modeling sites (child abandonment and violence prevention) and does not extend beyond. The capacity for the data collection at the local level is still quite low and some child protection indicators are not always properly reflected in national statistics. In this regard, it is necessary to use objective and subjective data available from the official sources additionally verified by independent sources such as surveys and studies conducted by local and international research companies, NGOs and UN agencies.

  Line ministries keep specific data on child protection that is not publicly available but can be accessed through official request. Thus, the evaluator will be asked to provide a list of indicators or additional data pertinent to the evaluation. The list of indicators will then be officially sent to the government by UNICEF in a formal way.

- **Preparation of detailed evaluation methodology** based on present framework and the above-mentioned list of questions. The methodology should include specific data collection tools for identified below key stakeholders involved in the programme.

- **Country visits interviews and focus group discussions.** The evaluation team will conduct one data collection visit to the country. The country visits should include interviews with relevant Governmental bodies including Parliament; Ministries of labor and social protection, Health, Education and Science; Ombudsman; Local administration of selected regions; international and national NGOs working in the area of child protection; Royal Norwegian Embassy in Astana.
The evaluation team will conduct focus group discussions with social workers and psychologists involved in child abandonment prevention model programmes in Astana, Karaganda and Semey cities; with school safety teams under the model programme for violence prevention in schools and institutions; with children in schools where the violence prevention model programme is being tested.

The applicant should identify whether the involvement of national consultant for data collection will be needed and indicate the level of involvement of such consultant and budget his/her participation.

- Online interview with the key implementing partner involved in modeling integrated social services delivery on local level including for prevention of child abandonment and separation from the family (Family for Every Child); online interview with the consultant on modeling violence prevention programme in schools.

- Presentation of the findings with recommendations for further reinforcement of child protection system in Kazakhstan to a wider audience, information about the programmatic directions and funding needs.

**Evaluation milestones:**

The evaluator will be responsible for implementation of the tasks identified in the “Methodology” Section and will follow the timeline as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparatory phase:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of ToR</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>End of October 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of TOR by UNICEF RO for CEECIS</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>Mid November 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision of the TOR according to recommendations of UNICEF RO for CEECIS</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>15 November 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of the TOR by the MFA of Norway</td>
<td>MFA of Norway</td>
<td>20 November 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of external evaluators</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>16 December 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk review of the relevant studies, reports, research documents, coordination mechanisms, modeling services and referral pathways, legislation and normative frameworks developed during implementation. The documents for review to be provided by UNICEF – see the initial not exhaustive list of documents for desk review at the end of these ToR.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>23-31 December 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of inception report with the methodology and data collection tools for the evaluation in consultation with UNICEF and state stakeholders. The inception report should include specific questions on data that the evaluator thinks would be pertinent to the evaluation. The UNICEF office in Kazakhstan will then make official request for data to the relevant government offices.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>2-11 January 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data request to Government</td>
<td>UNICEF/Contractor</td>
<td>3 January 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics (arranging meetings / interviews)</td>
<td>UNICEF/Contractor</td>
<td>3-19 January 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Collection of requested data from Government or UNICEF 19 January 2014
Field visits (meeting/interviews/focus group discussions with UNICEF, Ombudsman, line ministries, local authorities, key implementing partners and stakeholders: staff of policlincs, schools, maternities, infant homes, orphanages, children) Contractor with the support of UNICEF 19-29 January 2014
De-briefing meeting with UNICEF and MOH Contractor 29 January 2014
Reporting:
Developing of interim report (including internal and external versions) and incorporation of UNICEF comments Contractor 4 – 20 February 2014
Finalization of the evaluation report (including recommendations to UNICEF and Government of Kazakhstan and summary report) Contractor 5 March 2014
Presentation of the findings Contractor TBC
Use of evaluation findings:
Dissemination of the final report to all partners and stakeholders UNICEF April 2014

Evaluation report structure:
The evaluation report structure must be compliant with the UNICEF-Adapted UNEG Evaluation Reports Standards, 2010 (attached) and include:

The report should be well structured, logical, clear and complete
a. The title page and opening pages
b. Executive Summary (2-3 pages)
c. Annexes
d. Object of Evaluation
e. Evaluation Purpose, Objective(s) and Scope
f. Evaluation Methodology
g. Findings
h. Conclusions and Lessons Learned
i. Recommendations
j. Gender and Human Rights, including child rights

UNICEF will keep the right to share the shorter (external) version of the report with the Government and make it public. Donors will receive a full (internal) report.

7. DELIVERABLES

1. Completed desk review (suggested 8 days)
2. Inception report including evaluation work plan, detailed methodology of evaluation and instruments, list of indicators to request from government (suggested 10 days)
3. Completed first visit to Kazakhstan for data collection in the field (suggested 10 days)
4. Interim report (including internal and external versions and the executive summary, full report not exceeding 60 pages) (suggested 15 days)
5. Final report and recommendations to UNICEF and the Government of Kazakhstan (suggested 5 days)
6. If needed, the second visit to Kazakhstan for presentation and discussion of the findings of evaluation (suggested 2 days).

All submissions should in electronic version (Word and Power Point).

UNICEF reserves the right to withhold all or a portion of payment if performance is unsatisfactory, if work/outputs is incomplete, not delivered or for failure to meet deadlines (fees reduced due to late submission: 20 days - 10%; 1 month - 20%; 2 months - 50%; more 2 months – payment withhold). All materials developed will remain the copyright of UNICEF and that UNICEF will be free to adapt and modify them in the future. These ToRs are an integral part of the contract (SSA) signed with the institution/consultant.

8. TIME FRAME

The selected consultant/institution will work for agreed numbers of days during 4 months (December 2013-March 2014). The exact schedule of the activities will be agreed with the institution/consultant based on the submitted proposals. The deadline for submission of final deliverables to UNICEF is 25 March 2014.

9. QUALIFICATIONS OR SPECIALIZED KNOWLEDGE/EXPERIENCE REQUIRED FROM CONSULTANTS:

- Consultant/agency experienced in evaluation of development programmes preferably in child protection area;
- Knowledge of child rights and social inclusion related fields, including child protection sector;
- Proven very good knowledge on child rights and current political and social trends and social reform processes in EEC and/or CIS countries;
- Excellent analytical and report writing skills;
- Excellent communication and presentation skills with government and community members;
- Fluency in English (written and spoken), knowledge of Kazakh or Russian is an asset;
- Ability to work within the international and multicultural environment.

9. BIDDER’S RESPONSE:

UNICEF accepts applications from individual consultants (see Section 10, ANNEX I for specific requirements for submission from individual consultants). The Selection Committee, comprising of UNICEF and responsible government representatives will review applications and make a final decision on a successful application.

The institution/consultants are required to submit a brief project proposal explaining the planned methodology, activities and envisaged budget. The budget should include fees, international and national travels, in-country living costs, fee for local consultancy if needed. The suggested number of payable days for evaluation is 50 but will depend on the methodology proposed by the applicant.

10. SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS FOR INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT(S):

UNICEF accepts applications from individual consultants.
1. Project proposal form an individual consultant should clearly identify and address the objective and key tasks of the assignment and include:
   a. Conceptual framework and assignment implementation methodology
   b. Detailed CV and completed and signed UN Personal History Form (see attachment)
   c. Proposed timeframes (hour days)
   d. List of publications or analytical reports (if applicable).

2. Estimated fee (price proposal) on based on:
   - Daily fee and number of total number of estimated consultancy days; OR
   - Lump sum amount requested for the consultancy

   In both options all other additional foreseen or expected cost or expenditures, or any deductions from the fee, etc. should be included.

3. Any other additional information to support the application (optional).

Whenever the consultant will be required to travel within Kazakhstan UNICEF will be responsible for providing translation services and transportation. UNICEF does not provide or arrange health insurance coverage for consultants.
Annex 2 – Theory of Change (ToC)

A. Brief background with baseline identification

Children in Kazakhstan are exposed to a high risk of living in poverty. In total, 45 percent of all children below the age of 18 live below the poverty line (compared to 33 percent for the total population). In 2010, a number of 38,386 children were without parental care, of whom 14,052 children were living in public residential care institutions. A number of 1,586 children under three years age were institutionalised in 2010. Only 25% of these children were orphans, the rest of them dubbed “social orphans” with families unable to care for them. Every year about 2,000 children in Kazakhstan are institutionalised.

Due to the lack of a strong child protection system, every day a number of children are exposed to violence, exploitation and abuse. Violence and exploitation of children has been acute in schools, institutions and in the community. Every second child in state care or at school experiences or witnesses violence and self-harm among children, from the side of teachers or care givers. In addition to violence in institutions and in schools, in 2011, 49.4 per cent children aged 2-14 years experienced different forms of violent discipline in the home.

The country lacks a comprehensive strategic document on child care to guide the reform process. In its Concluding Observations (2007), the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child expressed concerns that the mandate of the Committee for the Protection of Children’s Rights in Kazakhstan, which should cover the full range of children’s rights, might be limited as a consequence of its establishment under the Ministry of Education and Science. The institutional responsibilities are divided among a large number of central and local authorities. The fragmented institutional framework and lack of a comprehensive child protection policy led to disconnected reforms and limited results in the area of transformation of residential institutions, gatekeeping and development of community-based family support.

B. Intervention logic/hypothesis

According to the intervention logic of “Strengthening the Ombudsman’s Child Protection System in Kazakhstan” Project, prevention and addressing child abuse, exploitation and family separation could be done if:

- an enabling legal framework in line with human rights standards is put in place;
- child rights violations are effectively monitored and addressed;
- all key stakeholders cooperate within an integrated child protection framework, based on reliable evidence, tested models and international best practices;
- professionals working in the area of child protection have the capacity to identify, refer and address the needs of vulnerable children and their families;
- traditional social norms on institutionalisation, stigma and ‘punishment’ are overhauled in favour of family support, tolerance and reward practices and beliefs.

In this respect, the Project targeted the following groups: Human Rights Ombudsman: management and staff; Oblast and City administrations and staff involved in the planning, testing and delivery of child protection services, including child abandonment prevention; School/institution management and staff engaged in piloting the violence prevention model; Children attending schools or hosted in institutions piloting the violence prevention model; and media, reporting on child rights violations.

The intervention logic of the Project is illustrated in the Goals Hierarchy below.
### Goals Hierarchy of the Project

**Development Goal/Impact**
A sustained and operational child protection mechanism prevents and responds to child abuse, exploitation and family separation in line with international standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 1</th>
<th>Outcome 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child rights violations monitoring and complaints from regions are effectively addressed by Human Rights Ombudsman’s Office</td>
<td>Developed practical models of integrated child protection mechanism at local level are ready for national replication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outputs**

1.1 Recommendations from studies on preventing violence against children in public settings and schools, in-country child trafficking and child prostitution provided to the Government
1.2 Changes made to the Marriage and Family Code and other legal documents to address child rights violations
1.3 Increased access of children to the Ombudsman’s Office
2.1 Models of integrated child protection services, violence identification and referral mechanisms developed, tested and implemented in two oblasts
2.2 Model of prevention of institutionalisation of children aged 0-3 have reached 20% more family care solutions

**Activities**

1. Strengthening the Ombudsman Office’s capacity
   - Revision of the Ombudsman Office’s child rights referral and complaints mechanism
   - Capacity building program for Ombudsman’s office staff
   - A study on violence against children in schools
   - Identification of gaps in legislation
2. Models of integrated child protection mechanisms
   - Modelling of integrated child protection services in two Oblasts
   - Design, test and evaluation of a model of prevention of institutionalization of children aged 0-3 in two pilot communities
   - Testing out an identification, referral and response system on abuse and maltreatment of children
   - Capacity building programs/Social work curriculum
   - Two study tours on effective child protection systems and violence prevention mechanism
   - Two National Conferences on progress and future directions
   - National Public Awareness Campaign to prevent institutionalisation of children
   - Establishment of peer support groups through youth NGOs and inclusive Youth Health Centers
   - Monitoring and evaluation, documenting best practices, support costs

**Inputs**

- Technical assistance (consultants, experts)
- Trainers
- Materials, studies, reviews
- Travel and per diems
- Financial resources
C. Project Approach to Child Protection Reform from a TOC perspective

The approach to child protection reform implemented by UNICEF in Kazakhstan during 2011-2014 within the Norway-financed Project “Strengthening the Ombudsman’s Child Protection System in Kazakhstan” is further explained using the UNICEF MoRES system (Monitoring Results for Equity System) and illustrated in the figures below.

**c1) Impact level (MoRES level 4)**

The Project aimed to contribute to the development of a sustained and operational child protection mechanism that prevents and responds to child abuse, exploitation and family separation in line with international standards (development goal).

A part of the progressive realization of child rights and reduction of equity gaps that UNICEF sought to contribute through the Project was to ensure that children without parental care, who belong to one of the most vulnerable groups in society, would be cared for in a family environment where appropriate and in the best interest of the child. Given the legacy of the system in Kazakhstan, which was heavily reliant on large scale residential care, the overall vision for the reform was to reduce the reliance on residential care through a progressive shift towards a continuum of services (see Figure below) aimed to prevent family separation, especially for children under the age of three, child abuse and violence against children in schools and residential care institutions.

**Continuum of services**

This ToC, developed for the purpose of the Project evaluation, considers the following indicators of immediate impact, as agreed with the UNICEF country office team:
- No. of children without parental care, disaggregated by gender, age, disability and oblast (reduction needed);
- No. and rate of children living in state residential care institutions, disaggregated by
gender, age, disability and oblast (30% reduction needed);
- No. of children placed into family-based care or reunited with their family,
disaggregated by gender, age and disability (increase desired in the targeted
oblasts);
- Ratio of children in family-based care versus residential care (improved ratio in favour
of family-based care in the targeted oblasts);
- Child abandonment rate, total and for children under the age of three (reduction
needed in the targeted oblasts);
- No. of children benefitting of new services developed by the Project, total and
disaggregated by type of service and oblast.

c2) Expected Changes at Outcome Level (MoRES level 3)

The development of a sustained and operational child protection mechanism that prevents
and responds to child abuse, exploitation and family separation required that child rights
violations monitoring and complaints from regions are effectively addressed by the Human
Rights Ombudsman’s Office (outcome 1) and that developed practical models of integrated
child protection mechanism at local level are ready for national replication (outcome 2).

The Project has thus addressed a certain number of issues in a coordinated manner, which
are presented using the UNICEF’s MoRES framework developed in 2012 (see Table
Determinants Analysis below). This framework did not exist at the time when the Project was
developed, but it is a useful tool to classify the key areas of expected change and its
determinants. The framework has ten determinants, fully operational systems requiring:
- An enabling environment with
  1. Conducive social norms
  2. Adequate legislation in place
  3. Adapted budgets
  4. Operational coordination mechanisms
- Appropriate supply
  5. Availability of essential commodities
  6. Access to adequately staff services, facilities and information
- Ability to express demand
  7. Financial capacity to access the services
  8. Enabling social and cultural practices
  9. Continued ability to timely use the services
- Quality
  10. Adherence to required quality of services.

The Determinants Analysis include all ten determinants to set the overall framework, but the
evaluation has focused more on some of them which were mainly targeted by UNICEF
through the Project, i.e. social norms, policy and legal environment, coordination
mechanisms, availability of services and quality of staff and services.
### Determinants Analysis based on bottlenecks with UNICEF’s core roles and contributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determinants</th>
<th>Possible barriers/bottlenecks and rating (significant, moderate, no bottleneck, no information)</th>
<th>Possible indicators to measure success</th>
<th>Baseline or 2011/Current status (2013)</th>
<th>Periodicity and disaggregation</th>
<th>UNICEF contribution (Core Roles - CR*)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enabling environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CR: A, B, E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Social norms and political will are conducive to prevention of abuse, exploitation and family separation | Vulnerable children are seen to be better cared for in institutions as per common view of the society, but also by professionals who do not understand the harmful effects of separation from parents and institutionalisation upon children. *Rating: Significant* | No. of children deprived of parental care in residential care  
No. of children deprived of parental care in family-based care  
Ratio of children in family-based care versus residential care  
Proportion of professionals in the child care sector who believe that prevention of family separation should be the main goal for this policy area.  
Proportion of the general public who thinks positively of the goal to re-integrate children in alternative care into their families | 2011: 12.925  
2013: 9.879  
2011: 23.852  
2013: 23.803  
2011: 1.8 to 1  
2013: 2.4 to 1  
2011: na  
2013: Importance of family for development of child is admitted by majority of respondents.  
2011: na  
2013: prevailing belief that family is very important for child development; 54.9% of public considers that institutionalisation is unacceptable or should be used only if no other option is available | Annual  
By gender, age and region  
Public opinion survey  
Public opinion survey | Communicate targeted advocacy messages to the public and decision-makers, public information campaign on prevention of institutionalisation. Improve family support, gatekeeping & referral through advocacy, communication for development, awareness raising and capacity building of professionals and media, enhanced inter-agency coordination. Advise on improvement of the legal framework (Law on “Domestic violence”, Criminal Procedure Code, violence against children) |

---

1. No targets available in the project documents.
2. See section c3) for presentation of core roles of UNICEF
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adequate legal and policy framework for integrated child protection approaches</th>
<th>Prevailing social and professional norms favour punishment of children in schools, institutions or at home as the ‘right’ way to discipline ‘unobedient’ children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rating: Moderate</td>
<td>Victims do not report complaints against perpetrators due to fear of punishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating: Moderate</td>
<td>No. of children who were victims of violence from teachers/staff in the pilot schools and institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013: 66% (national) 2015: na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of reported incidence of problem behaviors/school violence among children received by the School Safety Team in 10 pilot schools and institutions of East Kazakhstan (violence prevention programme)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013: 25 2014: 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of complaints received by Ombudsman on child rights violations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010: 43 2013: 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Survey 2015 in schools and institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quarterly, by region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of reported incidence of problem behaviors/school violence among children received by the School Safety Team in 10 pilot schools and institutions of East Kazakhstan (violence prevention programme)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013: 25 2014: 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of complaints received by Ombudsman on child rights violations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010: 43 2013: 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Survey 2015 in schools and institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quarterly, by region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adequate legal and policy framework provide legal space for institutionalisation, child abandonment and fragmented support by a large number of central and local bodies, at the expense of family support or family-based alternative care of children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating: Significant</td>
<td>Lack of legally-bound integrated approach to developing social services for protection of family and children: development of standards of special social services provision separately for the systems of health, education and social protection results in coverage gaps for vulnerable groups of children and families as well as in narrow visioning of systems’ roles in service delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating: Significant</td>
<td>Policies provide for the establishment of integrated social support services for all vulnerable groups of children and families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legal framework is revised to be in line with international standards and serve the best interest of children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legislation under review: law on child rights, law on juvenile justice, law and standards of special social services, standards of operation of infant homes, Marriage and Family Code, law on domestic violence, law on violence against children, law on neglected and homeless children, Administrative Offence Code,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whenever necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CR: A, B, E, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advocate for legislation that establishes integrated, family-oriented social services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advocate for the development of a coherent policy direction of child protection reform, based on inter-agency cooperation and partnership between all key stakeholders at national and local levels. Review of the legislation on effectiveness of social services and their linkages to the cash benefits, prevention of unnecessary institutionalisation and separation from the family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support the government in documenting the promising practices and taking stock of lessons learned to inform future legislative reform directions and introduction of new services in law based on modelling of child protection systems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Rating: Moderate

The legal framework is insufficiently developed and it does not always serve the best interest of the child (e.g. most of children placed in institutions whose parents have not given up or been deprived of parental rights cannot be fostered or adopted, being deprived of a family-based environment; domestic violence and violence against children not addressed by the legal system).

**Rating: Significant**

No Ombudsman for children. Low level of children’s accessibility to Ombudsman.

**Rating: Moderate**

Increased accessibility of children to Ombudsman: no of complaints placed directly by children, child-friendly communication means.

|---|---|---|

### Integrated child protection services and models budgeted

Lack of local capacity to document, cost and budget the new services which makes difficult the planning of resources for their continuation and replication of the new services to other regions.

**Rating: Moderate**

New services are budgeted and costed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New services are budgeted and costed</th>
<th>2013: 3 pilot regions</th>
<th>Once, by type and region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Law on social benefits and taxes revised

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Law on social benefits and taxes revised</th>
<th>2013: 3 pilot regions</th>
<th>Once, by type and region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

CR: B, D, E, F

Technical assistance for costing and budgeting the new services. Costing of new services will help to better understand the financial implications to be fed into the annual budget planning. Pilot models in the selected regions to test feasibility and demonstrate effectiveness. Advocate for leveraging public resources for sustaining the new services and changes in the system. Expand the knowledge of the private sector in the underfunded areas of child protection and raise their motivation to contribute.
### Integrated coordination, gatekeeping and referral mechanism

Fragmented child protection system: division of responsibilities for child protection between different agencies at national, regional and local levels leads to lack of coordination and deficiencies in the gatekeeping and referral mechanisms between the systems, resulting in partial coverage of vulnerable children and their families by services. Professional roles strictly demarcated by standards set by ministries and departments, creating rigid barriers to which the child and parents have to conform.

Lack of local capacity to ensure an effective and efficient gatekeeping system, especially at the level of Guardianship and Care Unit of the akimats: improper assessment of the child, little support to parents in case that want to take care themselves of the child; provides a service to foster parents and guardians rather than a service for children, in that they facilitate adults to acquire children

Lack of understanding of the concept of ‘good enough parenting’ by the professionals and decision-makers, who set unreasonable standards for parents and which further lead to family separation and placement in alternative care

**Rating: Moderate**

### Data management system on the most vulnerable children and their families

- Model for integrated child protection services
- Available Protocol & procedure for referral & monitoring of children under three years at risk
- Available Handbook on Case management, Memos for professionals
- Manual for the model programme to prevent and respond to school violence
- Number of regions with operational integrated coordination, gatekeeping and referral mechanism in place

- 2013: updated
- 2013: 1
- 2013: 1
- 2013: 1
- 2013: 1 + 3

### Rating: Moderate

### Supply

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>CR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Available child protection, other family support services and violence prevention services</td>
<td>Families at risk, unregistered and migrant families have limited access to social services, employment opportunities and social housing. The risk of abandoning their families</td>
<td>A, B, C, E, G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **No.of children aged 0-3 who benefitted of new services in the pilot regions**: 2013: 352
- **No. of children aged 0-3 who were**: 2011: na

**Rating: Moderate**

Make available evidence on the shortcomings of a fragmented system of child protection and care upon the well-being of the child. Provide technical assistance and training to akimat representatives and professionals in the pilot regions to develop knowledge, skills, tools and methodologies to enhance coordination and ensure efficient functioning of gatekeeping and referral mechanisms between key child protection bodies and services.

Advocate for benefits and develop model services for most at risk families. Develop model services for alternative care.
No programmes or services of violence prevention against children in schools and residential care institutions.

Number of children who benefit of violence prevention services in the targetted oblast (East Kazakhstan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of families at risk of abandoning their child who benefitted of new services in the pilot regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Families</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No of families at risk who were prevented from abandoning their children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Families</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of families at risk of abandoning their child who benefitted of new services in the pilot regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Families</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Access to adequately staffed services and facilities

Insufficient social workers at local level, low paid, low status of social work which makes the occupation unattractive for students and demotivating for existing staff (hence important brain drain to other sectors). No social worker in maternities although the highest risk of child abandonment is exactly this place. Limited quality of training courses. Unclear division of roles and responsibilities between social workers and psychologists, social pedagogues and medical staff. Unequal distribution of social services between and within the regions due to uneven budget allocation on local level.

Number of social workers providing services to families and children (increase desired)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Social Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>11,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>6,348 (3,000 3th-7th grade), of whom 211 from institutions and 6,137 from schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CR: A, B, C
Advocate for the provision of quality social services to all vulnerable families and children, based on evidence derived from independent assessments and research. Raise capacity of social workers, and improve case management, Provide technical assistance for the development of training curricula for pre and in-service education and training.

Demand

No financial barriers to child protection services

1/3 of low income families do not have access to social services and benefits

Number of low income families which are beneficiaries of services piloted in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Families</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; Ombudsman</td>
<td>Foster care particularly for children below 3 is under-developed and lacks proper financial stimulation mechanisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and cultural practices and beliefs</td>
<td>Resistance of potential adopting/fostering families to accept a child from institution, particularly, a child with disability and/or of older age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced trust in child protection system and Ombudsman</td>
<td>Stigma associated to the use of some services (e.g. psychologist), lack of efficient and timely support to cover the needs and respond to complaints of rights violations might discourage vulnerable families to continue to use the child protection services or to place a complaint with the Ombudsman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CR: A, B Provide support for the revision of the legislation on adoptions. Advocate for the rights of children with disability and children in alternative care to a family environment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Standards of social services and care provision do not reflect family needs and prevention of family separation. Job descriptions do not reflect current tasks and responsibilities</th>
<th>Recommendations for the revision of standards of social services provision so that they are family oriented. Updated job descriptions</th>
<th>Law and standards on specialized social services reviewed and 30% accepted for legislative change, the standards of operation of infant homes are under review, regulations on job descriptions for social workers, staff of centres for minors’ adaptation</th>
<th>Whenever needed</th>
<th>CR: A, B, C, E, G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of services and child rights violations well monitored</td>
<td>No. of staff (social workers, psychologists, staff of centers for minors’ adaptation) with revised functions</td>
<td>No. of trainees and training hours attended by professionals in the pilot regions</td>
<td>2013: 830</td>
<td>Whenever needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and skills of social workers and other professionals dealing with vulnerable children and their families are outdated which decrease the quality of their performance and the quality of the service generally. Academic and vocational training curricula are obsolete. In-service training courses are very rare (once in 5 years).</td>
<td>No. of members of school safety team and training hours on violence prevention in East Kazakhstan region</td>
<td>No. of trainees and training hours attended by professionals in the pilot regions</td>
<td>2013: 300 trainees (280 women)/128 h</td>
<td>Annually, by region, gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating: Moderate</td>
<td>Modernized curricula for in-service training in social work and for violence prevention in schools</td>
<td>Modernized curricula for in-service training in social work and for violence prevention in schools</td>
<td>2013: 40 trainees (40 women)/24 h</td>
<td>Annually, by region, gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Referral Mechanisms for Responding to Law and standards on specialized social services reviewed and 30% accepted for legislative change, the standards of operation of infant homes are under review, regulations on job descriptions for social workers, staff of centres for minors’ adaptation</td>
<td>Referral Mechanisms for Responding to Law and standards on specialized social services reviewed and 30% accepted for legislative change, the standards of operation of infant homes are under review, regulations on job descriptions for social workers, staff of centres for minors’ adaptation</td>
<td>2013: 1+1</td>
<td>Annually, by region, gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2013: 1</td>
<td>Onces</td>
<td>CR: A, B, C, E, G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cases of Violence in Residential Institutions for Children</td>
<td>Typology of institutional partners able to inform the Ombudsman on breach of children’s rights in the regions</td>
<td>No. of trainees and training hours attended by Ombudsman staff</td>
<td>No. of trainees and training hours attended by child rights NGOs (partners of Ombudsman)</td>
<td>No. of trainees and training hours attended by media (partners of Ombudsman)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data management system on the most vulnerable children and their families</td>
<td>Data on child trafficking and exploitation, violence against children, available</td>
<td>2013: updated</td>
<td>2013: 3 studies</td>
<td>Annually, per type of partner and region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data management system on the most vulnerable children and their families</td>
<td>Typology of institutional partners able to inform the Ombudsman on breach of children’s rights in the regions</td>
<td>2011: limited</td>
<td>2013: NGOs, media, right watchdogs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toolkits for Ombudsman’s Office on monitoring child rights and on processing complaints from children and on their behalf</td>
<td>No. of trainees and training hours attended by Ombudsman staff</td>
<td>2013: 1</td>
<td>2013: 20 trainees (10 women)/36 h</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of trainees and training hours attended by Ombudsman staff</td>
<td>No. of trainees and training hours attended by child rights NGOs (partners of Ombudsman)</td>
<td>2013: 20 trainees (10 women)/36 h</td>
<td>2013: 27 trainees from 10 NGOs/22 h</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of trainees and training hours attended by child rights NGOs (partners of Ombudsman)</td>
<td>No. of trainees and training hours attended by media (partners of Ombudsman)</td>
<td>2013: 27 trainees from 10 NGOs/22 h</td>
<td>2013: 50 trainees (43 women)/24 h</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliable and disaggregated data on various aspects of child protection are not always available (e.g. child trafficking, various indicators with no disaggregation by gender, disability, age)

**Rating: Moderate**

The Ombudsman does not have a regional representation which makes difficult the monitoring of rights violations

**Rating: Moderate**
C3) UNICEF Contribution through the Project (MORES level 2)

A. **Being a strong independent voice for the most vulnerable children through advocacy and awareness raising** - by implementing a public awareness campaign and conferences with the participation of high level decision makers, preparing information materials and policy briefs on the issue, informing government and parliamentary debates, communicating clear and evidence-based advocacy messages with explicit focus on most vulnerable children and around key issues of violence against children, child abandonment, sexual exploitation and trafficking, integrated child protection services; promoting direct participation of children and youth in the provision of evidence and implementation of the project.

B. **Policy advice and technical assistance through the provision of top notch international and national expertise to strengthen capacities for child protection reforms** - in particular through supporting changes in policy and modernization of legislation, engaging technical expertise on modelling and piloting of innovative services, development of tools and procedures for these services as well as for a better monitoring and reporting of child rights violation, development of curricula and training programmes for professionals working in the child care and child protection system, curricula, trainings and technical assistance for the prevention of violence against children, reform planning and action setting, etc.

C. **Monitoring and evaluation of most vulnerable children based on independent assessments, studies and international indicators** - in particular through closing the knowledge gap by improving the knowledge base on the situation of children without parental care, child abandonment, violence against children in schools and residential care institutions, child vulnerability to risky behaviour, exploitation and trafficking; assisting independent assessments of the functioning of the child rights protection systems and equity gaps in child well-being.

D. **Modelling/piloting of new services and practices**, based on cross-sector cooperation, to inform policy making, demonstrate how system could meaningfully evolve to reduce equity gaps and children’s rights violations and enhance child care system management, coordination and planning; introducing new or revised working protocols, tools and procedures for such services as well as revised functions of staff, in particular of social workers and psychologists working in primary health care, staff of transformed adaptation centres for adolescents as well as of teachers, pedagogues and psychologists who are members of the school safety teams.

E. **Facilitating national dialogue towards child friendly norms and international standards through strengthening strategic partnerships** for integrated approaches in child protection and monitoring of child rights violations, bringing together government, private sector and civil society to enhance public debate, participation, synergy and coherent action around equity and child rights issues in national conferences and meetings; promoting child-friendly corporate social responsibility.
F. **Leveraging resources from public and private sector** for services aimed to prevent/address child abuse, exploitation and family separation – engaging in strategic dialogue with national partners (ministries, akimats, schools, youth health centres, primary health care units) and international partners supporting the strengthening of child protection reform (Norwegian Embassy, UNDP, SOS Children’s Villages, Special Olympics), obtaining financial resources for piloting and expanding new services (from the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Unicredit Bank, UN Trust Fund), supporting NGOs to get financing from various donors, generating knowledge on vulnerabilities of children to risky behaviours, sexual exploitation and trafficking together with USAID.

G. **Enabling knowledge exchange** - by contributing to the global and regional UNICEF equity agenda, through documented innovations based on tested models with replicability potential; fostering horizontal cooperation and exchange of experience among countries in Central Asia region (as done in Dushanbe in 2013 on the occasion of the 4th Child Protection Forum for Central Asia); organising study visits for Government officials in Turkey and Moldova; fostering horizontal cooperation and exchange of experience within and among the three targeted oblasts

These Core Roles which UNICEF has used in the implementation of the Project reflect the normative principles of Human Rights Based Approach to Development and Gender Mainstreaming and translate into UNICEF essential functions: (a) Advocacy and Partnership, (b) Policy Work across all sectors; (c) Monitoring and Evaluation; (d) Social Change Communication and Communication for Development; and (e) Operations Management.

c4) **Enablers/Inputs (MoRES level 1)**

To address the bottleneck through the UNICEF core roles, enablers in Kazakhstan will include **availability of baseline data, effective human capacity, financial resources, stewardship and governance.**

**Availability of baseline data** could be a strong barrier in better planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. Due to the sensitivity of child rights violations, UNICEF faced some constraints, which were to a large extent overcome by engaging critical players in data collection and reporting: Agency of Statistics, Ombudsman, ministries, akimats, schools, other local implementing partners and consultants/researchers.

For **effective human capacity and governance**, two child protection and education officers and one programme assistant acted as key human resource for the implementation of this theory of change, enabling a high level dialogue, providing technical support, documenting the process and identifying top notch international expertise needed, based on the detailed identification of key assignments. UNICEF Representative, Deputy Representative, Operations Manager and Communication Officer contributed to the overall advocacy, financial management, leveraging resources, recruitment and visibility of the changes.

**Financial resources** NOK 3,588,158 (USD 640,935\(^5\)) were provided by the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs as a part of a grant agreement signed with UNICEF. UNICEF also contributed NOK 1,204,970 (USD 215,238) from with its Regular Resources and grants of Unicredit/ATF Bank and Government of Kazakhstan (for the East Kazakhstan oblast). Given

that the UNICEF resources are limited, modelling was applied to test the feasibility and/or the effectiveness of innovations in the country. This theory of change models integrated child protection services, child abandonment prevention services for children under the age of three and their families and violence prevention in schools and residential care institutions. Given the financial capacities of the Government of Kazakhstan, there is a high opportunity for replication of innovations if they prove to be effective and cost efficient.

Having the advantage of working with different sectors, UNICEF could steward the exchange and ensured the sectors and partners partner with each other for better coordination, cross-sectoral response and design of joint strategic documents to be nurtured during the implementation of the theory of change. UNICEF ensured target groups, children and NGOs were closely involved into the dialogue and implementation of the theory of change, having the right to share their opinion about the progress in addressing bottlenecks.

A schematic illustration of ToC is provided in the Figure below.
UNICEF Contribution in Kazakhstan

- Strong independent voice for the most vulnerable children through advocacy and awareness raising
- Delivering top notch international and national expertise to strengthen capacities for CP reforms
- M&E of most vulnerable children based on independent assessments, studies, int'l indicators
- Introducing new services and professional practices, which were modeled and piloted
- Strengthening strategic partnerships for integrated approaches in CP and monitoring of child rights violations
- Leveraging resources from public and private sector for services aimed to prevent/address child abuse, exploitation and family separation
- Contributing to the global and regional UNICEF equity agenda with documented innovations based on tested models with replicability potential

System change outcomes

- Social norms conducive to prevention of abuse family separation
- Adequate legal framework for integrated approach
- Integrated CP services & models budgeted
- Integrated coord., referral & gatekeeping mechanism
- Adequate staffing of services and facilities
- Available CP & violence prevention services
- No financial barriers to CP services & Ombudsman
- Social and cultural values and beliefs challenged
- Quality of services and child rights violations well monitored
- Enhanced trust in CP system & Ombudsman
- Adequate legal framework for integrated approach
- Adequate staffing of services and facilities
- Available CP & violence prevention services
- No financial barriers to CP services & Ombudsman
- Social and cultural values and beliefs challenged
- Quality of services and child rights violations well monitored
- Enhanced trust in CP system & Ombudsman

Impact: Child abuse, exploitation and family separation is prevented and addressed by a sustained and operational child protection (CP) mechanism in line with international standards

Other stakeholders' contribution

- Children’s Rights Situation Baseline (MICS, SitaAn, UNICEF and partners studies)
- Human and financial capacities, stewardship and governance
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## Annex 4 – People Consulted during Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position/function</th>
<th>Institution/organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>UNICEF Kazakhstan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Radoslaw Rzehak</td>
<td>Deputy Representative</td>
<td>UNICEF Kazakhstan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Tatiana Aderikhina</td>
<td>Programme Manager</td>
<td>UNICEF Kazakhstan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Aislu Akhmediyarova</td>
<td>Child Protection Officer</td>
<td>UNICEF Kazakhstan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Äigul Nurgabulova</td>
<td>Health and Nutrition Officer</td>
<td>UNICEF Kazakhstan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Zhanar Sagimbayeva</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation Officer</td>
<td>UNICEF Kazakhstan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Violetta Krasnikova</td>
<td>Programme Assistant</td>
<td>UNICEF Kazakhstan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Oversight bodies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Vyacheslav Kalyuzhnyi</td>
<td>Head, National Centre for Human Rights</td>
<td>Commissioner for Human Rights of the Republic of Kazakhstan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Toty Kassymzhanova</td>
<td>Chief Expert, Social Assistance Department</td>
<td>Ministry of Labour and Social Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Gulnara Oryntayeva</td>
<td>Director, Social Assistance Department</td>
<td>Ministry of Labour and Social Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Zhanyl Zhontayeva</td>
<td>Director, Department for Pre-School and School Education</td>
<td>Ministry of Education and Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Yessengazy Islammaliyev</td>
<td>Vice-Minister</td>
<td>Ministry of Education and Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Raisa Sher</td>
<td>Chair, Committee on Protection of Children’s Rights</td>
<td>Ministry of Education and Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Magripa Yembergenova</td>
<td>Head of Mother and Child Health Unit</td>
<td>Ministry of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Donor Organisations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Ole Johan Bjornoy</td>
<td>Ambassador of Norway to Kazakhstan</td>
<td>Royal Norwegian Embassy in Astana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Victor Waldemar Jensen</td>
<td>Deputy Head of Mission</td>
<td>Royal Norwegian Embassy in Astana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Parliament</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Schools, residential care institutions, universities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Klara Baidildinova</td>
<td>Vice-Rector, Quality and Continuous Education</td>
<td>Semey State Medical University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Almagul Mukhamedkhanova</td>
<td>Director of the research centre and former UNICEF Consultant</td>
<td>Semey State University after Shakarim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Irina Ravnikova</td>
<td>Vice-Rector</td>
<td>East Kazakhstan State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Yelena Barabanova</td>
<td>Head of Psycho-physiologic laboratory, Centre for Qualification Upgrade</td>
<td>East Kazakhstan State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Aitzhamal Chamarova</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Centre for Adaptation of Minors, Semey city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Gulbairam Negmetzhanova</td>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
<td>Centre for Adaptation of Minors, Semey city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Zhanaïym Chamarova</td>
<td>Social pedagogue</td>
<td>Centre for Adaptation of Minors, Semey city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Serzhan Okasov</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Children’s Home no. 8, Semey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Birzhan Bulabayev</td>
<td>Deputy Principal</td>
<td>School no. 19, Semey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Altnynai Toktarova</td>
<td>Deputy Principal</td>
<td>School no. 34, Semey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Gulmira Dyzbenbekova</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>School no. 27, Ust-Kamenogorsk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Vera Kurochkina</td>
<td>Deputy Principal on Social Issues</td>
<td>School no. 27, Ust-Kamenogorsk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Akimats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Mansiya Iskazina</td>
<td>Former Head of Child Protection</td>
<td>Akimat of Astana city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Almagul Beisembayeva</td>
<td>Head, Division for Special Social</td>
<td>Akimat of Astana city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Services, Employment Unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Saule Mukusheva</td>
<td>Deputy Head of Healthcare Department</td>
<td>Akimat of East Kazakhstan oblast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Almira Toktarbekova</td>
<td>Head of Division, Child Protection</td>
<td>Akimat of East Kazakhstan oblast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Liliya Kuzemko</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Family Support Centre, Akimat of Ust-Kamenogorsk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Rakhima Abenzhanova</td>
<td>Head, Juvenile Police Division,</td>
<td>Akimat of East Kazakhstan oblast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal Affairs Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Bulat Kurzhikayev</td>
<td>Head of Guardianship and Care Division</td>
<td>Akimat of Semey city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Sarkyt Shabdanoova</td>
<td>Chief Paediatrician, Healthcare</td>
<td>Akimat of East Kazakhstan oblast, responsible for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department</td>
<td></td>
<td>Semey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Nataliya Korolyova</td>
<td>Head of Child Protection Division,</td>
<td>Akimat of Karaganda oblast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Child Protection Unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Yelena Rumyantseva</td>
<td>Chief specialist on Mother and Child</td>
<td>Akimat of Karaganda oblast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health, Healthcare Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Civil Society Organisations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Larissa Tikhonova</td>
<td>National Advocacy Advisor</td>
<td>SOS Children’s Villages Kazakhstan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Elena Dmitrienko</td>
<td>President, Editor-in-Chief of ZhasStar,</td>
<td>The Union of Children’s Public Organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Child and Law newspapers</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Zhuldyz’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Tatiana Golomolzina</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Public Union Centre Sem’ya, Karaganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Svetlana Volkova</td>
<td>Psychologist</td>
<td>Public Union Centre Sem’ya, Karaganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Svetlana Ivanenko</td>
<td>Deputy Chair</td>
<td>Perspektivt NGO, East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare Organisations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Roza Abzalova</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Center for Family Health 'Demeu', Astana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Gulnar Kumarova</td>
<td>Coordinator for Social and Psychological Services</td>
<td>Center for Family Health 'Demeu', Astana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Ziyada Nurmanganbetova</td>
<td>Psychologist</td>
<td>Clinic no. 5, Semey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Lyazzat Sarsembina</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>GP Clinic no.12, Semey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Gulzhan Toleubekova</td>
<td>Social worker</td>
<td>GP Clinic no.12, Semey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Nadezhda Puzikova</td>
<td>Psychologist</td>
<td>GP Clinic no.12, Semey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Yelena Korostylyova</td>
<td>District obstetrician-gynaecologist</td>
<td>Hospital no. 1, Karaganda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Lyudmila Boikova</td>
<td>Head of GP Department</td>
<td>Hospital no. 1, Karaganda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journalists/mass media representatives</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53. Kristina Emanakova</td>
<td>Journalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Alyona Kuzub</td>
<td>Journalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Olga Nikolayeva</td>
<td>'Vykhod Est!' Talk show Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Eldar Kurmanbayev</td>
<td>Talk show Editor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Youth Health Centres</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57. Yevgeniya Nesterenko</td>
<td>Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Makhabbat Nugumanova</td>
<td>Psychologist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultants</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>59. Ardak Sailaubayeva</td>
<td>Coordinator of the joint East Kazakhstan Oblast Akimat and UNICEF Programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Aiman Ispulayeva</td>
<td>Coordinator of UNICEF Programmes in Semey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. Robin Haarr</td>
<td>International Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. Zoya Tulendina</td>
<td>Former UNICEF Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. Svetlana Ryzhikova</td>
<td>International Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Questions (EQ) as per ToR</td>
<td>Judgement Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation Objective 1</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>RELEVANCE - To what extent is the Project responding to the needs of stakeholders and beneficiaries? Is it in line with national strategies and international commitments of the country?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ1 Are the interventions planned and executed under the project in accordance with the strategic documents of UNICEF and the Government of Kazakhstan?</td>
<td>• Alignment of project interventions with the needs and priorities identified in country strategies aimed to guide and advance realisation of child rights and child protection reforms&lt;br&gt;• Alignment of project with the strategies of UNICEF, MFA of Norway, Kazakhstan’s international child rights commitments and standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ2 How appropriate are the UNICEF strategies aimed at developing a sustained and operational child protection mechanism for the needs of children and their families?</td>
<td>• Adequacy of strategies employed by UNICEF in the project for the needs and challenges faced by vulnerable children and their families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation Objectives 2 and 6</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>EFFECTIVENESS - To what extent does the Project meet the outcomes as defined by the Description of Action (Application for Grant) and Theory of Change?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ3 Have the planned results been achieved to date (quantitative and qualitative)? What were the benefits for its various target groups: Ombudsman office, Ministries of health, education and labour &amp; social protection responsible for coordination and</td>
<td>• The project produced the planned outputs for each target group&lt;br&gt;• The outputs produced the intended outcomes (quantitative and qualitative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ4</td>
<td>To what extent have the UNICEF’s interventions concerning the independent Ombudsman’s monitoring and complaint system contributed to the improvement of child protection systems?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ5</td>
<td>To what extent have the project developed innovative approaches in child protection helped to improve local and national child protection systems? Could they be used as examples across and beyond Kazakhstan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ6</td>
<td>To what extent have the developed materials been used? Are they relevant?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Evaluation Objective 1

**DOCUMENTATION**

- To what extent did the project contribute to the attainment of envisaged outcomes?

| Documents (studies, researches, policy papers, documentation, toolkits, manuals) contributed to the attainment of envisaged outcomes? |
| studies, papers, manuals |
| • Utility of these materials for informing policy change, continuation of reforms in child protection, change in professional conduct and practices with the child protection system |
| addressed by the documents/materials for child protection reforms and challenges |
| • Evidence of practical use of these documents and materials by the national and local stakeholders |
| • Examples of most effective / ineffective documents in terms of resulting effects |

### EQ7

- What were the barriers and bottlenecks that impeded the implementation? What strategies have been used to mitigate them and with what results?

| Project reports |
| Reports of pilot regions |
| Interviews with stakeholders |
| Feedback from focus groups and discussion groups |
| Site visits to pilot regions |

| Employment of risk prevention and mitigation strategies: timeliness, relevance and effectiveness |
| Examples of factors which contributed or hampered the effective achievement of project outputs and outcomes |
| Evidence of measures taken to cope with barriers and overcome challenges and bottlenecks |
| Evidence of successful/unsuccessful effects of mitigation measures and strategies |

### EQ8

- Has the project provided any additional (not directly planned by the Project) significant contribution/outcomes towards improving the child protection mechanism in the country?

| Identification and assessment of additional (planned and unplanned) outcomes (effects) |
| The identified additional outcomes (effects) are (not) classified into positive or negative |
| Evidence through examples of additional outcomes (effects) and their appraisal |
| Effects (positive or negative) of identified outcomes |

| Project reports |
| Fieldwork investigations, including consultation with focus groups and main stakeholders |

### Evaluation Objective 2

**EFFICIENCY - To what extent did the management of the project ensure timelines and efficient utilization of resources?**

### EQ9

- To what extent were the following UNICEF Core Roles particularly efficient to achieve the results of the project?

| Project reports |
| Studies and reports, reviews of legislative system |
| Interviews with stakeholders |

<p>| UNICEF Core Roles particularly efficient to achieve the results of the project? |
| Project reports |
| UNICEF reports |
| UNICEF website |
| Interviews with stakeholders |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) The ‘Voice’ for children and adolescents</td>
<td>• Efficiency of UNICEF advocacy and communication around key national policies and child rights issues addressed by the project</td>
<td>• Effects of advocacy and communication activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td>• Extent to which UNICEF assisted independent assessments of the functioning of child rights guarantee systems, the progressive realisation of child rights and the reduction in equity gaps in child well-being</td>
<td>• Availability of independent assessments on issues addressed by the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Policy advice and technical assistance</td>
<td>• Efficiency of policy advice and technical assistance provided by UNICEF during project implementation for supporting the development of legal and policy frameworks aimed at improving child protection in the country</td>
<td>• Independent assessments, policy advice and technical assistance mobilised through the project speeded up reforms in the protection and realisation of child rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Leveraging resources from the public and private sectors</td>
<td>• Capacity of UNICEF to efficiently leverage resources for accompanying reforms in child protection at national and local levels</td>
<td>• Public/Private resources leveraged by UNICEF through the project to facilitate reforms of the child protection system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Facilitating national dialogue towards child friendly social norms</td>
<td>• The project brought together various stakeholders (government, civil society, academia, donors etc.) to enhance public debate, participation, synergy and coherent action around equity and child rights</td>
<td>• Coherence between the project and similar interventions’ objectives; co-ordinated implementation schedules; demonstrable effects of complementarity or overlaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Enabling knowledge exchange</td>
<td>• UNICEF fostered horizontal cooperation and exchange of experience among various regions and reports from pilot regions, site visits to pilot regions, focus groups and discussion groups, minutes of coordination meetings (if any), reports of study visits, conferences and other coordination events, materials for communication campaign</td>
<td>• Evidence of actions implemented through the project for experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evaluation Objective 3

**IMPACT - To what extent has the Project contributed to ensuring that more children in targeted regions grow up in a family environment and benefit from community services in case of need?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQ11</th>
<th>What project impact on the right of children to grow up in a family environment can be observed in the three targeted regions?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Contribution of the project to the decrease of children without parental care residential care institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Family-based care is the preferred alternative form of care in the targeted regions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ No. of children deprived of parental care living in state residential care institutions, disaggregated by gender, age, disability and region (30% reduction needed);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Placement rate of children deprived of parental care in state residential care institutions, disaggregated by gender, age, disability and region (reduction needed);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ No. of children placed into family-based care,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National statistics and reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research studies and assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews with key stakeholders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQ10</th>
<th>How efficiently were used the financial and human resources?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Management of the project ensured timeliness and efficient use of financial and human resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Chosen management and implementation modalities are in line with best practices of other UNICEF or donors’ intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Evidence that chosen management modalities provided for needed efficiency, timely delivery and adaptation/flexibility in project implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Examples of management intervention for overcoming barriers and constraints in project implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projects documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews with stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus groups and discussion groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site visits to pilot regions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**g) Modeling/piloting**

- The project demonstrated how the child protection system could meaningfully evolve to reduce equity gaps and children’s rights violations
- Examples of models of child protection systems developed, tested and disseminated
| EQ12 | What was the impact of the project on specific groups of vulnerable children in the targeted regions:  
- Children under the age of three  
- Children with disabilities  
- Children from deprived areas  
- Children exposed to violence in schools/institutions |  
- Contribution of the project to the increase of children and parents with benefitting from new services  
- Services are used by vulnerable families with children  
- Identified systemic barriers (administrative, institutional, financial, human resources, etc.) which reduce the identified impact of the project |  
- No. of children deprived of parental care, disaggregated by gender, age, disability and region (increase desired)  
- No. of children benefitting of new services developed by the Project, total and disaggregated by type of service and oblast;  
- No. of children under the age of three prevented from being abandoned in the pilot region  
- Factors reducing the impact of project (external and internal to the management of the project) |  
- Project documentation  
- National statistics and reports  
- Reports of international organisations (UN, CRC, WB, etc.)  
- Research studies and assessments  
- Interviews with key stakeholders  
- Site visits and focus groups, feedback from service users (to the extent possible) |

**Evaluation Objective 1**  
**SUSTAINABILITY - To what extent are the project outcomes achieved sustainable?**

| EQ13 | To what extent the Government, regional and local authorities (akimats) and the non-government sector involved in project implementation have the capacity to sustain the child protection system components established through the project? |  
- Legal and institutional framework allow the continuation of services introduced by the project  
- Evidence of cooperation between the public services and the NGOs in the provision of child protection services  
- New knowledge and skills integrated into regular activities of professionals working in the child protection system in the pilot regions |  
- No. changes in the laws and regulations adopted/approved enabling continuation of reforms in child protection  
- Cooperation agreements between the public services and the NGOs  
- No. of professionals applying new knowledge and skills in regular activities  
- No. of child protection services integrating new working methods developed by project |  
- Project documentation  
- Analytical reports by government and independent experts  
- Interviews with key stakeholders  
- Site visits and feedback from professionals and end beneficiaries (to the extent possible) |
### Evaluation Objectives 4 and 5

#### EQUITY, HUMAN RIGHTS-BASED APPROACH AND GENDER EQUALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQ14</th>
<th>What is the likeliness that the national and regional authorities (ministries, akimats, schools, institutions) will continue financing the new models and services introduced by the project?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Availability of human resources to maintain effects in beneficiary organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Further staff development planning, based on capacity building packages developed by the project, for keeping abreast with professional challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staffing of services is appropriate in terms of number and qualifications of staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Available staff development plans at regional/district level                                                                ographies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of new services introduced by the project where future running costs have been taken over by the regional/district budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence through examples of actions taken to ensure sustainability of services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project documents and reports Regional/District budgets Interviews and discussion groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQ15</th>
<th>Has the project actively contributed to the promotion of child rights?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alignment of the Project with child rights international standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use of a child-rights based approach in the design and implementation of the Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project documents make reference to CRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence that the Project has been guided and respected the principles of non-discrimination, equality, participation, rule of law, inclusion, progressive realisation of human rights, use of maximum available resources, empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project documents and reports Interviews and discussion groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQ16</th>
<th>To what extent has the project integrated gender equality into its design and implementation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicators in the project documents and reported in progress reports are gender-dissagregated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of women in the overall staffing of the inter-agency working groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project documents Project progress reports Reports of consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ17</td>
<td>To what extent and how the project ensured an equity focus?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Extent to which the training strategy of the Project is gender-sensitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No. of staff working in child protection system with revised functions, of which women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• % of women in the school safety teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• % of women participating in training courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Proportion of girls benefitting of new services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Interviews and discussion groups |

| EQ18 | How was the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the project? Which were the key success factors? Which were the major barriers? (summary conclusion) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Objective 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDATIONS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| EQ19 | What are the needs that should be addressed by future interventions for strengthening the reforms in the area of child protection in Kazakhstan? |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQ20</th>
<th>Which areas of child protection require further funding?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EQ21</td>
<td>What would be the transformed engagement of UNICEF (in part of exercising its Core Roles) in the project areas in the future given the fact that Kazakhstan is expected to reach the high income country status by 2020?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ22</td>
<td>Which good practices can be identified? Which lessons can be learned from the project approaches for possible scaling up in and outside the country?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 6 – Guides for Interviews

General methodological notes:

Each interview, focus group and discussion group will start with the presentation of the evaluation team and of the evaluation objectives, followed by the presentation of the interlocutors. Whenever necessary, a brief presentation of the Project will be also done. The questions will be sent in advance to the people who are going to be interviewed. Interviews will last 1-1.5 hours each.

The participants in focus groups and discussion groups will be briefed in advance about the major topics to be discussed during the meeting. The focus groups will be composed of 6-8 people, while the discussion groups could be larger (around 8-12 people). The focus and discussion groups will last 1.5-2 hours each (1 hour maximum for the focus groups with children) and will take place during the site visits to the regions and cities municipalities targeted by the Project.

Interview Guide for UNICEF management and project staff

1. What strategic needs of the child protection reform at national and local level have been addressed by the Project?
2. What are the major achievements of the Project that you are proud of? What was the most challenging in achieving these results? Are there any planned results which have not been achieved? Any unplanned results?
3. What was the role of UNICEF in achieving these results (core roles)?
4. What difference has UNICEF made via this Project for children, in particular for children with disabilities, and their families in terms of social inclusion and livelihood?
5. The integrated child protection model developed by the project has been tested in three different regions. What are the lessons learnt from this testing, especially in view of the intended scaling up of the model? Is the system/ministries ready for this?
6. The same question for the child abandonment prevention model.
7. Which capacity building activities and mechanisms were the most / least successful in achieving the planned results and outcomes and why? What was the effect of trainings delivered by the Project? Have the trainings reached a critical mass of professionals in the selected regions?
8. Were there any barriers or bottlenecks faced by you and your partners that affected the implementation of the Project? Please explain the delays in the implementation of several activities.
9. How would you describe UNICEF’s cooperation with the Ombudsman and the partner ministries? What went well (synergy)? What could have been done better?
10. What efforts did UNICEF undertake, and what challenges did it face in view of managing available funds efficiently?
11. Looking ahead, which of the achievements made to date are likely to be sustained or expanded without further external support? Which of them will require further support?
12. In your opinion, which are the top three priorities of the child protection reform in Kazakhstan that needs to be addressed in the coming years? How do you see the core roles of UNICEF in addressing these needs?

Also, some clarification questions concerning the Goal Hierarchy, impact evaluation, selection of East Kazakhstan for the violence prevention programme/schools/institutions, certification of training, quality standards, embedment of case management protocols into by-laws, partnership with private sector; monitoring and reporting mechanisms

Interview Guide for Institutional Partners (Ombudsman, ministries)

1. What was the role of your institution in the design and implementation of the Project?
2. To what extent was the project aligned with explicit priorities and needs of the (national/local) Government and/or your institution?
3. In your opinion, what was the value-added of the Project? (e.g. changes in legislation, capacity building, new services, new tools and methodologies, improvement of work practices, evidence/data on children’s rights violation and challenges, etc.)
4. What was the role of UNICEF in achieving these results? What about the other partners and stakeholders, including NGOs?
5. (only for ministries) The integrated child protection model developed by the project has been tested in three different regions.
   - What are the lessons learnt from this testing, especially in view of the intended scaling up of the model? Is the system/ministries ready for this?
   - What quality assurance system would need to be put in place?
6. (only for ministries) One of the planned outputs of the Project is ‘a model of prevention of institutionalisation of children aged 0-3 have reached 20% more family care solutions’. In your opinion, has the Project achieved it?
7. (only for Ombudsman) What are the reasons which impede children to directly address their complaints to the Ombudsman?
8. (only for Ombudsman) Do you cooperate in your work with NGOs and media? If yes, what was the Project contribution in this respect?
9. What was the effect of trainings delivered by the Project, especially given the important staff turnovers in the public system? Have the trainings reached a critical mass of professionals in the selected regions? Were the trainings certified?
10. Were there any barriers or bottlenecks faced by your institution that affected the implementation of your role in the Project and the planned Project results?
11. Looking ahead, which of the achievements made to date are likely to be sustained or expanded without further external support? Which of them would require further support?
12. In your opinion, which are the top three priorities of the child protection reform in Kazakhstan that needs to be addressed in the coming years? What could be the role of UNICEF in this regard?

Also, some clarification questions for Ombudsman concerning their annual reporting on child rights, NGO network on independent monitoring, use of manuals, toolkits etc. developed by the project
Interview Guide for the Royal Norwegian Embassy

1. How does the Project align with the strategies and priorities of the MFA of Norway? How does it align with Kazakhstan’s needs and international commitments?

2. In your view what were the major achievements of this Project and at which levels was the project most / least successful? Which were the factors that enabled or hampered the attainment of project objectives and expected results?

3. What was the role of UNICEF in achieving these results? What about the other partners (Ombudsman, MoLSP, MoH, MoES)?

4. How do you reflect on Project’s partnership arrangements and decision making structure?

5. Have you noticed any significant drawbacks and what worked well in the implementation? How did the project ensure co-ordination with other similar interventions funded by your organization to encourage synergy and avoid overlaps?

6. How well did M&E work (in your opinion)? What types of reporting were required from UNICEF, and what was the quality of information they provided?

7. Judging by UNICEF reports and your own monitoring activities, how did the Project perform in terms of reaching its overall planned goal and objectives? To your best knowledge, where was the most significant result/difference made?

8. What are the lessons learnt derived from your experience as donor in assisting UNICEF and its institutional partners to conduct this Project. What would you do differently?

9. Would you consider the results of the Project sustainable or do you believe additional donor interventions/projects are necessary to maintain the achieved levels of capacities and services? Would you consider supporting such projects in the future and why?

Interview Guide for other organisations (Parliament, academia, youth health centres, NGOs, consultants)

1. What is the mandate of your organisation?

2. Have you been involved in the implementation of the Project? If yes, how?

3. As far as you know, to what extent has the Project addressed the needs and priorities of the child protection reforms in Kazakhstan?
4. Are you aware of any outstanding results achieved by the Project? Who has benefited most from the Project?

5. In your opinion, are these achievements sustainable? Please motivate your answer.

6. As far as you are aware, do you think that the chosen implementation modalities of the Project were appropriate? Were there more efficient modalities that the Project could have been used (possibly used by other projects) to deliver the expected results?

7. According to your view, which are the top three priorities of the child protection reform in Kazakhstan that needs to be addressed in the coming years?

8. Do you see any particular role of UNICEF in addressing these needs/priorities?

**Interview Guide for media representatives**

1. What are the frequent child rights violations that you report on in your newspaper/TV channel?

2. Have you cooperated with UNICEF in documenting your articles/TV documentaries, advocacy, etc.? If yes, how?

3. Did you attend the training courses organised by UNICEF for media representatives over the last two years? (2012- Communication with children, ethics, Understanding sensitive issues; 2013 - Communicating about violence, addressing complaints). If yes, to what extent have these been useful in your work?

4. According to your view, which are the top three priorities of the child protection reform in Kazakhstan that needs to be addressed in the coming years?

5. Do you see any particular role of UNICEF in addressing these needs/priorities?

**Guide for Discussion Groups with representatives of akimats and members of inter-agency working groups**

**Introduction**

- Introduction of the evaluation team to the group
- Presentation of participants
- Provision of background information to the discussion group:
  - The purpose of the discussion
  - The intended recipients of findings and how they will be used
  - How feedback will be handled (issues of anonymity, confidentiality, data protection)
- Rules of the discussion group: who speaks when and agreement on how to indicate when one wants to speak
- The time allocated for discussion and explanation of the discussion group approach
- Answering any questions participants might have.

Discussion
1. How do you see your role in the process of improving child protection in your city/region, particularly with regards to most vulnerable children? What have been the measures undertaken by your institution to support the process of improving child protection in your city/region?
2. How has the Project supported your efforts? What do you think have been the biggest achievements of the Project?
3. What was your role in achieving these results? What about UNICEF’s role?
4. Would it have been possible to achieve these results/changes (if any) without the Project?
5. Has your akimat ensured sufficient human and financial resources for the continuation of the integrated child protection model and child abandonment prevention model developed by the Project and tested in your city/region? If yes, in what way?
6. What are the challenges ahead and ways to overcome them?

End of Discussion
Thanking participants for attending and giving feedback.

Guide for Focus Groups with professionals (psychologists, social workers, medical staff)

Introduction
- Introduction of the evaluation team to the group
- Presentation of participants
- Provision of background information to the focus group:
  - The purpose of the discussion
  - The intended recipients of findings and how they will be used
  - How feedback will be handled (issues of anonymity, confidentiality, data protection)
  - Rules of the focus group: who speaks when and agreement on how to indicate when one wants to speak
  - The time allocated for discussion and explanation of the focus group approach
  - Answering any questions participants might have.

Discussion
1. Exploring actual learning experience
   - What is your position and role in your organisation?
   - Which new skills and knowledge do you retain following the trainings delivered by the Project? Do you apply new skills and approaches in your daily routine? (explore, as well, use of manuals, toolkits etc. developed by the project)
2. Exploring actual changes in behaviours and attitudes

- What is the profile of children that you work with? (age, education level of parents, socio-economic status of the family, children with disability, etc.)
- How do you see your role in the process of improving the access of vulnerable children to quality services? What is most challenging?
- What do you think have been the biggest achievements of the Project in terms of improved child protection and inclusion upon finalization of the trainings and introduction of integrated child protection model / child abandonment prevention model?
- Would have it been possible to achieve these results/changes (if any) without the Project?
- What are the challenges ahead and ways to overcome them?

End of Discussion

- Thanking participants for attending and giving feedback.

Guide for Discussion Groups with school/institution safety teams

Introduction

- Introduction of the evaluation team to the group
- Presentation of participants
- Provision of background information to the discussion group:
  - The purpose of the discussion
  - The intended recipients of findings and how they will be used
  - How feedback will be handled (issues of anonymity, confidentiality, data protection)
  - Rules of the discussion group: who speaks when and agreement on how to indicate when one wants to speak
  - The time allocated for discussion and explanation of the discussion group approach
  - Answering any questions participants might have.

Discussion

1. What is your role as member of the school/institution safety team?
2. Have you been trained in fulfilling this role? If yes, what have you learnt that you did not know (or you were not aware) before?
3. What tools and methodologies do you use in your school/institution safety activity?
4. In your opinion, what has been changed in the school/institution since the introduction of the violence prevention programme?
5. What was the most challenging in implementing this programme?
6. Have you cooperated with UNICEF in the implementation of the violence prevention programme in your school/institution? If yes, how?
7. In your opinion, could this programme be replicated in other schools/institutions of other regions?

End of Discussion

Thanking participants for attending and giving feedback.
Guide for Focus Groups with parents

Introduction
- Introduction of the evaluation team to the group
- Presentation of participants
- Provision of background information to the focus group:
  - The purpose of the discussion
  - The intended recipients of findings and how they will be used
  - How feedback will be handled (issues of anonymity, confidentiality, data protection)
  - Rules of the focus group: who speaks when and agreement on how to indicate when one wants to speak
  - The time allocated for discussion and explanation of the focus group approach
  - Answering any questions participants might have.

Discussion
1. How have you learnt about the violence prevention programme?
2. Have you been involved in its implementation? If yes, how? Please give 1-2 examples.
3. Are you satisfied with the extent to which your ideas and views have been taken into account?
4. What do you think have been the benefits that the violence prevention programme brought to your children/ to their peers/ to your family/ to the teachers?
5. In your opinion, what should be done in the future to improve the safety level in the school and general behaviour of children?

End of Discussion
- Thanking parents for attending and giving feedback.

Guide for Focus Groups with children

Introduction
- Introduction of the evaluators to the children
- Provision of background information to the children in an easily understandable and friendly language:
  - The purpose of the discussion
  - The intended recipients of findings and how they will be used
  - How feedback will be handled (issues of anonymity, confidentiality, data protection)
  - Asking the children to confirm if they wanted to participate
  - Rules of the focus group: who speaks when and agreement on how to indicate when one wants to speak; free to leave the focus group when/if they want
  - Answering any questions children might have
• Presentation of children: they will be given colour pencils and paper, be asked to draw their name tag and finally be invited to present themselves (to warm up the atmosphere and break the ice)

Discussion
1. Does your school/institution have a mission statement? Do you recall it?
2. What is the behaviour expected from every pupil in the school / child in the institution?
3. Have these behaviour expectations (rules) been explained to you?
4. Are these rules respected by children in the school/institution? (participating children will be asked to mark their responses on an individual paper: “never”, “sometimes”, “very often”; their responses will be kept confidential to their peers)
5. What do you do when you see a child who does not respect the rules?
6. Can you give us an example of your own behaviour which you are most proud of?

Interview Guide for service beneficiaries (parents at risk of abandoning their child 0-3 years)

1. Life circumstances which led to the risk of abandoning the child.
2. Services that beneficiary parents used to prevent child abandonment: what services, how have learnt about them, how useful they were, how accessible?
3. Current and further challenging in upbringing the child.
4. What services would they need for helping them overcome these challenges? (Priorities, opinions, proposals)
#### GOALS HIERARCHY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Goal</th>
<th>According to Description of Action</th>
<th>According to the Progress Reports</th>
<th>Suggested indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                  | A sustained and operational child protection mechanism which prevents and responds to child abuse, exploitation and family separation in line with international standards | • Reduction in the number of children victims of in-country trafficking and child prostitution in targeted oblasts  
• 30% reduction in the placement of children in state child care institutions, including CwD, by strengthening preventative and family support mechanisms in targeted oblasts  
• Integrated child protection mechanism ready for national replication  
• Modern child protection legislation framework introduced based on tested models and recommendations  
• Increased capacities of key state and non-state stakeholders engaged in child protection system at central and local level  
• Children and youth participate in peer support and establishment of child protection system in their communities  
• Knowledge on vulnerable children and their challenges was brought to the government’s attention | • Developed practical model of local integrated child protection mechanism is ready for national replication  
• Data management system on the most vulnerable children and their families updated  
• # of new child protection services are introduced  
• revised national child protection legal and policy framework  
• # of staff with revised functions | • # of children without parental care, disaggregated by gender, age, disability and oblast (reduction needed);  
• # and rate of children living in state residential care institutions, disaggregated by gender, age, disability and oblast (30% reduction needed);  
• #of children placed into family-based care / reunited with their family, disaggregated by gender, age and disability (increase desired);  
• Ratio of children in family-based care versus residential care (improved ratio in favour of family-based care);  
• Child abandonment rate, total and for children under the age of three (reduction needed);  
• # of children benefiting of new services developed by the Project, total and disaggregated by type of service and oblast.  
• # of children victims of in-country trafficking and child prostitution (reduction needed)  
• Legal framework on child protection aligned with international standards  
• Compliance of staffing of child protection services and their funding with the requirements of national quality standards and international practice |

#### Outcomes

1. Child rights violations monitoring and complaints from regions are effectively addressed by the Human Rights Ombudsman’s Office

| (list of indicators, not assigned to a specific outcome) | • Data management system on the most vulnerable children and their families updated  
• No. of new child protection services introduced  
• Revised national child protection legal and policy framework  
• No. of staff with revised functions | • # of complaints received directly from children and processed  
• # of capacity building trainings for Ombudsman staff conducted  
• Practical Toolkits for Ombudsman’s Office on monitoring child rights in institutions, and on processing complaints from children and on their behalf are developed  
• Study on vulnerable children conducted | • # of child rights violations identified by the Ombudsman office itself  
• # of NGOs, media and other partners cooperating with Ombudsman in the identification of child rights violations  
• # of cases of child rights violations monitored  
• % resolution rate of child rights violation cases following recommendations issued by the Ombudsman; average duration of case resolution  
• Enhanced capacity of Ombudsman, measured by:  
  - # of trainees attending capacity building events; # of training hours  
  - learning outcomes (reflected in the first 4 indicators)  
  - # of developed toolkits, procedures, manuals on monitoring children’s rights and processing complaints in use  
  • # of trainees from media; # of training hours |
### Outputs

#### 1.1 Recommendations from studies on preventing violence against children in public settings and schools, in-country child trafficking and child prostitution provided to the Government

- Study report includes a set of practical recommendations, printed and distributed
- 

#### 1.2 Changes made to the Marriage and Family Code and other legal documents to address child rights violations

- Study reports include a set of practical recommendations, printed and distributed
- No. of changes introduced to legal documents
- No. of complaints received directly from children and processed
- Two models incorporate all necessary components for the delivery of integrated child protection services
- No. of children placed into family care or re-united with their families
- No. of social workers trained and involved in case management

#### 1.3 Increased access of children to the Ombudsman's Office

- Study report includes a set of practical recommendations, printed and distributed
- No. of changes introduced to legal documents
- No. of complaints received directly from children and processed
- Two models incorporate all necessary components for the delivery of integrated child protection services
- No. of children placed into family care or re-united with their families
- No. of social workers trained and involved in case management

#### 2.1 Models of integrated child protection services, violence identification and referral mechanisms developed, tested and implemented in two oblasts

- Two models incorporate all necessary components for the delivery of integrated child protection services
- No. of children placed into family care or re-united with their families
- No. of social workers trained and involved in case management

#### 2.2 Model of prevention of institutionalisation of children

- Two models incorporate all necessary components for the delivery of integrated child protection services
- No. of children placed into family care or re-united with their families
- No. of social workers trained and involved in case management

#### 2.3 Transferability potential of piloted models of integrated child protection services, with focus on child abandonment prevention of children aged 0-3 years (in terms of legal backing, resource affordability, effectiveness)

- Study report includes a set of practical recommendations, printed and distributed
- No. of changes introduced to legal documents
- % of recommendations for change in the total no. of suggested changes reflected in the adopted version of amendment of the legal provisions
- Two models incorporate all necessary components for the delivery of integrated child protection services
- No. of children placed into family care or re-united with their families
- No. of social workers trained and involved in case management

### 2. Developed practical models of integrated child protection mechanism at local level are ready for national replication

- Two models incorporate all necessary components for the delivery of integrated child protection services
- No. of children placed into family care or re-united with their families
- No. of social workers trained and involved in case management

### (list of indicators, not assigned to a specific output)

- No. of changes introduced to legal documents
- No. of complaints received directly from children and processed
- Two models incorporate all necessary components for the delivery of integrated child protection services
- No. of children placed into family care or re-united with their families
- No. of social workers trained and involved in case management

### # of models of child abandonment prevention (0-3y)

- No. of models of child abandonment prevention (0-3y)
- No. of oblasts where models of child abandonment were tested/implemented

### # of oblasts

- No. of oblasts where models of integrated child protection services, violence identification and referral mechanisms were tested/implemented
- # of professionals trained; # of training hours
- # of staff with revised functions
- # of school/institution management and staff engaged in the piloting of violence prevention model
- # of children in schools piloting violence prevention model
- # of developed toolkits, procedures, manuals
- # of children / youth participating in peer support groups
- # of study tours
- # of national conferences on progress / future directions
- # of models of child abandonment prevention (0-3y)
- No. of oblasts where models of child abandonment were tested/implemented

### # of school/institutions

- No. of school/institutions piloting violence prevention model
- # of developed toolkits, procedures, manuals
- # of children / youth participating in peer support groups
- # of study tours
- # of national conferences on progress / future directions
- # of models of child abandonment prevention (0-3y)
- No. of oblasts where models of child abandonment were tested/implemented

### # of children

- No. of children placed into family care or re-united with their families
- No. of children participating in peer support groups
- No. of children participating in study tours
- No. of children participating in national conferences on progress / future directions
- No. of children participating in models of child abandonment prevention (0-3y)
- No. of oblasts where models of child abandonment were tested/implemented
| aged 0-3 have reached 20% more family care solutions | • # of social workers trained and involved in case management | prevention were tested/implemented  
• # of professionals trained: # of training hours  
• # of staff with revised functions  
• # of developed toolkits, procedures, manuals  
• % of cases using the model to address risk of child abandonment  
• # of National Public Awareness Campaign to prevent institutionalisation of children |
### Annex 8 – Results of the Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators (as per DoA and Progress Reports)</th>
<th>Baseline (2011)/Target</th>
<th>Achieved (as of March 2014)</th>
<th>Achieved/Planned (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact, Outcomes and Output levels</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in the number of children victims of in-country trafficking and child prostitution in targeted oblasts</td>
<td>209 / No target</td>
<td>Unknown, no records in official statistics or in project documents</td>
<td>Calculation not possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of placement of children in state care institutions</td>
<td>12,925 children in 2011 / 30% reduction</td>
<td>9,879 children in 2013 (23% reduction)</td>
<td>Partially achieved (77%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of children placed into family care or re-united with their families in target oblasts</td>
<td>0 / No target</td>
<td>195 children aged 0-3 in target regions</td>
<td>Calculation not possible, no target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention of institutionalisation of children aged 0-3 have reached 20% more family care solutions</td>
<td>0 / 20% more family care solutions</td>
<td>40-60% children aged 0-3 at risk prevented from being abandoned in target regions (proxy indicator)</td>
<td>Overly achieved in target regions (200-300%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of changes introduced to legal documents (Marriage and Family Code and other legal documents)</td>
<td>Legal framework in need of modernisation in line with international standards / No target</td>
<td>Review and recommendations provided for Marriage and Family Code, foster care regulations, 5-step policy, Law on Specialised social services and implementation standards, monitoring and coordination functions, Law on National Prevention Mechanism (NPM), legislation and strategy on violence against children, Criminal Code, Regulations on Infant homes and social workers, draft law concerning improvement of the system of juvenile justice, draft law on youth. Over 30% recommendations approved by the MoLSPP to be introduced in the revisions of legislation. Draft Law on NPM adopted. Concept Note on legislative amendments concerning the protection of the rights of children developed and commented.</td>
<td>Assessment not possible, no target</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

7 Based on cases identified by NGOs in seven urban areas, including the target regions, and reported in the UNICEF study from 2012 on child trafficking and prostitution, reviewed by the evaluation team for the evaluation purposes.

8 Committee for the Protection of Children’s Rights in Kazakhstan (Ministry of Education and Science).

9 According to UNICEF response, March 2014, following clarification request from evaluation team, internal evaluation document “Additional documents and information needed for the evaluation”

10 Based on various assessments and critical reviews of independent experts, UNICEF, think tanks, NGOs which were reviewed for this evaluation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data management system on the most vulnerable children and their families updated</th>
<th>Lack of disaggregated data, incomplete or incoherent sets of data to picture vulnerability(^{11}) / No baseline / Updated system</th>
<th>Profiling of children conducted in East Kazakhstan institutions and Astana infant home. Review of data on children with disabilities in Karaganda. The Committee on the Rights of the Child, the Republican Centre for Health Development and the Agency of Statistics of the RK base their work on annual planning. Collection is performed by local departments and compiled, processed and analyzed on central level. Information is stored in established databases. Transmoniee is also regarded as data storage.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developed practical model of local integrated child protection mechanism is ready for national replication</td>
<td>0 / 1</td>
<td>Piloted, not fully documented yet, not ready for replication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two models incorporate all necessary components for the delivery of integrated child protection service</td>
<td>0 / 2</td>
<td>4 (1 integrated child protection model, 3 child abandonment prevention models in Astana, Karaganda and Semey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of new child protection services are introduced</td>
<td>0 / 2 child abandonment prevention</td>
<td>9 (3 child abandonment prevention, 1 violence prevention, 5 transformed centres of adaptation of adolescents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of peer support groups through youth NGOs and inclusive Youth Health Centers</td>
<td>No baseline / 6 youth peer support groups</td>
<td>30 (11 youth health centres, 19 youth rural centers) <em>result of other UNICEF initiatives, not a direct project effect</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of staff with revised functions</td>
<td>0 / No quantitative target At least social workers in the health system and staff of centers for adaptation(^{12})</td>
<td>830 (supervisors of social workers, social workers and psychologists in polyclinics, infant homes, maternity words and centres for the adaptation of adolescents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of social workers trained and involved in case management in target oblasts</td>
<td>0(^{13}) / No targets</td>
<td>300 professionals from target regions trained in case management, social work; 120 training hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of complaints received directly from children and processed</td>
<td>0 / At least 30(^{14})</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{11}\) ibid
\(^{12}\) According to UNICEF response, March 2014, following clarification request from evaluation team, internal evaluation document “Additional documents and information needed for the evaluation”
\(^{13}\) ibid
\(^{14}\) ibid
# of capacity building trainings for Ombudsman staff conducted | 0 / No target | 4 trainings, 20 trainees (10 women) Ombudsman staff, 36 training hours | Calculation not possible, no target
Practical Toolkits for Ombudsman’s Office on monitoring child rights in institutions, and on processing complaints from children and on their behalf are developed | 0 / 2 | 2 | Achieved (100%)
Study reports includes a set of practical recommendations, printed and distributed | 0 / 2 studies | 2 studies on violence against children in public settings and schools and on in-country child trafficking and child prostitution | Achieved (100%)
Two study tours on effective child protection systems and violence prevention mechanism | 0 / 2 | 2 | Achieved (100%)
Two National Conferences on progress and future directions | 0 / 2 | 1, final conference planned for May 2014 | Partially achieved (50%)
National Public Awareness Campaign to prevent institutionalisation of children | 0 / 1 | 1 | Achieved (100%)

**Target groups**

| Professionals working in child protection in central and local agencies | 700 | 491 trained, 830 professionals with revised functions, participants in the national conference and study visits | Overachieved
| School/Institution management and staff engaged in the piloting of violence prevention model | 7 schools 3 institutions 900 staff members | 7 schools 3 institutions 150 staff members | Achieved (100%)
| Local NGOs and peer support groups which will be provided with knowledge and skills to deliver child protection services | 10 NGOs 6 peer support groups | 10 NGOs (27 trainees, 22 training hours; members of inter-agency groups or service providers) see above | Achieved (100%)
| Media, reporting on child rights violations | No target | 50 trainees (43 women), 24 training hours | Calculation not possible, no target

**Final beneficiaries**

14 ibid
15 Baselines not applicable, only targets
16 Interview with East Kazakhstan State University. The PCA mentions only 150 teachers, but only for grades 3rd-7th. With the expansion of the programme to all grades, the figure might be 900.
17 Baselines not applicable, only targets
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Achieved/Calculated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children and parents benefiting of child prevention abandonment in the pilot regions</td>
<td>No target</td>
<td>Calculation not possible, no target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>352 children&lt;sup&gt;18&lt;/sup&gt; / 348 families&lt;sup&gt;19&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children and parents benefiting of violence prevention services in the pilot region</td>
<td>3,000 children&lt;sup&gt;20&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Overly achieved (211%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6,348 children (due to expansion from 3th-7th grades to all grades)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children currently placed in institutional care, including children with disabilities, by enhancing the system of child protection in the targeted regions</td>
<td>No target for parents</td>
<td>Calculation not possible, no figures available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No available figures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children likely to be placed in institutional care each year</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>No monitoring data available, but could be considered beneficiaries of an improved legal framework, better quality of services, more prevention and family-based solutions promoted by the project, better awareness level of parents concerning the risks of institutionalisation and available support services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children identified as being “at risk” (children at risk of self-harm, trafficking and child prostitution who will benefit of professional assistance; children from most vulnerable families in Kazakhstan by future replication of the models)</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General public in need of awareness raising for prevention of harm to children</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>Beneficiaries of public information campaigns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>18</sup> It includes actual figures for Karaganda and Astana (all beneficiaries) and estimated figures for Semey (based on reported cases which were prevented from abandonment plus an average of 50% more of cases serviced but with no successful result).

<sup>19</sup> Interviews with local contractors (Demeu Astana, Sem’ya Karaganda) and Semey chief paediatrician.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid
Annex 9 – Additional Documents and Information needed for Evaluation

International consultancy on evaluation of the supported by the Government of Norway programme on developing a sustained and operational ombudsman’s child protection mechanism that prevents and responds to child abuse, exploitation and family separation in line with international standards
/KAZA/2013/009

ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS AND INFORMATION NEEDED FOR THE EVALUATION

1) Detailed budget breakdown of the project (mentioned as an attachment to the Application for Grants) – planned budget

2) An up-to-date breakdown of expenditures, end of January 2014 – actual expenditures
   Note: 1) and 2) are important for the evaluation of efficiency. I have only the broad budget categories which does not help too much. The detailed financial reports attached to the two progress reports would also help (I got only the narrative).

3) Up-to-date progress of the project, end of January 2014

4) Data on Project indicators (Tables 1 and 2)
   Note: Related to 3), the latest progress report is until June 2013 and I would like to capture your achievements to date as well. Concerning 4), such data are essential to inform the evaluation. Please be so kind and fill in the attached Tables 1 and 2 to the extent possible and/or submit an official request to the Government/Oblasts, as per ToR, pages 8 and 10. I have gone through all databases, reports and studies available in English and I have not been able to identify the needed information. Once the national expert will be on board, I will ask him to look particularly into the statistical data on the CRP Committee/Ministry of Education website and into the reports from the pilot Oblasts.

5) Goal Hierarchy as attached to the Application for Grants
   Note: In the Application for Grants, only one Outcome is mentioned. However, the Goal Hierarchy that I received from you specifies two Outcomes.

6) Theory of Change template
   Note: According to the ToR, page 7

7) Progress reports for Semey/Ust-Kamenogorsk
   Note: I received the reports only from Karaganda and Astana

8) Full set of Every Child’s reports
   Note: I received only the Inception Report

---

21 Transmonee 2013 – data available only until 2011 and not disaggregated by regions: National Statistical Agency – I picked up data on poverty and unemployment per regions; MICS 2010-2011 – no relevant data for this evaluation; public databases of the ministries of labour and health – not able to identify them on their websites (EN pages); annual reports of Ombudsman – not available to identify them on its website (EN pages); CRP Committee/Ministry of Education – statistics available only in RU, while available reports for 2011 posted on its website were for other regions than those targetted by this evaluation; Model programmes data – reports are in RU; Thematic reports/studies – mainly national data, not useful for filling in the regional data.
   Note: These docs are important for the project context and for the analysis of project relevance. I was not able to find them on internet.

10) Relevant national legislation and strategies (social welfare, education, health), ideally the English version if available
   Note: These are mentioned in the ToR, pages 2 and 13, and are important for the analysis of relevance, effectiveness, impact.

11) Training documentation and figures (Table 3)
   Note: I would need any available TNAs and Training Reports in relation to the courses delivered to the Ombudsman staff and to the social workers and other specialists. Please also fill in Table 3 attached.

12) Contribution of the project to specific legislation and policy framework revision and development (Table 4)
   Note: The two progress reports mention various legal and policy documents, but it is unclear to what extent there was a specific contribution of the project to their revision/design. For instance, the new Marriage and Family Code has been adopted in December 2011, so quite soon after the project start-up in June – was there any input from the project? Please fill in Table 4 attached.

13) Toolkits, Manuals, Studies produced under the project (Table 5)
   Note: It would be very useful for effectiveness, but also for sustainability analysis to have a clear inventory of ‘intelligence’ deliverables in Table 5.

14) Information on the 6 peer support groups: membership, activities, results to date

15) Reports of the two study tours, if available; any follow-up

16) Initial Implementation Plan (as attached to the Application for Grants) and the Grant letter KAZ-11/0003, updating the implementation period.

17) Clarification on the project partnership. Attachments to the Application for Grants on all Cooperating partners. Cooperation agreements between UNICEF and these partners for the implementation of this project, if any
   Note: In the main Application, 3.1, only the Ombudsman is mentioned; however, project responsibilities are also entrusted to Ministries of Health and Labour according to 3.2 plus oblasts. In the first progress report, Ministry of Education shows up as a new partner.

Camelia Gheorghe, 5 February 2014
### TABLES

#### Table 1. Project Indicators – overall project level (template)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline (2011)</th>
<th>Target (planned level at the end of the project)</th>
<th>Achieved to date (Jan 2014**)</th>
<th>Data source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of complaints directly received from children, of which processed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of new child protection services* introduced, total and by region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of children benefitting of new services due to the project, total and disaggregated by gender, disability and pilot region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of staff working in child protection system with revised functions, of whom women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of trained social workers engaged in case management, of whom women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Specify which are these  ** Or the latest figure available, indicating the year/month

#### Table 2. Project Indicators – regional level (template)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline (2011)</th>
<th>Target (planned level at the end of the project)</th>
<th>Achieved to date (Jan 2014**)</th>
<th>Data source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poverty rate (Share of population with income lower than value of</td>
<td>National Karaganda East-Kazakhstan Astana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>subsistence level</th>
<th>National Karaganda East-Kazakhstan Astana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth unemployment rate (15-24)</td>
<td>National Karaganda East-Kazakhstan Astana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of cases of child trafficking and prostitution</td>
<td>National Karaganda East-Kazakhstan Astana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of children in all trafficking cases</td>
<td>National Karaganda East-Kazakhstan Astana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of state child care institutions, total and for CwD</td>
<td>National Karaganda East-Kazakhstan Astana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of children in state care institutions, total and dissaggregated by gender and disability</td>
<td>National Karaganda East-Kazakhstan Astana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of children deprived of parental care, total and dissaggregated by gender and disability</td>
<td>National Karaganda East-Kazakhstan Astana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of annually placed children in state institutions, total and dissaggregated by gender and disability</td>
<td>National Karaganda East-Kazakhstan Astana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of children placed into family or reunited with their family, total and dissaggregated by gender and disability</td>
<td>National Karaganda East-Kazakhstan Astana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of families reunited with their children</td>
<td>National Karaganda East-Kazakhstan Astana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of social workers engaged in case management, of whom women</td>
<td>National Karaganda East-Kazakhstan Astana</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* One table for each of the three regions ** Or the latest figure available, indicating the year/month
Table 3. Training courses delivered until January 2014 (template)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of the course</th>
<th>Training provider</th>
<th>Main training topics</th>
<th>Period and location</th>
<th>No. of training hours/course</th>
<th>Target audience</th>
<th>No. of trainees Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Legal and Policy Framework (template)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of law/policy document</th>
<th>Project contribution to its design /revision*</th>
<th>Stage of adoption by the Government/Parliament**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*e.g. critical review, recommendations for improvement, drafting of draft, participation in expert groups, consultations, etc.  ** A=adopted, U=under adoption process, S=submitted for adoption

Table 5. Toolkits, Manuals and Studies produced under the project until January 2014 (template)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title and author of the document</th>
<th>Type*</th>
<th>Year of publication/release/finalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*M=Manual, T=Toolkit, S=Study, R=Review, C=curriculum, O=Other